

Inuvialuit Regional Corporation

Request for Quote: GIS Services

Addendum 1: Questions and Answers

Q: Are the boundaries of plans 75719 CLSR, 75720 CLSR and 75721 CLSR as represented in the digital cadastral files, available from the Surveyor General Branch, for zones 108, 110, and 111 allowed to be used for the comparison with the metes and bounds descriptions? Or do the aforesaid plan boundaries need to be compiled from the plan information?

A: Yes, as long as those cadastral files are aligned with the actual plans. The NRCan Aboriginal Lands shapefile contains several unexplained deviations from the plans, but it's definitely possible the cadastral files are correct.

Q: If the digital cadastral files are deemed to be useable, will a scale factor be provided to allow ground level distances to be extracted from them?

A: We do not have the capacity to provide that.

Q: The verbiage in the metes and bound descriptions creates some ambiguity in how to create the boundary which will lead to differences when compared to the plans of survey. Is the primary goal to analyze the total area of each annex or are differences in rectilinear boundary dimensions to be discussed and if so, what magnitude of difference would justify a discussion in the report?

A: Area is more important than boundary distance. However, any difference of more than 1% (the allowable margin of error in subsection 7(5) of the IFA) between the plans and the metes and bounds should be flagged.

Q: Is the scope to include verifying the sub-surface rights for all parcels within the designated annexes? Or, are the sub-surface interests in the RFQ the only ones that need to be shown in the shapefiles?

A: The IFA has two basic categories of lands: 7(1)(a) lands include both surface and subsurface rights, and 7(1)(b) lands include surface and granular rights. The above plans cover both classes of lands and they are clearly delineated in the plans. Since the IFA was signed there have been several adjustments to the boundaries Inuvialuit lands for various reasons, and this has created a few parcels where Inuvialuit own some or all subsurface, but not surface rights (all of these are listed in Appendix 2 of the original RFQ). Verification of these changes is not part of the scope of this RFQ as they were surveyed prior to a land exchange and did not rely on metes and bounds. However the boundaries as they are, including the newer subsurface-only parcels, should be reflected in the updated shapefile.