Cadastral User Forums

Oct. 9, 2003 in Calgary – 24 users in attendance

Oct. 16, 2003 in Edmonton – 32 users in attendance

Users identified the following issues for SDW/AltaLIS to consider:

Users Helping Users:
1. <u>Bulletin Board</u> – By posting issues and responses from both AltaLIS and users on the AltaLIS website, users would have a ready-made forum to exchange ideas and find potential solutions for their problems. ESRI seems to have an effective process in place.
2. <u>User Groups</u> – Getting together users with common interests (eg. Municipalities) would allow users to learn from each other. It was suggested that unless SDW took the initiative it probably wouldn't happen.
3. <u>Sharing of user data</u> – AltaLIS should consider introducing a process whereby users could share their value added data, something along the same lines as GBIS in Edmonton.
4. <u>Importing data into MapInfo</u> – Users have experienced problems with importing data into older versions of MapInfo. Newer versions of MapInfo seem to have solved the problem.

Dynamic Base:
5. <u>Synchronizing user data with a shifting base</u> – All users face the challenge of maintaining their own data in sync with the continually shifting cadastral base. Any tools that would assist them in this process would be most helpful. Tracking the amount of shift in the base could help users decide whether or not the change warrants them adjusting their facility data.
6. <u>Identifying updated areas</u> – Indicate areas that have been updated and the reason for the update i.e. integration of a new plan, ripple effect of new integration, error correction, etc.

Marketing & Promotion:
7. <u>Promotion of AltaLIS data</u> – AltaLIS should do more to market its data and make potential users aware of the products.
8. <u>Fee structure</u> – Municipalities would like to see one annual fee for access to all SDW and GOA (Government of Alberta) data for their area. This would avoid the difficulties associated with having to seek council approval each time they need additional data.
9. <u>Edmonton and Calgary data</u> – A common access point for all Alberta data, including Calgary and Edmonton would be beneficial.

New Products & Services:
10. <u>Base Features</u> – Many users would like access to the Base Features dataset.
11. Municipal addresses – Many users would find municipal addresses as a valuable addition to the data.
12. <u>Meta data</u> – Additional meta data would be beneficial.
13. <u>ATS shape files</u> – Make the ATS data available in shape file format.

14. Real time updates – The ability to access up to date data on an as required basis.
15. AltaLIS viewer – Some municipalities would like to see the AltaLIS viewer maintained for future deliveries of updated data. Currently the viewer is only provided with the initial data delivery. Municipalities would like to see the capability of the viewer expanded to incorporate some of the municipality's own data.
16. Building footprints – Showing the outline of buildings in the data would be another "nice to have" addition to the data.
17. Access roads and structures – Introduce an additional data set that shows access roads and structures.
18. Cadastral data in GIS format - Having cadastral data in a GIS format would give users considerable more capability. Querying by individual lot or plan shapes are just a few examples.
19. Data by themes – Currently most of the data products contain various features that were collected from various sources and vintages. Many of these features are not maintained and are not coincidental with other features. Features such as hydrology, geo-admin boundaries, and ATS could be "extracted" from the various datasets, meta data could be used to identify the most current version and the data could then be maintained in-sync with other appropriate data. These features would then be available as their own theme or product that could be referenced or "overlaid" with other datasets..
20. Additional geo-admin boundaries - Additional geo-admin boundaries such as school board boundaries and health authority boundaries would assist certain users.
21. Banff and Jasper – Add these municipalities to the data sets.

Reporting of Errors & Corrections:
22. Reporting of errors – Users would like some guidelines on what procedures they should follow when they are investigating apparent errors in the data. They would also like clarity on how they go about reporting actual errors.
23. Municipal Boundaries – There are some discrepancies between what AltaLIS and the municipalities show for municipal boundaries.
24. Error reporting status – Report on what stage the correction is at.
25. Street name changes – It was suggested that a more structured process be introduced for changing street names in the cadastral data. Currently AltaLIS recognizes the municipality as being the authority and will only change the street name if requested by the municipality to do so.

Cadastral Improvements:
26. AltaLIS layer structure – Some layers contain too much data and users could benefit from separating the layers. As an example, street and lot dimensions appear on the same layer.
27. Municipal boundaries in rural cadastral files – Town boundaries currently are shown in the urban cadastral files. Users would like to see these boundaries depicted in the rural cadastral files as well.

28. <u>Hydrography</u> – Hydrography is not consistent between the various data sets. Having meta data that defines the date of capture and accuracy of the data would help.
29. <u>Duplicate linework</u> - There is duplicate linework when you order two adjacent map sheets. "Clipping" would eliminate the duplicate linework but would require extra cleanup. The question is which option would best satisfy the majority of clients.
30. <u>Stub lot lines</u> – For cartographic purposes it would be helpful to depict stub lot lines on a separate level. This would allow users to remove some lot lines from their maps and thereby eliminate some clutter.
31. <u>Displaying data</u> – Sometimes the displayed data doesn't agree with specs. For example, colors may not match. Often this can be a problem with the user-defined settings.
32. <u>Edge of roads</u> – Showing the edge of roads would be a "nice to have" addition to the data.

Title Mapping Improvements:
33. <u>Title boundary conflicts</u> – Flag problems with riparian rights (hydrography) and other title boundary conflicts for municipalities.
34. <u>Polygons with no LINC numbers</u> – Polygons with no LINC numbers still have a PID. It would be helpful to specify what the polygon is i.e. crown land, road allowance, hydrography, etc.
35. <u>Fill holes in Titles Mapping data</u> – Creating polygons for roads, road allowances, right of ways, and hydrography would allow more GIS queries and assist in the creation of county maps.
36. <u>Multiple parcels</u> – Some users are having difficulty in working with TM data that contains multiple parcels with only one owner, such as a factory.
37. <u>Multiple parcel titles in urban areas</u> – Creating polygons for each individual parcel within a title would assist some users.
38. <u>Road closures</u> – not all road closures are in the titles mapping data.
39. <u>Additions to the TM database</u> - In the TM municipal database, include a table that has the long legal description concatenated into one memo field.
40. <u>TM polygon centroids</u> – Add a field to the TM database that depicts the coordinates (x,y) of the centroid of each polygon.

Municipal Databases:
41. <u>MIMS</u> – Many users would find it advantageous to be able to use SDW data when utilizing the Municipal Infrastructure Management System (MIMS) toolset.
42. <u>Connecting to municipal databases</u> – Any tools that would help municipalities tie the titles database to their own databases would be valuable.