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### Past Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>W. Pearce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>L.C. Charlesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>L.C. Charlesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>R.W. Cautley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>A.C. Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>J.L. Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>H.H. Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>A.S. Weekes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>G.W. McLeod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>R.H. Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>A.P.C. Belyea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>C.M. Hoar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>J.L. Doupe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>B.J. Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>O. Inkster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>C.M. Hoar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>R.H. Cautley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>E.D. Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>T.W. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>N.H. Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>C.B. Atkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>H.S. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>A. Cormack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>W.E. Zinkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>W. Humphreys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>J.W. Doze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>R.M. Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>G.Z. Pinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>J.H. Holloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>R. McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>G.C. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>G.C. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>R. McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>C.W. Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>W.D. Usher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>D.K.F. Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>C.H. Weir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>W.A. Wolley-Dod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>L.O. Olsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>C.W. Youngs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>E.J. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>G.C. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>A.J. Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>G. Oslund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>W.E. Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>T.E. Rippon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>T.C. Swany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>D.C. Holmberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>D.B. Gillmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>M.A. MacCrimmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>R.A.F. Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>T. Okamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>M.L. Sexauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>R.J. Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>J.W. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>J. Deyholos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>E.J. Tessari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>N.R. Mattson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>J.E. Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>B.R. Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>W.R. Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>R.A. Bassil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>R.J. Fulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>A.D. Hosford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>R.E.D. McCuaig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>L.W. Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>G.E. Olsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>I.C. Maltais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>S.M. Loeppky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>G.L. Haggerty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>R.F. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>H.E. Impye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>L.H. Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>J.H. Holmlund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>W.R. Dabbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>S.J. Longson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>D.R. Jaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>L.M. Pals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>G.K. Allred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>D.R. McWilliam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>J.G. Halliday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>A.W. Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>S.C. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>D.H. VandenBrink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>R.M. Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>R.O. Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>D.R. George</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Past Presidents - Back row from left to right: Larry Pals, Jim Halliday, Dirk VandenBrink, Bob Wallace
Front row from left to right: Ron Hall, Lyall Pratt, Dave McWilliam, Ken Allred*
## Attendance at the 101st Annual Meeting

### Active Members

| J.A. Adair | J.A. Fehr | D.A. Lachance |
| D.J. Amantea | L.C. Finer | J.E. Landry |
| A.O. Amundrud | A.V. Flim | P.H. Lapainis |
| L.A. Andersen | W.C. Foran | A.J.S. Large |
| C. Ashton | M. Forsyth | C. Larsen |
| J. Barich | L.J. Frederick | B.B. Laurie |
| K.B. Beatty | D.R. George | L.A. Laurie |
| C.W. Beaugrand | B.R. Giesbrecht | M.P. Lee |
| B. Benson | A. Gill | R.W. Leeman |
| L.M. Bily | D. Gillis | J.H. Lehners |
| J.W. Blatz | D.C. Gillmore | S.P. Lin |
| R.P.J. Blommaert | H.J. Goosens | W.A. Lippitt |
| R.T. Bode | R.T. Gordon | M.R. Louie |
| G.A. Boggs | D.E. Gosling | R.G. Luard |
| S. Boulanger | K.T. Grenchie | H.D. Macaulay |
| M.M. Bourgeois | K. Grover | R.B. MacDormand |
| J.K. Boutilier | B.W. Gudim | C.S. MacKeen |
| J.N. Broderick | R.C. Guy | K.N. MacLeod |
| R.E. Broderick | D.J. Hagen | J.I. Maidment |
| J.S. Brooks | J. Haggerty | A.R. Main |
| P.D. Brown | R.O. Hall | J.A. Main |
| D.C.J. Bruce | J.G. Halliday | I.C. Malais |
| M.A. Chandler | T.J. Hansen | D.N. Marquardt |
| C.J. Chiasson | J.N. Harland | J.M. Matejkow |
| A.R. Clapperton | D.M. Haub | J.D. Matichuk |
| W.B. Clark | C.E. Henrie | D.C. Mazurkewich |
| D. Connatty | D.B. Higgins | D.J. McArthur |
| H.L. Cummings | J.D. Howden | C.A. McBride |
| R.J. Deis | V.G. Hut | B.J. McKenna |
| P.A. Dennismore | G. Illchuk | R.P. McMahon |
| J.P. Deschamps | M.R. Ingalls | D.R. McWilliam |
| F. Dion | L. James | A.L. Melton |
| L.A. Dixon | D.A. Jamieson | R.O. Metcalfe |
| I. Douglas | C. Jeske | P.M. Michaud |
| W.B. Doyle | K. Jewett | A.F. Miles |
| S.C. DuFour | D.R. Jones | W.J. Mintz |
| R.D. Egger | S.R. Keddy | J. Misic |
| D.G. Ekland | J.H. Keong | P. Moloney |
| H.C. Engler | R.G. King | L.P. Morden |
| M.J. Ettinger | M.S. Kocher | B.A. Murray |
| L.L. Ewoniak | M.J. Koncan | B.N. Necyk |
| S.A. Fediw | C.D. Kuntz | K.J. Nemrava |

### Honorary Life Members

| G.K. Alred | J.H. Webb |
| G. Baerg | C.C. Everett |
| G.E. Moore | |

### Retired Members

| M. Abdel-salam | R. David | D. McKee |
| B. Ball | B. de Jong | L.E. Monk |
| J. Ball | C.M. Fox | D. Parmar |
| L.C. Boe | R. Fraser | T. Pasika |
| A.P. Cammaert | E.J. Gibbs | T. Robinson |
| H. Caraba | S.H. Hubert | N.R. Ronisko |
| I. Cleland | J. Jackson | W. Savoury |
| B. Clipperton | J. Klein | A.C. Spiers |
| J. Coates | P. Lund | B. Tattrie |
| J. Corcoran | N. Madarash | J.S. Thompson |
| R. Cream | R. Man | T. Willms |

