

DIDs Stakeholder Session Concerns or Recommendations

1. Change attribute name from ASB (as-built) to something else, when plan is in a different ¼ section from the application. Start to populate the disposition type i.e LOC, PLA ect.
Action: Populate the disposition type (LOC, PLA ect) in this attribute. We will create another field called “New Location” when the disposition leaves the ¼ section.
2. Create a new attribute to flag if Disposition compiled plan is an actual “as-built”.
Action: Create this only after # 3 below is implemented.
3. Mike Michaud said SRD is considering a 1 year lease. Then either cancelling or approving the disposition if they do not get or get the “as-built” plan within the year. Users did not raise any real concern with this suggestion.
Action: SRD will continue to pursue this alternative to ensure “as-built” information is captured, although there is no definite timetable at this time.
4. Users want to see discrepancy data.
Action: Today 6 categories with 21 separate discrepancy codes in the database are delivered to SRD. Users will receive this same data as well.
5. Concerned about how a user knows how accurate a plan really is.
Action: How the plan is compiled is captured in an attribute i.e. sketch, survey, aerial photo, digitized ect. Add multiple sources to the list and provide this attribute with the end product.
6. Web Based system for users to identify errors or discrepancies.
Action: We will provide a Web Based form to record errors.
7. Concern was raised with regards to line work ties. If data is used in any other projection then Geographic line work will not snap together.
Action: If there was enough User demand to warrant we would look at developing a second product in possibly 10TM. There would be significant cost in developing this product and might require users to pay something to recover cost.
8. Concerned about all other geographic data for purposes of ILM (Integrated Land Management), if they will be created or stored using fixed ATS Mar05 V4.1.
Action: SRD recognizes this as an issue and are in the initial stages of formalizing a plan. AVI (Alberta Vegetation Inventory) target is for new submissions to be delivered in the new ATS Mar05 V4.1, then transitioning all existing data over time.
9. Base Features – Users would like a second label at the township level that displays the information in reverse order Township/Range/Meridian.
Action: AltaLIS will add a new attribute to the new ATS Mar05 V4.1 township file line work product that will be Township/Range/Meridian.
10. Users would like to submit data by Shape File instead of CAD File. MNC doing a pilot with Blue Ridge right now to see how this would/could work.
Action: Results of Pilot will hopefully form the new standard for submitting applications in Shape files. SRD will still require a PDF in “Plan of Survey format” i.e. Title Block, North Arrow, ect.

11. History file with attribution is only sent to SRD at present, Users would like this data.

Action: We will provide the same data SRD receives to users.

12. Would like Cut Blocks, Log Decks, Campsites shown on disposition plans mapped. They are not being captured at this time. One issue would be with transitory nature of these areas, i.e. changing from log deck to camp site.

Action: The “as-built” process back in number #3 would be one solution to this. Getting existing information from FMA is another possibility.

13. Users would like Web Based Service. With AltaLIS hosting the data and users hitting it live.

Action: AltaLIS has an existing pilot of this for Cadastral data which will be completed at the end of October 2006. To be considered pending results of the pilot.

14. Users would like existing “as-built” file combined with regular Disposition file not kept separate.

Action: Would require an additional attribute to keep plans unique. We will discuss further at next Stakeholder meeting.

15. Create a new attribute called Operator. This would need to change when Disposition holder is changed.

Action: This will be added for all dispositions. It will be delivered as an external database to handle when there is more than one operator.

16. Create a new attribute called Purpose. That states the purpose for the specific disposition.

Action: This will be added for dispositions directly out of LSAS. It is not always populated in LSAS.

17. Users want different polygon for road versus well site. This would allow them to map by theme i.e. color differently.

Action: This requires further review by SRD. The way dispositions are applied for and accepted would need to change i.e cases of restricted access road and MSL together.

18. Users would like Compilation change when new PLA comes in later. Always move existing LOC to it instead of moving it to an existing LOC that is likely not as accurate.

Action: During compilation this process is used already. SRD/SDW/AltaLIS will have to discuss this further for plans in maintenance as there is a cost to redraw plans numerous times.

19. Survey companies will use Disposition data the same way they use parcel data.

Action: Utilizing the data for the surround information on there new plans. Is it possible to have Survey companies use this compiled data for more then surround information?

20. Other Users intend to use the Disposition data as the source for their production system.

Action: Great

21. Jim Chorel indicated he would like to deliver in 1:250,000 block files. Most users were OK with that. One user would like to download data from AltaLIS in smaller files right down to individual disposition plans themselves.

Action: More review is required. There would be a significant cost to this and would require a large customer volume to justify.

22. Can users have access to townships that have compiled plans but have not been finalized and scheduled for release?

Action: We will look into some possible delivery mechanisms and provide feedback at the next Stakeholder meeting.

23. With schedule look at entire FMA area and deliver it together rather than leaving small piece in a future delivery.

Action: MNC will look at this along with Number #24 below and put together several different options for review and discussion.

24. Oil & Gas would like us to look at Foothills area and try to deliver earlier.

Action: MNC will look at this along with Number #23 above and put together several different options for review and discussion.

25. Will we have a Dispositions Specifications Committee that meets regularly to review and recommend any changes to the specifications?

Action: At this stage in the project (1 year complete) the specifications can not change very drastically as there is a huge cost to revisiting completed plans. We will however, continue to have a Stakeholder or (External Advisory Group) meet once or twice a year and review any suggestions or requests.

26. Everyone would like to shorten the delivery span from 4 years to something less.

Action: We will review possible options with SRD.

27. CAPP would entertain a new proposal and discuss with their membership an increase in price. If the completion date of the project could be moved significantly earlier.

Action: Not likely the political will to make changes to Regulations at this stage of the project. We will review other possible option with SRD.