Notes from Mapping Stakeholder Forum – June 10, 2009

1. New ATS 5.1?? update was discussed but there is no formal plan or agreement to replace it at this time. It is felt that within the next year or two the timing would be good to produce a new frozen version. However, it will be discussed with end-users at another EAG before any action is taken.

2. ATS products clipped to the new provincial boundary.
Action: AltaLIS will deliver the ATS products in both a clipped and non-clipped version.
2.1 Users would like an attribute on Road Allowance polygon to indicate if road is in surveyed or unsurveyed territory.
Action: We are reviewing this and a decision will be made shortly to either include in our new upcoming delivery of ATS products including LSD's or not.

3. With new LSD Level in the ATS, AltaLIS will deliver the ATS product with a separate layer for LSD, 1/4 Section, Section and Township all with Road Allowances.

4. DIDs Data – Could we produce a new Township plot with readable text or PDF on website with Township background to navigate more easily?
Action: We will investigate this further to determine economics and viability of meeting this suggestion.

7. The standard for digital submissions at SRD in AutoCad is AutoCad 2006. When will it move to some later version of AutoCad? The newer versions will not save that far back.
Action: I will ask SRD to investigate this suggestion and report back.

8. New DEM - a lot of users felt we should pursue a new more accurate DEM.
   □ A suggestion that we look at even better then 30m to 40m grid and possibly go to a 20m grid.
Action: We are continuing to look at this and develop a business case to hopefully proceed.

9. Look for ways to attach Metadata to product rather then an attached word document.
Action: We will investigate and report back.

Breakout Group Discussion

10. Can a Subdivision layer that has the boundary of each subdivision be created?
Action: This is part of the CAD to GIS Ready Project recommendations. We will need a business case to proceed.

11. Boundaries for Hamlets in the cadastral instead of point feature.
Action: Not an 'Order in Council' boundary but will investigate and report back.

12. New Geo-Admin file that shows crown Land versus Patented Land.
Action: Will investigate and report back.

13. Trapper file that goes with Geo_Admin file. They presently can buy a file from fish and wildlife but it is hard to work with as it contains redundant data and must be culled carefully and manually.
Action: May be considered in the future in conjunction with other LUF requirements.

14. Combine DIDs mapping data with Land Status/Standing Report. Most End Users are doing this anyway themselves including SRD.
Action: Will discuss this further with GOA and report back.

15. Dispositions in private land are going to be a necessity for LUF and End Users agree they would be very useful.
Action: Due to large cost of this a funded business case will need to be developed before this can be undertaken.

16. Geo Data Base instead of Shape files would be the preferred format for all products for some Users.
   □   Expensive venture to continually reformat to GIS standards
Action: Will be considered for new format in future, once Pilot with GOA is complete.
   □   Need to standardize attribute data for each product.
Action: SRD is developing some standards for GEO Discover and we will review and comment on these.

17. The Land Use Framework presentation discussed the need for Conservation easements/ Building footprints. Could these features be SDW products?
Action: Will review and if possible look at adding these in the future.

18. SDW is supportive of province wide addressing for all parcels with municipalities maintaining the addresses, sending in changes or new addresses as they happen.

19. LSAS_Conflict and APPL features – for activities where this occurs, could the feature be contained in the opposite feature classes. This will make working with the data simpler and more readily understood. Currently if you want to view the best representation of the activity, users must remove the features in the APPL feature class and replace them with the LSAS_Conflict geometry. It is more logical to have the LSAS_Conflict hold the application geometry for the feature and let the APPL feature house the most useable depiction.
Action: Will review this possibility.