### Articled Pupils

| D.B. Neufeld | R.C. Ross | D.M. Thomas |
| J.A. Nome | D.J. Rutherford | M.A. Thompson |
| E. Oh | G.A. Schirrmacher | D.R. Thomson |
| L.R. Olson | R.W.M. Scott | S.J. Van Berkel |
| L.M. Pals | M.A. Selander | D.H. VandenBrink |
| J.L. Park | D. Sharp | A. Vasynda |
| J.R. Paziuk | D.R. Shaw | S.M. Vollick |
| C.W. Pennell | N.J. Sikkes | J.D. Wallace |
| C.R. Petersen | J. Siu | R.M. Wallace |
| A.T. Pham | B.W. Smith | W.A. Wesolowsky |
| J. Phillips | P.E. Smith | P. Westersund |
| R.A. Pinkerton | R.C. Smith | B.R. Wetter |
| J.M. Plante | S. Spence | G.S. Whaley |
| R.B. Pollard | C.A.S. Sprott | C.A. White |
| R.J. Pominville | J.D. Stephens | J.D. Williams |
| W.T. Powley | D.W. Strachan | D.J. Wilson |
| L.H. Pratt | G.K. Strosmoe | B.M. Wilson |
| M.D. Prevost | P. Strozyk | B.E. Winton |
| J.R. Pyc | M.A. Sutter | K.C. Wong |
| G.A. Quarmby | K.T. Swabey | M.D. Woychuk |
| J. Quinlan | J.E. Sweeney | S.T. Yanish |
| D.R. Regan | A.J. Tarapaski | A.N. Zaver |
| M.D. Robinson | M.P. Theuerkauf | |
| B.D. Ross | J.O. Thistle | |
| ASSOCIATE MEMBERS | S. Cornett  
|                   | G. Hebb  
|                   | R. Heilman  |

| TOTALS | Active Members: 199  
|        | Honorary Life Members: 2  
|        | Retired Member: 3  
|        | Articled Pupils: 33  
|        | Associate Members: 3  
|        | Total: 240  |

**Officers and Staff of the Association 2010-2011**

**PRESIDENT**  
B.D. Ross, Calgary

**VICE PRESIDENT**  
D.R. Thomson, Calgary

**PAST PRESIDENT**  
D.R. George, Edmonton

**SECRETARY TREASURER**  
J. Haggerty, Grande Prairie (2010-2013)

**MEMBERS OF COUNCIL**  
G.A. Boggs, Edmonton (2009-2011)  
C.J. Chiasson, Grande Prairie (2010-2012)  
H.C. Engler, Edmonton (2009-2011)  
D. Gillis, Calgary (2010-2012)  
D.J. Hagen, Edmonton (2009-2011)  
R.A. Pinkerton, Calgary (2010-2012)

**PUBLIC MEMBERS**  
R. Barnes, Medicine Hat (Council)  
R. Palovcik, Sherwood Park (Practice Review Board)

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**  
B.E. Munday

**OFFICE STAFF**  
S.D. Armstrong: Executive Assistant  
K. Barrett: Administrative Assistant  
T. Berezan: Administrative Assistant  
C.C. Everett: Director of Practice Review  
D.R. McWilliam: Registrar  
D.A. Phelan: Information Services Administrator  
M. Woywitka: Administrative Assistant
## 2010-2011 Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUTORY COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chairman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical &amp; Biographical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDING COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALSA/DOS/LTO Metis Settlements Liaison</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASAASMT MOU Implementation Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.J. Chiasson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER COMMITTEES/GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSMT Liaison</strong>: C.J. Chiasson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPP Geomatics and CAPP Resource Access Liaisons</strong>: D.A. Jamieson, J.D. Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors (CBEPS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member: L.M. Pals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Council of Land Surveyors (CCLS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director: R.M. Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee (GECL)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members: V.G. Hut, D.R. Thomson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2009-2010 Council |  
| Back row, left to right: Greg Boggs, David Hagen, Don George, John Haggerty, Jim Maidment, Ron Hall |
| Front row, left to right: Connie Petersen, David McWilliam, Brian Ross, Hugo Engler |
Proceedings of the 101st Annual General Meeting

of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association held at the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge, Jasper, Alberta from April 23 to 24, 2010

President Don George called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. by welcoming the assembly to the 101st Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

Mr. George announced that Ken Allred, ALS agreed to serve as parliamentarian and that the meeting would follow Robert’s Rules of Order.

The 2009-2010 Council members and Practice Review Board Public Member Rudy Palovcik were introduced and given a round of applause by the assembly.

Mr. George then introduced and asked the Honourable Mel Knight, MLA for Grande Prairie-Smoky and Minister of Sustainable Resource Development, to address the assembly.

Minister Knight congratulated the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association on 100 years of service to the general public, the government and the business community in the province of Alberta. He brought greetings from the Honourable Ed Stelmach, Premier of the Province of Alberta, and all of his colleagues in the provincial legislature. He advised that in the latest budget, 20 billion dollars has been invested for infrastructure over the next three years which bodes very well for the land surveying profession. Minister Knight further advised that Bill 1, the Alberta Competitiveness Act has been introduced to partner with industry, business and all Albertans to bring forward innovation, effective policy and regulation that will put the province in the driver’s seat relative to competitiveness. This will have the result of streamlining the regulatory business of the major pieces of government such as Environment, Energy, Sustainable Resource Development, Municipal Affairs and others. Minister Knight thanked the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and its members for working and cooperating with the Director of Surveys Office and its staff and expected that it will continue to build a competitive economy, a healthy environment and sustainable resources for the province of Alberta for many years to come to attract investment, jobs and promote growth.

Minister Knight concluded by advising that Bill 1 is a partnership to build competitiveness starting with the fiscal part of the energy industry and going into a regulatory review. He also indicated that government welcomes the participation of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association at the table to represent the profession, clients and the communities served by the profession.

Mr. Wayne Hnatyshin, Director of Operations, was introduced and welcomed the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association to the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge.

