Using a Geographic Information System (GIS) to leverage the biophysical classification of a project site where ground data is linked to the Grassland Vegetation Inventory (GVI), and used to evaluate minimum disturbance practices and options for the placement of industrial projects like well sites, access roads and pipelines.

Using Grassland Vegetation Inventory Data

GVI USE IN PRE-SITE ASSESSMENT
WHAT IS THE GRASSLAND VEGETATION INVENTORY (GVI)?

- The GVI represents the Government of Alberta’s comprehensive biophysical, anthropogenic and land-use inventory of the province’s grassland natural region.
- Information for the GVI project will be collected for the entire area regardless of jurisdiction including the foothills grasslands (water bodies, native or natural areas, and agricultural, urban and other anthropogenic areas).

GVI progress to January 2011
1. Determine the size and scope of the project, including the infrastructure necessary for full development.

2. Delineate local study area boundaries on digital ortho-rectified colour imagery.

3. Map proposed development target area by projection specific coordinates.

4. Overlay the GVI data layer for the area on the air photo imagery.

5. Are anthropogenic features available within the target zones?

6. Adjust target(s) to minimize footprint in undeveloped GVI site types.


8. Use GVI attribute table and Range Plant Community Guide to flag GVI site types sensitive to disturbance.

9. Identify potential construction issues and explore possible options.

10. Adjust target(s) to avoid or minimize disturbance where possible.
SIZE AND SCOPE OF LOCAL STUDY AREA

- Digital ortho-rectified colour imagery of the potential development area.
DELINEATE LOCAL STUDY AREA

- Transportation Features.
- Protective Notations (PNT).
  - Note: Two PNTs within study area.
- Range Management Features (e.g. Fencing).
DEVELOPMENT TARGET AREA

- Add coordinates of target down-hole location.
- Maximum spatial adjustment buffer around the target (600m).
GRASSLAND VEGETATION INVENTORY

- Overlay of the Grassland Vegetation Inventory (GVI).
- Identification of **least** suitable GVI site type.
- Identification of **most** suitable GVI site type.
ANTHROPOGENIC FEATURES?

- Identification of existing industrial features within the buffer zone (e.g. Pipeline).
- Identification of anthropogenic features available for shared use (e.g. Access / Trails).
PROPOSED FOOTPRINT

- Provide options for proposed development locations within the remaining acceptable areas of the downhole target buffer.
- Map coordinates for surface
Additional values are now added:

+ ACIMS data
+ FWMIS data
  - Including Critical Ungulate Winter Range (CUWR)
+ Known Noxious Plant locations
+ Water resources
CONSTRUCTION ISSUES IDENTIFIED

- Digital Elevation Model added.
- Creek crossing identified.
- Slope Analysis
- Topographic issues identified (e.g. cut and fill).
OPTION 1 REVIEW - ADVANTAGES

- **Access**
  + Making use of an existing anthropogenic feature.

- **Conservation**
  + Consideration of PNT via development of a forested site type.
**OPTION 1 REVIEW - DISADVANTAGES**

- **Access**
  - Development within the PNT.
  - Creek crossing.
- **FWMIS Occurrences.**
- **ACIMS Occurrences.**
- **CUWR**
  - Timing constraint
- **Topography**
  - Significant well site variation.
**OPTION 2 REVIEW - ADVANTAGES**

- **Access**
  - Making use of an existing anthropogenic feature.

- **Conservation**
  - Development primarily within a Tame Pasture site type.
**OPTION 2 REVIEW - DISADVANTAGES**

- **Access**
  - Development within the PNT.
  - Creek crossing.
  - Longest access.
  - Weed locations.

- **Topography**
  - Some wellsight variation.
OPTION 3 REVIEW - ADVANTAGES

- **Access**
  - Length (short).

- **Topography**
  - Minimal wellsite variation.
**OPTION 3 REVIEW - DISADVANTAGES**

- **Access**
  - Development within the PNT.
  - Significant sensitive site type (Overflow).
  - Creek crossing.
- **ACIMS occurrences.**
- **Development within PNT**
  - Well site entirely within the PNT.
Consideration of available information makes Option 2 the preferred site from which to proceed with the more costly fieldwork requirements of the pre-site assessment process.
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