

PMBC Adoption Working Group - Working Session #2 Notes – Oct 17, 2018 Teleconference

Scribed by: John Samulski, Bill Johnstone, Dennett Woodland

Attendees:

Bart Fyfe
Ben Driver
Kenna Bilek
Brian Goble
David Gariepy
Eva Kerby
Evan Schwab
Oscar Huang
Jason Hart
Terry McDonald
Bill McKay
Myron Doherty
Rory O'Connell
Scott Macphail
Colin Newall
Brad Sparks
Dale Sparrow
Tom O'Brien
Vanessa Pocock

Brian Greening
Ann Archibald
Steve Mark
John Samulski
Dennett Woodland
William Johnstone
Hari Yeruva
Irshad Jamal
Peter Haas

BG: Primary purpose of meeting is to follow up on the inputs received during AWG working session #1.

BG: Review of Basecamp portal. How is it working for the group? Any issues? Some initial issues with too many messages going out. Working on establishing a schedule for correspondence so people aren't overwhelmed with messages. Group generally satisfied with the portal. Some regularity in the timing of communications would be appreciated. Over organisation and content seems to be effective.

Review of status of PMBC Operations (BG): Provided an overview of current status and performance metrics for PMBC Ops. Numbers overall very good and meeting objectives. Scott M: Stat ROWs – are some Stat ROWs missing? BG: ROWs being brought in initially with a single PIN, then individual PINs added as charges are raised against the ROW.

Adoption Progress Stats for Local Gov'ts (SM): Steve Mark presented a summary of adoption progress. Adoption rate generally exceeding projections in both groups (LG non-ICF and LG ICF). Current numbers: 80 out 118 LG non-ICF, all 69 LG ICF now consuming PMBC. Tom from BCA: How were projected numbers estimated for adoption? Ann: Numbers were based on conversations with ICI Society stakeholders and to some degree a “best guess” based on strategic plan assumptions and estimates.

Jason Hart: Are there any metrics around what “consumers” are actually doing with PMBC? E.g. Linking to Tempest? Steve: ICI are starting to gather that information and will be doing more detailed tracking in the future. BG: ICI/LTSA are working on operationalising the tracking of adoption – more granularity required.

Brian (Sooke): Is the software that is being used by consumers being tracked? ArcGIS? AutoCAD? ArcGIS Pro? Tools being used will dictate the platform for scripts... tools not cross platform compatible in some cases. ArcGIS Pro introduces some challenges vs. ArcGIS Desktop. ICI/LTSA actively working with Esri Canada to ensure tools “keep up” with technology changes as best as is practical. New tools are being built for ArcGIS Pro, but the issue is complex and will take time to resolve all issues.

DG (Esri): A year or two away until parcel mapping supported in ArcGIS Pro.

Follow up on actions from Working Session #1 (BG):

1. ALR dataset dependency
2. Federal Lands dataset dependency
3. PMBC Spatial Improvement Assessment app

ALR Dataset Dependency

BG presented a summary of feedback received from AWG members RE ALC dataset in terms of common themes around how ALC data is used and where dependencies exist.

Most members not editing / aligning ALR data to their parcels and are using it “as is”.

Some members (e.g. Surrey) using title information vs. spatial information to determine whether a parcel is within the ALR.

Bill M (Surrey): ALR shown in Cosmos. Spatial layer being shown hasn't been changed for a long time. Just compared to current ALC data and little or no changes between the data sets. ALR boundary updated quarterly by ALC. This includes meta-data on the source of the line features used to build the boundary polygons (ALR_Lines dataset).

Brian (Sooke): Doesn't make sense for consumers to edit / modify ALR data given that it is updated quarterly.

Bart (Trail): Use ALR data as an overlay only. No point trying to keep up with changes by attempting to align/conflate with parcels.

Jason: Dependency between PMBC and ALR data should not be a real barrier to adoption – alignment between the two data sets is a “nice to have”, but not a

barrier to adoption. *General consensus achieved among the group that this is indeed the case.*

Jason: There are currently several sources for ALC data (e.g. DataBC / GeoShare). Is there an "official" source for this data? Are the versions that are available from various sources the same? SM: Will follow up and report back to the group.