Mr. George proceeded to introduce the following visiting delegates and guests:

Richard Wey, President
Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors

Dave Gurnsey, Past President
Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association

John Kalchynski, President
Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors

Wally Kowalenko, President
Association of Ontario Land Surveyors

Jacques Grondin, Vice-President
Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors

Gary Hughes, President
Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors

George Schlagintweit, President
Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors

Sarah Cornett, Executive Director
Canadian Council of Land Surveyors

Darryl Larson, President
Alberta Society of Surveying & Mapping Technologies

Mike Michaud, ALS
Director of Surveys

Curtis Woollard, Director
Land Titles and Surveys, North

Professor Kyle O’Keefe
University of Calgary

Department of Geomatics Engineering.
President’s Address

Mr. George called upon the assembly to observe a moment of silence in honour of the following Alberta Land Surveyors who passed away:

- Ernie Zander – ALS #143
- Tom Watmore – ALS #148
- Dick Fox – ALS #300
- Walter Carbis – ALS #550

Retired, honorary life and associate members registered for the annual general meeting were introduced.

At this juncture in the meeting, principals were asked to introduce their articling pupils.

It was MOVED by Mr. Pratt, seconded by Mr. Pals, that the 2009 Report of Proceedings be adopted.

Motion Carried

President Don George addressed the assembly as follows:

On March 19, 2010 we celebrated our 100th anniversary, and I am privileged to have been your president during the time your Association moved from the past 100 years and into the next 100 years. It has been an honour representing the needs of the public and the membership. I thank the staff for all of their hard work and personal support during my tenure.

Some of you may be aware, we had many deliberations with the Director of Surveys office over the last year, outside of our Council meetings. Many thanks to your vice-presidents (Brian), past-president (Ron), Councillor (Greg), Brian Munday and the Director of Surveys’ staff for attending various meetings we had to discuss issues surrounding Public Lands. I believe it is important for the Association and those affected (the public) to be involved with and work with the Director of Surveys office to ensure that everyone is on the same page and to see that issues are worked out prior to the implementation of new initiatives. Your Council has developed the terms of reference for a new Director of Surveys’ office interaction to address questions and queries posed by the public; the Registrar by handling public complaints; the Public Relations Committee by promoting the profession and you, the membership, for providing professional services to the public.

First, was to serve and protect the public. I think we have continued to provide that through: our public representatives on Council (Russ Barnes) and the PRB (Rudy Palovcik); office interaction to address questions and queries posed by the public; the Registrar by handling public complaints; the Public Relations Committee by promoting the profession and you, the membership, for providing professional services to the public.

Second, was to keep within our budget. With the continued significant reduction in the sales of posts, we have had to make many adjustments and to date, have been able to keep the spending under control. Some of the ways we were able to accomplish this was through staff cuts, limiting the amount of face-to-face meetings and cutting back on some of our previous commitments.

Having online meetings provided significant savings and most committees were still able to handle their terms of reference efficiently. In addition to cost savings, members were able to spend less time away from their offices by not having to travel the highways, which was a safety issue, and be involved with the group even from remote centres.

Third, continue to develop, maintain and enhance the competency and high standards of our profession. I believe we are getting close to doing this. The Continuing Competency Working Group has spent many hours developing a program that will be presented later today. Be sure to voice your opinions, as your input and comments are essential prior to its implementation later this year. The PDC has continued to put on many seminars to assist us in learning and has developed a questionnaire that was instrumental in assisting the Continuing Competency Review Program.

Fred Cheng, ALS
Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT)

Stephen Fedlow, ALS
SAIT Polytechnic

Lee Morden, ALS
Northern Lights College

It was MOVED by Mr. Pratt, seconded by Mr. Pals, that the 2009 Report of Proceedings be adopted.

Motion Carried

President’s Address

Mr. George called upon the assembly to observe a moment of silence in honour of the following Alberta Land Surveyors who passed away:

- Ernie Zander – ALS #143
- Tom Watmore – ALS #148
- Dick Fox – ALS #300
- Walter Carbis – ALS #550

Retired, honorary life and associate members registered for the annual general meeting were introduced.

At this juncture in the meeting, principals were asked to introduce their articling pupils.

It was MOVED by Mr. Pratt, seconded by Mr. Pals, that the 2009 Report of Proceedings be adopted.

Motion Carried

President Don George addressed the assembly as follows:

On March 19, 2010 we celebrated our 100th anniversary, and I am privileged to have been your president during the time your Association moved from the past 100 years and into the next 100 years. It has been an honour representing the needs of the public and the membership. I thank the staff for all of their hard work and personal support during my tenure.

Some of you may be aware, we had many deliberations with the Director of Surveys office over the last year, outside of our Council meetings. Many thanks to your vice-presidents (Brian), past-president (Ron), Councillor (Greg), Brian Munday and the Director of Surveys’ staff for attending various meetings we had to discuss issues surrounding Public Lands. I believe it is important for the Association and those affected (the public) to be involved with and work with the Director of Surveys office to ensure that everyone is on the same page and to see that issues are worked out prior to the implementation of new initiatives. Your Council has developed the terms of reference for a new Director of Surveys’ office interaction to address questions and queries posed by the public; the Registrar by handling public complaints; the Public Relations Committee by promoting the profession and you, the membership, for providing professional services to the public.

First, was to serve and protect the public. I think we have continued to provide that through: our public representatives on Council (Russ Barnes) and the PRB (Rudy Palovcik); office interaction to address questions and queries posed by the public; the Registrar by handling public complaints; the Public Relations Committee by promoting the profession and you, the membership, for providing professional services to the public.

Second, was to keep within our budget. With the continued significant reduction in the sales of posts, we have had to make many adjustments and to date, have been able to keep the spending under control. Some of the ways we were able to accomplish this was through staff cuts, limiting the amount of face-to-face meetings and cutting back on some of our previous commitments.

Having online meetings provided significant savings and most committees were still able to handle their terms of reference efficiently. In addition to cost savings, members were able to spend less time away from their offices by not having to travel the highways, which was a safety issue, and be involved with the group even from remote centres.

Third, continue to develop, maintain and enhance the competency and high standards of our profession. I believe we are getting close to doing this. The Continuing Competency Working Group has spent many hours developing a program that will be presented later today. Be sure to voice your opinions, as your input and comments are essential prior to its implementation later this year. The PDC has continued to put on many seminars to assist us in learning and has developed a questionnaire that was instrumental in assisting the Continuing Competency Review Program.
Professions and Occupations

Adrian Pritchard

My travels across this great country gave Eileen and I the opportunity to meet and make many new friends. Over and above this, I was able to learn what other jurisdictions are dealing with and was able to give them updates of what is happening within our Association. Our Association is seen to be a leader in many areas such as a TILMA with the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors and the mutual recognition agreement with other Canadian jurisdictions. I believe it is important that we share our knowledge and expertise with other associations in Canada.

