

Form T9: Final Ecosystem Mapping QA

Submission # _____ **Date of Submission** _____
Rural Area of Princeton Sensitive Ecosystem Mapping

Project Name _____
Shikun Ran

QA Ecologist _____
Maureen Ketcheson

Mapper(s) _____

Materials checklist:

- A sample of draft ecosystem maps with completed labels (ecosystem, BGC, ecoregion) map legends and linework. This can include a portion of a single mapsheet or a representative sample from different portions of the study area and should include representative samples of mapping from each mapper (if more than one mapper involved)..
- Draft map legends, and expanded legend/report if available, listing all mapped units (including both ecosystem unit two-letter codes and associated site series numbers, along with ecosystem unit names, descriptions, site modifiers and structural stages)
- Typed air photos (including standard terrain labeling)
- A small scale map of study area w/ project boundary & flightlines clearly marked
- Topographic base map at scale of mapping (TRIM or NTS)
- Plot data for submitted area
- Applicable forest cover mapping
- Working legend

Polygon Specific Comments:

All polygon specific comments and/or recommendations must be documented in a separate PDF or word file and included as part of the QA report. It is recommended that mapping corrections be numbered and/or indicated on the stereo-pair or on an overlay. Comments associated with each number can then be kept in a separate file.

Final Ecosystem Mapping QA Review Questions:

1. Does the coding of ecosystem units follow RISC standards? Yes No
Comments/Recommendations: _____
 2. Is the format and content of the map legend to standard? Have all the required elements been included? Are all mapped ecosystem units listed in the legend? Yes No
Comments/Recommendations: _____
 3. Have ecosystem units been mapped consistently and accurately? Yes No
Comments/Recommendations: _____
 4. Is the photo interpretation of all ecosystem attributes consistent and accurate? Yes No
Comments/Recommendations: _____
-

5. Is the ecosystem mapping consistent with respect to polygon size and the level of detail in the mapping? Have small but important features been pulled out in a consistent manner (e.g., wetlands)? Does the level of detail meet project objectives? Yes No
 Comments/Recommendations: _____
-
6. Have the non-vegetated, sparsely vegetated and anthropogenic units been mapped consistently and correctly? Yes No
 Comments/Recommendations: _____
-
7. Are ecosystem unit proportions (deciles) consistent with other polygons and with the terrain unit proportions, where applicable? Yes No
 Comments/Recommendations: No terrain units mapped
-
8. Have site series and other non-correlated ecosystem units been mapped consistently over the entire study area, between adjacent polygons, across biogeoclimatic boundaries, between mappers and relative to the legend? Yes No
 Comments/Recommendations: _____
-
9. Have site series and other non-correlated ecosystem units been correctly mapped relative to existing knowledge (MOF regional field guides, previous mapping, adjacent mapping), terrain attributes, field data, forest cover attributes, topography and site conditions? Yes No
 Comments/Recommendations: _____
-
10. Have site modifiers been consistently and correctly mapped over the entire study area, within polygons, between adjacent polygons, across biogeoclimatic boundaries, and between ecosystem mappers? Have they been mapped alphabetically? Yes No
 Comments/Recommendations: _____
-
11. Have site modifiers been consistently and correctly mapped relative to the terrain attributes, plot data, topography, site conditions and the assumed site modifiers? Yes No
 Comments/Recommendations: _____
-
12. Have structural stages and structural stage modifiers been mapped consistently and correctly between polygons, over the study area, relative to the field data and relative to the forest cover maps or air photos? Yes No
 Comments/Recommendations: _____
-
13. Was the entire project area submitted for review? Yes No
 What percent of the study area was reviewed? _____
 Comments/Recommendations: _____
-
14. Was more than one person involved in the mapping? Yes No
 If yes, please list the areas mapped by each individual _____
-
15. Record the number of air photos reviewed _____ Record the number of air photos typed _____

List the air photo numbers that were reviewed _____

16. Record the number of mapsheets reviewed _____ Record the number of mapsheets typed _____
List the mapsheet numbers that were reviewed _____

17. Record the number polygons reviewed 150 Record the number of polygons typed 1455
Record the number of polygons in agreement (i.e. acceptable) _____
Record the number of polygons in disagreement (i.e. not acceptable) _____

18. Other: Yes No
Comments/Recommendations: _____
A well mapped product

QA Sign Off: (Please Print)

Name QA Contractor(s)

**Shikun Ran (Timberline
Internal Quality Assurance)**

Signature



Acceptable?

Yes No

Review Date

August 24, 2009

Yes No

Yes No