Federal Lands Dependency

BG presented a summary of feedback received from AWG members RE Federal Lands data in terms of common themes around how Federal Lands data is used and where dependencies exist.

Overall trend seems to be that there currently is poor alignment between NR Can data and other parcel fabric data. Degree of misalignment varies from location to location, or depending on the type of boundary (e.g. natural boundaries tend to be very misaligned).

DG (Esri): Have been encouraging NR Can to focus on aligning their boundaries with local jurisdictions and establish common rules when adjusting boundaries. Will require collaboration to develop standards and processes to support this.

Bill (Surrey): Would like foreshore lots included in PMBC. This is currently a "thorn in their side" and would like LTSA/PMBC to take this on.

BG: Is alignment with Fed Lands a "carrot" as opposed to a true barrier? *General consensus among the group that this is a "Carrot" (like the ALC data). Not a real barrier to adoption.*

DG (Esri): Offered to support LTSA in establishing a dialogue with NR Can around working through this issue.

Tom (BCA): Currently have a process whereby they download NR Can data for IRs and maintain it. Delivered at the IR level. Would like a compiled data set to be available to save effort on this. SM (ICI): Has looked into this, but hasn't been able to get traction in resolving the issue.

WMJ: Foreshore lot data: Where do you get data from? Are you communicating with Vancouver Fraser Port Authority who create/maintain some of the foreshore and water lots? This question also applies to all other port operations in BC (e.g., Victoria, Nanaimo, Port Alberni, Prince Rupert). Given increased public interest in land and environmental management/risks within harbour areas, it will be very important to have clear mapping of the shoreline and foreshore land title interests). Bill (Surrey): Get it from the Port Authority. Could also be sourced from other places. Mix of sources. BG: Didn't include foreshore lots in PMBC spec due to challenges with different sources of data / data quality issues.

PMBC Spatial Improvement Assessment app

BG: Has everyone had a chance to look at the app? A few people had not seen it yet. Various comments received from AWG members and some comments/suggestions have been incorporated into the app already. Continuing to work on enhancing both content and functionality.

Mechanism for providing feedback via the app: BG: LTSA working on a "widget" to provide the ability for users to provide feedback.

Brian (Sooke): Encourages AWG members to use the app to "walk around" their jurisdiction to detect issues, etc.

Ability to offer the app to others? BG: LTSA working on making the app accessible by the public soon. Target is to make it available by the end of October.

BG walked through a number of technical / functional requests: various enhancements are planned to the application based on user feedback. Most/all requests should be addressed by planned future releases.

Ben (MoTI): Are there any plans to include attribution via the app around when improvements are planned for a particular area? BG: Difficult to communicate that info reliably, as things change that affect scheduled improvements.

Top Priorities / Topics for Upcoming Working Sessions

Bart: Linking PMBC data to BCA XML data advice. This is an important consideration for adoption.

Tom (BCA): Might be better to link the XML data advice to the BCA parcel fabric, since there is a direct link based on JUROL.

Bart: Some features are different between the PMBC and BCA parcel representation.

Tom (BCA): Will this issue "go away" when BCA adopts PMBC? Bart: Yes. Tom: BCA very close to adopting PMBC, so this should not be a problem much longer.

WMJ: An important concept from Colin Newall: A stakeholder organization might be "the custodian of a derivative product based on another external source." A nice summary of how parcel data can "cascade" through the other dependent datasets.

Eva: This topic would be a good candidate for the next AWG working session. Various other members agreed this would be a high priority for an AWG working meeting topic.

BG: Should work with Tom from BCA to address this topic and prepare for the next AWG working meeting.

Future Workshops

Next session – Wed, Nov 21 – 10:30am to 2:00pm – in person attendance at Vancouver & Victoria LTSA offices.

Subsequent session dates (tentative):

Dec 19, 2018

Jan 16, 2019

Feb 20, 2019

Mar 20, 2019

Apr 17, 2019

BG: LTSA could host people during the Web-based meetings if that is desired.