I would like to thank Dave McWilliam for his significant contributions to your Council over the past three years. The positions he has held in the last three years are Secretary Treasurer, member of the Executive Committee, CCLS director and, of course, a member of Council. We will lose his expertise from Council but have not lost him altogether as he will remain involved as the Registrar of our Association.

I would like to thank the retiring members of Council—Ron Hall, Connie Petersen and Jim Maidment—for all of their hard work and commitment to our Association. Thanks also to John Haggerty as his term on Council as councillor is over but I see he does not want to quit and would like to come back for three more years as Secretary-Treasurer. I see Past President Hall has a complete slate of officers and even has a choice for two of the positions. Well done Ron.

Many thanks to both Brians. First to Mr. Munday for all of his support and guidance throughout the year. He and his staff are the backbone of this great organization.

Now, Mr. Ross, thank you for your extra commitment of always being there to attend special meetings and handling issues that I sometimes surprisingly dumped on you. Brian has been a great support to me and will make an excellent president of our Association. Thank you.

President George introduced and called upon Mr. Adrian Pritchard of Professions and Occupations, Alberta, Employment, Immigration and Industry to address the membership.

Mr. Pritchard address the assembly by indicating that the way the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association conducts its annual general meeting is a model that well represents professional associations. He added that he is always amazed with the kind of support the Association gets from its membership.

Mr. Pritchard commended the Association in being one of the first to have a labour mobility agreement put in place with its counterpart in British Columbia. He referred to the issue of competitiveness in Minister Knight’s address and indicated that the Department of Professions and Occupations looks at the issue in professional legislation as well as ensuring that the public’s interest is protected.

Mr. Pritchard thanked the members of Council and Executive Director Brian Munday for the strong working relationship over the last several years.

President George offered his thanks to and introduced staff of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

President George introduced and thanked the exhibitors for sponsoring and exhibiting at the Annual General Meeting, sponsoring the annual golf tournament and advertising in ALS News. He also thanked Mr. Richard Andrews for participating as exhibitor liaison on the Convention and Social Group.

Mr. Rick Kurash of Spatial Technologies announced that, at the hockey game played in Edmonton, the North was the winner of the Jules Brassard Memorial Cup.

President George announced that Les Frederick was the early bird prize winner of a complimentary evening stay for two at the Jasper Park Lodge.

It was MOVED by Mr. Pals, seconded by Mr. Marquardt, that the committee reports for 2009-2010 be received as circulated.

Motion Carried

It was MOVED by Mr. McWilliam, seconded by Mr. Hagen, that the 2008-2009 financial statements for the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association be received.

Motion Carried

Mr. McWilliam spoke to the 2009-2010 financials projected to year end as follows:

In January 2009, Council approved a deficit budget of $57,528, balancing the budget with the Financial Stabilization Fund. In April 2009, the membership directed Council to develop a contingency plan to be instigated if a further 25% drop in iron post and marker post revenues was realized. The fluctuations of the post sales were monitored on a monthly basis throughout the year and revenues never dropped below 25% of what was budgeted. In fact, to the end of March 2010, the iron post sales were at 11% below budget and the marker post sales are at budget level. The projection to year-
end comes in at approximately 10% below budget. In dollars, this projects to $61,708 below budget. During the year, the Association made some cuts which resulted in a savings of $55,796 which brings the total projected budget deficit to year end to approximately $6,000. Overall, the projection to year end is a surplus of $128,923, most of which is due to a better than anticipated return on investments.

Mr. McKenna asked why the Discipline Committee has a revolving fund.

Mr. McWilliam responded that the Discipline Committee is in a revolving fund because there is money coming in generated from fines or costs as well as money being paid out in costs and legal fees. The Discipline Committee activities are not part of the fiscal year of the Association as there are some cases that do not conclude for a number of years. He added that the activities of the Discipline Committee are difficult to budget for. The revolving fund is topped up at the beginning of every fiscal year.

Mr. McKenna commented that he could not see why the Discipline Committee could not be the same as the Practice Review Board which is under the general committee list. He added that, right now, it is not clear what the projected financial position of the Discipline Committee is to year end.

Mr. McWilliam responded that the Discipline Revolving Fund for 2009-2010 projected to April will be at a deficit of approximately $28,504. For the fiscal year 2008-2009 there was an actual deficit of $2,477. For 2007-2008 there was a deficit of $32,525 and for 2006-2007 a deficit of $15,589.

Mr. McWilliam spoke to the 2010-2011 budget by indicating that the iron post and marker post revenues are projected the same as they were in the previous year. He went on to say that the budget anticipates a slight drop in overall revenue from last year. Mr. William advised that the ALSA has changed the minimums on post orders because freight costs were becoming too expensive. The projection is for a deficit budget of $15,880 with support from the Financial Stabilization Fund.

President George invited Mike Michaud, Director of Surveys, to make a presentation to the membership on the initiatives which he has undertaken in the last year and upcoming initiatives for the next year.

Mr. Michaud took the assembly through the structure of the Director of Surveys Office and then addressed specific items as follows:

**Land Surveys Unit**

We have had three official surveys this year and we are working on two additional ones. An official survey typically is a settlement plan or it could be a partial township official survey. We have three formal boards of investigation which are ongoing; two are with the ALSA (one initial and one back for a second time) as well as a third one that will go back for a second time. There are different counties involved and we are hoping there will be a move to resolve the three issues through the Boundary Panel, Registrar or someone else.

The business of the unit deals with land surveyors and landowners on boundary problems, boundary questions, field notes, and so on. In the past year, the unit has had 55 medium-sized projects. For a small group of ten people in the land surveys unit, it is a big job to keep up with all the different activities.

