Arkansas Centerline File Standard – Proposed Revision

Copies of Public Comments
(all public comments were received via email)

1. **Commenter's Name:**   Judi Frigon
   Commenter's Business/Agency: Benton County 9-1-1 Administration

The following are comments to the proposed ACF Standard revision:

CITY_L and CITY_R would be a problem for emergency 9-1-1 dispatching because we need to know what municipality is the responding agency or if it is in the County. Some of our zip codes do not correspond with the city it is actually located in. We have a field CITY_ZIP that uses the USPS city name.

RD_CLASS AND RD_DESIGN should be spelled out and not abbreviated. You would need a code book to understand what the abbreviations designate.

LOG_DIRECT should be designated as log and anti-log. A and B is very confusing.

2. **Commenter's Name:**   Lara Wood
   Commenter's Business/Agency: Arkansas GIS Office

I am writing in response to your announcement of the Public Comment period for adoption of a new Arkansas Centerline File Standard.
I would like to propose four (4 to 16, depending on how you look at it) alterations and one addition to the existing standard.

For the alterations, I would like to suggest changing the Left and Right From and To range fields for all appropriate fields (16 total, including Alternate name fields) from Text to Integer. This allows for sorting numerically, as well as aiding in definition queries involving mathematical operators such as "greater than" or "less than".

The addition I'd like to propose is including a PSTR_FULNAM (corresponding to the current APF standard) field , which would consist of a concatenation of the four street name elements (PRE_DIR, PSTR_NAME, PSTR_TYPE,

PSUF_DIR). This addition could aid in definition queries and labeling, among other things.

3. **Commenter's Name:**   Jonathan Hall
   Commenter's Business/Agency: Little Rock Police Department

The proposed standard does not clearly articulate "exceptions" to the "Must Not Intersect" Topology rule. These exceptions are necessary, unless additional attributes are added to the standard, to build topologically correct street networks for routing (navigation).

In my opinion, 1.b. should explicitly state that centerlines shall not be split at grade-separated overpasses and underpasses.

http://www.gis.arkansas.gov/Docs/LAW/20171206_ACF_Standard_Proposed_Revision_Full_Markup_SoS.pdf, Page 6, "Digitizing" 1.b. states:

> "1. All linear road features representing public or private roads that have been given a name and left/right range values for addressing purposes should be properly segmented into individual features at intersections representing traffic transportation decision points and snapped to endpoints to ensure proper topology. If an existing road feature is split to create proper segmentation, the left and right addresses ranges should be recalculated to reflect the change in geometry. The exceptions to this could be but are not limited to:
> a. Where the local jurisdiction digitizes driveways for location purposes and does not name or range them for addressing.
> b. Where two road centerline features intersect and do not represent a transportation decision point, e.g. an overpass or underpass where direct travel between the roads is not possible."

Definitions, excerpt from page 16:

> "Grade Separated Access Ramp – Connects roadways, permitting traffic flow from one mainline route to another without crossing any other traffic stream. These are typically found at controlled access interchanges, e.g. access ramps on an interstate highway. The grade separation implied by the name refers to the different levels at which the two mainline routes cross each other, i.e. at an overpass or underpass."

The standard's intent may be consistent with my comment, but the language describing "exceptions" in 1.b. is not clear. As worded currently, ("exceptions to this could be"), the standard may lead GIS technicians to split every centerline where "Must Not Intersect" topology errors occur.

Admittedly, not splitting centerlines at grade-separations complicates a GIS technicians work, applying the "Must Not Intersect" Topology rule, and

identifying legitimate "exceptions" to the rule at every overpass or underpass.

Modern CAD (Computer Assisted Dispatch) software is capable of generating turn-by-turn driving directions for first responders to an emergency location, and locating the first responder with the shortest drive-time from the emergency location. Most, if not all, CAD software that supports generating driving directions, and nearest-unit dispatching, require centerlines have additional attributes, or require centerlines that have no node at grade-separated overpasses and underpasses.

I am not suggesting additional attributes. I suggest that for ACF to support CAD navigation and routing functions, centerlines must not be split at grade separations.

I hope this comment is helpful for updating the standard.

4. **Commenter's Name:**   Elizabeth Bowen
   Commenter's Business/Agency: Northwest Arkansas Regional
                                        Planning Commission

Thank you for coming to our GIS meeting on Tuesday. It was so good to see you and hear about what the State is doing. Below are some of our comments regarding the most recent version of the ACF file standards.

Page 8 Add Prefix_Type
Add complete road name field
Add USPS City_L
Add USPS City_R
Add Functional Class
For RD-Class spell out instead of abbreviations For Rd-Design spell out instead of abbreviations Add Hwy_Num Add Ownership Add CommunityL Add CommunityR Add speed Limit Add speed emveh Add Rd_Width Add Max height Add max Weight Add One way Add Sign_Color For Log_Direct - instead of A&B put log and anti-log Add Rd_SurfMat (ie asphalt, chip&seal, gravel, concrete, etc) Page 15 add visuals like you have on pages 4&5 Page 17 add visuals for traffic cirls and addressing

I think we need to include bike lane and cycle track facilities in the system. These are on-road facilities.

We may need to also start including the Shared Use Paved Trails that are considered transportation routes?

5. **Commenter's Name:**   Mayor Kevin Johnston
   Commenter's Business/Agency: City of Gentry

Good morning,

I received an email from the Arkansas Municipal League in reference to the "PROPOSED REVISION TO THE ARKANSAS CENTERLINE FILE STANDARD - OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT."

I merely wanted to confirm the response you were hoping to receive from municipalities as, we, at the City of Gentry want to do all we can to assist in your successful project.

Are you in need of any necessary comments on the proposed revision or are you in need of our city's assistance as it pertains to our boundaries?

Thank you for your time.

6. **Commenter's Name:**   Matthew Charton
   Commenter's Business/Agency: DataScout, LLC; Arkansas GIS
   Board member

FYI: you have two "or" in your description of RD_DESIGN: Design characteristic of the road. Acceptable values are 'DC', 'SC', 'TC', 'CS', **or** 'RA', 'RG', 'FR', **or** 'HF'

Otherwise, it looks good.

7. **Commenter's Name:**   Matthew DeLong
   Commenter's Business/Agency: Arkansas GIS Office

Change AH_District to AH_Dist to keep field names less than 11 characters which causes truncation of field names with some GIS file formats.

Change Unique_ID data type to Long Integer so the field will sort.