**Part 2 Surveys (2004)**

The Alberta Law Reform Institute has been looking at the issue of Part 2 surveys. The Association prepared a detailed document about amending the Surveys Act to give governing status to re-established monuments. The Alberta Law Reform Institute met with us in November, for a second time. I suggested to Council that there would be some information back from the Institute by the spring of 2010 but have since changed that to the summer of 2010.

**Changes to Geo-referencing of the CAD File**

We are only talking about geo-referencing the CAD file. We are not talking about changing survey practices. There is no additional field work required. Specifically, thinking about the bearings on the plan, there is no intent for land surveyors to change how the plans have been drafted for years. We don’t want you to put grid bearings on the plan if you haven’t tied to control. When you do a survey in an urban area, you show grid bearings. In a rural areas, we have seen some surveyors take the ATS coordinates, which are theoretical coordinates, and rotated them to show grid bearings on the plan. It is not the intent to change field practices or how you show bearings on plans. It is an initiative to deal with the CAD file and specifically, it will support our mapping. The question could be asked why should land surveyors pay the costs to support the government’s mapping programs. I suggest that it is a stepping stone to integrated surveys. There
is also no requirement to tie to a section corner to geo-reference a descriptive plan. To geo-reference a descriptive plan in rural Alberta, you use the ATS file. In urban centres, you should use the cadastral mapping file. Take the coordinate off that mapping base for a lot corner or a section corner and use it for your geo-referencing purposes. Geo-referencing is around giving information in the legend about what your datum is, what your projection is, what your rotation is and what your combined scale factor is. It is the next step of taking the CAD file and rotating it.

Webdips

Webdips is something that has changed just recently. A plan prior to January 2010 does not have to be geo-referenced because it is not a requirement on older surveys. That plan does need to be submitted to the Land Titles Office (LTO). You don’t need to geo-reference it and the Webdips file is causing a problem because it is looking for you to fill in fields. If you are prior to the aforementioned date, and geo-referencing is not required, you won’t be required to fill in the fields. It has been discussed that the Webdips will be changed so that the fields will not be mandatory.

SPOC

Some of you may be familiar with SPOC (Survey Plan Online Checker). This is for digital plan submissions for LTO. I suggested May 3, 2010 which I feel now is a little optimistic. Some of you may have been involved in the testing and know a bit about it. It will be a tool that you will be able to use to visually see your new subdivision in relation to the cadastral mapping. We think it will be an excellent tool and a positive change in doing submissions. One of the features that we hope to expand the tool to include will be to ensure that the dimension on your plan matches the distance on your CAD file.

Integrated Surveys

Integrated surveys is an initiative that has been around for approximately 25 to 30 years and it dates back to changes to the Surveys Act and saying that when you are within two kilometres of two markers or one kilometre of two markers, you need to make a tie. Integrated surveys will change how we survey and will take advantage of the technologies that we are already using on a daily basis, referring specifically to GPS with the addition of the federal government opportunity to correct your observations using PPP. The goal is a five-centimetre accuracy. Many surveyors are using PPP on a daily basis. All members need to get to that level and move on.

Coordinate Based Cadastre

There was a study completed by the Association a few years ago. At that time, it was deemed that the ALSA was not ready for a Coordinate Based Cadastre (CBC). Ten years have gone by and technology has changed. The question is, are we now ready for a CBC? It is on the table for me because the CAPP Geomatics Committee have indicated that they would like to see a CBC in Alberta. I believe that my role was to bring this information to Council. My recommendation to Council was that when our clients are telling us we need to think about a new technology, as a profession, that is a red flag and a green light, that we should review a CBC and see what has changed from last time. The oil & gas industry may not know what the issues are and complexities involved with a CBC, but obviously they have learned something. One of the issues is legislation but, before we even consider changing legislation we need to do some homework. We need to see if there are any technical problems and we need to find out if our clients and the public are ready for a CBC. We need to determine what a CBC means; no reference, no monuments, nothing on the ground or, does it mean coordinates that govern property corners with some kind of a mark on the ground that landowners can use? When I think of the period between 1912 and 1988, we had a CBC at lot corners. Those iron bars that we placed for 70-80 years did not govern lot corners but were there for the landowner’s use. That was a form of CBC. It worked then and I am not
sure why it cannot work on a move-forward basis. These are issues that we need to continue to review rather than having government tell the profession that we have to implement this type of initiative. The profession needs to shake off past perceptions about a CBC, think about where we are going today, what opportunities we have and how we can serve the public better. The oil and gas industry is asking the question and we all know what drives the economy in Alberta. We don’t want to let this opportunity go. The challenge is to get going with the committee and start going back through all the issues that we talked about ten years ago to see what has changed and find out if there is any interest from the public to move on with a CBC. Technically, I don’t see a problem. What I see is that we are used to a system and we are reluctant to change. We need to be open and flexible. Here is an opportunity where we can take a lead role.

Survey Control
Our vision for the future is to move away from a monumented survey control network to one that is supported by the federal government’s active control system by taking your base stations that you have hours of observations on, to be integrated into the spatial referencing system of the province. This is a move forward to integrated surveys. You are already relating all your surveys to base stations across the province. By integrating to one system, all your surveys will be connected and in sync.

Vertical Datum
We are still continuing on work with vertical datum. No dates have been set as yet.

CSRS Maintenance
We have 1,100 markers on which CSRS coordinates are available. I’ve heard discussion on why don’t we take all 29,000 markers and convert them to CSRS? The problem with that is that, other than those 1,100, there are not enough observations to really get into that level of accuracy. By just calculating coordinates at CSRS, we would be really doing a disservice and it would be a false understanding that these coordinates that you brought your GPS receiver to would match. Those coordinates are substandard because they do not have enough observations.

Technical Services
Back in October of 2009 we finished the DIPS mapping throughout the province which was quite an accomplishment.

LiDAR Pilot Projects for Wellsites
We’ve had 13 new projects in the past 12 months and we have a total of 38.

Applications on Crown Land
We are not surprised that we are down approximately 30% from last year. We were 10% down from the year before that. In a busy year, we would see 200 applications per day during November through February. This past year and for the last several months, we are at 30 per day. This past year, we were able to spend $400,000 and hire surveyors to survey 55 Department Dispositions—meteorological sites, camp sites, towers, and so on.

Survey Manual
On February 1st, subsequent to working with the Standards Committee, a survey manual was completed and is up on the website. It is pretty limited and talks about how to proceed with amending an existing disposition. I am hoping, over time, we can expand that to include other things.

Special Areas
Special areas mapping is limited—a one-time snapshot—and will only cover MSLs and LOCs. The data is available but we need to find a process to maintain the data.

Enhanced AOA Process
Of all the things that I have talked about today the enhanced AOA process will have the biggest impact. It may not physically be a big impact to Alberta Land Surveyors but the downstream benefits will be huge. It is a new proposed process with a goal to implement it September 1, 2010. The government has directed that SRD, Energy and ERCB work together in figuring out what this enhanced AOA process is. It is really moving from a 25-year lease up front to a two-phase lease—a four-year lease—and if you meet all the requirements for that lease, it is then parachuted into a 25-year lease. The benefit of that for us, will ensure that our plans do not sit dormant in some company’s office. You apply on a sketch at SRD on Day One (no survey). At some point, your client is ready to go to ERCB and requests a license for that well. At that point, ERCB requests the survey. I’m not saying this is the only way to do it, this is one way. Your client may wish to submit a wellsite and a survey right up front. What will happen is that it will go through this three-year window—so, for example, if you plan a LiDAR wellsites, three years later, in cooperation with ERCB, SRD will be
affidavit that we changed and talked about, well, Statutory Declaration we are concentrating on oil and gas competitiveness. I am going to change it again. Environmental Law with Alberta Justice have referred me to Section 18 of the and that is a regulation. All of our other affidavits are not in any form of legislation. Because of that, Section 18 of the Evidence Act kicks in and we have to move to what is called a statutory declaration.

May 1, 2011
We are going to iron posts for all our activities on public lands. I hope this issue will go to the Committee for the Director of Surveys and we will get into the details of what that means for an LOC. We have a year to figure it out.

LSAS
January 1, 2011 is the replacement date. It may not have all the functionality that we are hoping for and will be in a phase process. We will get off that main frame that Alberta Energy maintains and on January 1st, we will be on a new system.

DIP Plans at Land Titles
Because of the budget constraints and the priorities that the Minister has placed on our IT resources, all of our IT resources are going to AOA enhancement and LSIS redevelopment. That means things like planning distribution will be knocked down a notch.

President George announced that he was giving the assembly the opportunity to partake in a question and answer period with the Director of Surveys as a follow-up to his presentation.

Mr. John Wallace asked what SRD’s intent was with respect to the format of the preliminary plan that will be submitted to obtain the initial disposition. He asked whether it was the intent that the plan be prepared by a land surveyor and signed accordingly. Mr. Wallace indicated that the reason he brought it up is that ERCB accepts sketch plans done by a land surveyor but they have to be signed by the land surveyor and it would seem like a cost implication if two separate plans have to be done up on crown land.

Mr. Michaud responded that currently SRD will accept a sketch for a pipeline. He suggested that it is common knowledge that non-land surveyors are submitting sketch plans for pipelines.

Mr. Wallace clarified that he was specifically referring to a well license being issued at ERCB.

Mr. Michaud responded that he did not feel that the question has been answered internally. He continued by advising that during a recent meeting with ERCB, it was clear that they want a plan from a surveyor prior to issuance of that well license. Mr. Michaud suggested that it is a question of backing up the process to when the client is ready to submit for the surface disposition—what needs to come in. Mr. Michaud agreed that a land surveyor should prepare that plan but did not offer any guarantee that would take place. He went on to say that as a land surveyor and as the Director of Surveys, wanting to ensure that government is protecting the public.
what should not happen is a garbage in, garbage out situation. Mr. Michaud advised that there have been some discussions on when is a survey a survey. Is a sketch plan a survey? He questioned that if SRD is accepting sketch plans for pipelines, is it already contravening what would make sense to a land surveyor? Mr. Michaud concluded that the goal is to ensure that the land surveyor does survey that disposition and that it is on file at Public Lands and every effort should be made to ensure that land surveyors submit those plans.

Mr. Wallace commented that he only brought it up because it is unique to the wellsite itself that gets licenced at ERCB. He suggested that there may be two different issues—one for a disposition and one for the well licensing itself. A PLA sketch plan does not go to ERCB. The pipeline permit is granted on a line drawing at ERCB.

Mr. Michaud indicated that was not his understanding with a pipeline. He understood that the PLA that SRD approves on a sketch is what is used at ERCB to issue the licence for construction of the pipeline.

Mr. Wallace indicated that was not his understanding.

Mr. George stressed the importance of the liaison committee that has been struck which will be dealing with many of these issues.

Mr. Pals brought up the subject of the coordinate based cadastre. He indicated that he was the ALSA president when the ALSA worked with the University of Calgary in getting the study done from the public with regard to coordinates governing. Mr. Pals advised that the conclusion of that study was that the public was not ready for a coordinate based cadastre ten years ago. He added that they may have changed their view, but from what he sees in his business, he did not think so. Mr. Pals concluded by indicating that he felt that the issue of a coordinate based cadastre will be an interesting discussion and it should be reviewed.

Mr. Hagen advised that he did not have a problem with the concept of integration but the method of implementation. He continued by indicating that the Standards Committee studied and came up with recommendations with respect to integration. Mr. Hagen expressed concern that the Director of Surveys rejected the recommendations and was moving forward without consulting the land surveying profession.

Mr. Hagen asked Mr. Michaud to make a commitment to guarantee that he will work the Standards Committee and bring recommendations to the AGM rather than just going ahead with implementation.

Mr. Michaud responded by advising that the issue of integrated surveys will be forwarded to the Director of Surveys Liaison Committee which is the group that will look at all the issues involved. He added that the concept of integrated surveys has been around for 30 years and from his perspective, surveys will be integrated in 2013. Mr. Michaud indicated that he knows that some practitioners are asking why the concept is being forced for the 2013 date. He suggested that the profession should look at opportunities to move forward rather than debate, discuss and vote on it for the next twenty years as has been done for the last twenty years. Mr. Michaud indicated that he has asked himself whether the implementation will be onerous, expensive or whether there will be a radical change in how the profession operates. He suggested that the answer was no to all those questions. Mr. Michaud continued by advising that many large firms have indicated that they are already involved in the concept of integrated surveys with drafting on grid and using GPS coordinates to do that. He did realize, however, that the implementation will have a bigger impact on the smaller firms.

Mr. Michaud suggested that if the government had not put a date in place for digital plans submissions five years ago, the profession would not have digital plan submissions today. In 2005, the membership argued against the concept of digital plan submissions. He indicated that he believes the system in place is excellent and also believes that the membership agrees. Mr. Michaud felt that is what is happening with the concept of integrated surveys and that is why he chose to pick a date to give the membership three year’s notice. He further advised that he takes the responsibilities that he has been given through the legislature very seriously. Mr. Michaud did not feel that he moves forward on issues without a lot of discussion and debate.

Mr. Roger Ross asked whether the geo-referencing symbol could be changed to something that doesn’t look like a witness I.

Mr. Ross also commented on the subject of what the governing monuments are going to be for an access road next to a pipeline. He suggested that, at present, there are many access road plans that are sketches with pipelines being built next to them resulting in conflicting thoughts of what governs.
Mr. Michaud responded that the goal at the committee level, is to solve those types of questions and give everyone clear directions on what to do in the coming year.

Mr. Ross continued by referring to a request from CAPP and asked whether those individuals are just a very select few and whether the request is really in the best interest of the public.

Jeff Blatz asked whether the Director of Surveys will be setting up a committee within the Standards Committee to come up with some standards on what intersections are going to be required for different disposition plans before the date that we have to start posting iron posts.

Mr. Michaud responded that issue will be addressed by the Director of Surveys Liaison Committee. The goal is to tackle all those questions prior to implementation.

Mr. Kocher commented if the members are to be posting wellsites and access road within a year, it seems counterproductive if that, two or three years down the road, a coordinate based cadastre is implemented. He asked whether the members couldn’t skip the whole step of posting all the wellsites and access roads and avoid having a lot of pins in the ground.

Mr. Michaud indicated that he has asked that question of himself many times. He added that he did not see a coordinate based cadastre working within ten to fifteen years as it needs support of the public and a determination of whether it is in the public’s best interest. Mr. Michaud did not feel that it makes sense to wait that long for implementation.

Mr. Hagen indicated that he did not understand why Alberta is forced to have a five-centimetre accuracy when Canada Lands requirement is twenty centimetres. He went on to say that the Standards Committee had proposed transitioning as technology improved as this would not have as great an impact on the membership.

Mr. Maloney complimented the Director of Surveys Office in moving forward with change. He felt that the Director of Surveys Office is changing with technology and geomatics more quickly than the Association is and encouraged the Association to endeavour to keep up to change.

It was MOVED by Mr. Boulanger, seconded by Mr. McKenna, that the following revisions regarding references to the Métis Settlements Land Registry and Sustainable Resource Development be made to the Manual of Standard Practice:

Page 19 (Part C: General Standards and Procedures)
3.9 Establishment of Monuments Plan

If a statutory monument has been established but is not shown on a plan registered at in the Land Titles Office, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (Lands Division), or the Métis Settlements Land Registry; the Surveyor must register an Establishment of Monuments Plan at the Land Titles Office or at the Métis Settlements Land Registry within two years of establishing the monument. This does not negate the requirements of Sections 44 and 46 of the Surveys Act regarding the re-establishment of survey monuments established under Part 2 or Part 3 of the Act.

Page 24 (Part C: General Standards and Procedures)
5.1 Research

Prior to undertaking a retracement survey, a thorough review of all available information pertaining to the property boundary is mandatory. Relevant information includes, but is not limited to:

1. Land Titles Office registered plans, Certificates of Title, and other documents.
2. Director of Surveys Office original Township Plans, original field notes for the Township Surveys, and cadastral tie reports. Township Plans and original field notes are also available from the Alberta Land Titles Spatial Information System (SPIN) and the Provincial Archives.
3. Other Surveyors’ files and field notes when they are known to exist but the survey has not been publicly recorded.
4. Energy Resources Conservation Board (ERCB) wellsites plans and licensed pipelines.
Land Dispositions Branch, Lands Division
Alberta Sustainable Resource Development
7. Métis Settlements Land Registry registered plans and other documents.

Page 30 (Part C: General Standards and Procedures)

7.1 Requirements

1. Every survey for which a plan is to be registered under the Land Titles Act or the Métis Settlements Land Registry Regulation, requires integration with survey control if two or more monuments found or placed by the survey are each within one kilometre of any two Alberta Survey Control Markers (ASCMs).

Page 35 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)

Section 1: General Requirements for Plans

The Surveys Act defines the field requirements for surveys. The Land Titles Office Land Titles Act and the Métis Settlements Land Registry Regulation and certain acts provide the authority for the registration of plans of survey and specify, to some extent, the information that must be shown on plans.

The information in this Section supplements and expands on statutory provisions to support effective plan preparation. Alberta Land Surveyors should also consult the following publications for direction:

1. Land Titles Procedures Manual:
   http://www.servicealberta.gov.ab.ca/836.cfm

2. Consolidated Policy and Procedures Manual for the Submission of Digital Plans of Survey for Registration:

3. Documentation Registration Request (DRR) Procedures:

4. Métis Settlements Land Registry Regulation

5. Métis Settlements Land Registry Registrar’s Rules

6. Public Land disposition plans
   https://login.ihsarc.com/login/erc?

Page 36 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)

1.2 Datum or Origin for Bearings and Coordinates

The recognized horizontal datums for spatially-referenced data in Alberta are the North American Datum 1983 (Original) and the North American Datum 1983 (Canadian Spatial Reference System - CSRS). For more information on NAD83 (Original) and NAD83 (CSRS), refer to the Geodetic Fact Sheets available at this site:

These datums and related ellipsoids shall be used on all plans of survey registered in at the Land Titles Office, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (Lands Division), or the Métis Settlements Land Registry when plan information relates to grid bearings or grid coordinates. The map projections chosen must be consistent with the requirements of the provincial mapping system.

The rest of this section is unchanged.

Page 38 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)

2.1 Statutory Requirements

The standards provided in this Section are in addition to the statutory requirements of the Municipal Government Act, the Land Titles Act, the Métis Settlements Act, the Surveys Act, the Public Lands Act and the related regulations regarding the survey and preparation of plans of subdivision.

Page 41 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)

Section 4: Right-of-Way Surveys

This Section provides standards supplementary to the Surveys Act for surveys of new roads, utility rights-of-way, pipeline rights-of-way, and railways.

Alberta Land Surveyors should also consult these sections of the Land Titles Procedures Manual for direction:
1. Section Sur-5: Examination of Road Plans and Other Public Works Plans

2. Section Sur-6: Examination of Right-of-Way Plans, Related Site Plans, and Miscellaneous Plans

For surveys located on Métis Settlements Land, the Métis Settlements Land Registry Registrar’s Rules should be consulted for direction in the following sections:

1. Section Sur-4: Examination of Road Plans and Other Public Works Plans

2. Section Sur-4: Examination of Right-of-Way Plans, Related Site Plans, and Miscellaneous Plans

Page 42 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)
4.5 Cancelled or Abandoned Plans

Boundaries shown on cancelled subdivision plans for which no titles exist or on abandoned Right-of-Way Plans need not be intersected. A right-of-way may be considered abandoned when no interest in the right-of-way exists.

To determine the status of current recorded interests, review records at the Land Titles Office, Métis Settlements Land Registry, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (Lands Division), and the Energy Resources Conservation Board (ERCB), as well as other available records.

Page 50 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)
Section 5: Wellsite and Public Land Dispositions

This Section deals with the survey of petroleum-related facilities and other public land dispositions, including the licensing of wells under the Oil and Gas Conservation Regulations. Surface tenure on patented lands is normally protected by caveats registered at the Land Titles Office or at the Métis Settlements Land Registry, whereas interests in unpatented public lands are dealt with by the Minister responsible under the Public Lands Act.

The rest of this section is unchanged.

Page 59 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)
Section 7: Descriptive Plans

This Section provides specifications and guidelines for the preparation of Descriptive Plans. Alberta Land Surveyors should also consult either the Land Titles Procedures Manual or the Métis Settlements Land Registry Registrar’s Rules for direction. Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (Lands Division) does not accept descriptive plans:

1. Land Titles Procedures Manual:
   http://www.servicealberta.gov.ab.ca/836.cfm

2. 1.1 Section Sur-3: Examination of Descriptive Plans:

2. Métis Settlements Land Registry Registrar’s Rules
   2.1 Section Sur-3: Examination of Descriptive Plans

Page 68 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)
Section 12: Métis Settlements Land Registry

When conducting a survey on a Métis Settlement, an Alberta Land Surveyor must register the plan with the Métis Settlements Land Registry. A client requesting a survey on a Métis Settlement should be advised that the plan has no effect unless so registered. The plan may also be filed or registered at the Land Titles Office for information purposes only.

Métis Settlements Land Registry plan requirements are similar to those of the Land Titles Office with a few exceptions:
• The Registry block refers to the Métis Settlements Land Registry.
• The plan must be on mylar.
• It is preferred that the Alberta Land Surveyor’s affidavit be on the plan rather than separate.

Information on Métis Settlements is available at http://www.msc.gc.ca/.
Detailed plan requirements are available in Part 8, Division 6 of the Métis Settlements Land Registry Regulation: http://www.qp.alberta.ca/574.cfm?page=1991_361.cfm&leg_type=Regs&isbncln=9780779732197

Page 69 (Part E: Appendices)
Section 1: ALS Certifications

Most plans should be signed by the Alberta Land Surveyor who is responsible for the plan.

This Section contains templates for two standard Alberta Land Surveyor certifications on plans that are not registrable at the Land Titles Office or at the Métis Settlements Land Registry:
1. Alberta Land Surveyor’s Real Property Report
2. ALS Certification for Wellsites and Public Land Dispositions

Plans that are submitted for registration at the Land Titles Office or at the Métis Settlements Land Registry also require various signatures, affidavits, and/or other approvals. The Surveyor should consult the Land Titles Procedures Manual or the Métis Settlements Land Registry Registrar’s Rules regarding which of these are required for the type of plan being prepared and submitted for registration: http://www.servicealberta.gov.ab.ca/836.cfm

Page 74 (Part E: Appendices)

Page 76 (Part E: Appendices)
This change is to the existing definition, not to the proposed definition in Recommendation #7.

parcel
an area of land that has one or more boundaries surveyed in accordance with the Surveys Act, and which is capable of having an interest or right granted and registered in at the Land Titles Office or filed in the Métis Settlements Land Registry.

Page 77 (Part E: Appendices)

surveyed line
any boundary shown as surveyed on a plan registered in at the Land Titles Office or a blind line, whether surveyed on the original Township Plan or not, excepting thereout boundaries created by cancelled subdivision plans or abandoned Right-of-Way Plans as defined in Part D, Section 4.5 (Right-of-Way Surveys – Cancelled or Abandoned Plans) on page 42.

Motion Carried

Mr. Boulanger advised the assembly that the changes came up during the last year’s re-write of the Manual of Standard Practice. He went on to say that it was identified that there were many instances where the Land Titles Office was referred in the Manual but, the Metis Settlements Land Registry and ASRD were not. A Standards Committee Subgroup was tasked to try to determine whether they should be mentioned in some instances.

Mr. Bruce Clark expressed concern about the revisions referring to plans registered at ASRD. He added that registration is defined in the Land Titles Act. ASRD will not register the plans but will either deposit or record them by some method.

Mr. Boulanger indicated that the Standards Committee did discuss the issue brought forward by Mr. Clark and the question that came up was whether registration was defined for the purposes of registration in the Land Titles Act and whether registration is defined for the purposes of registration in the Métis Settlements Act. It was felt by Land Titles and Metis Settlements Registry that the word “registration” did not have strict connotations and could be used in reference to ASRD.

Mr. George informed the membership that Recommendation #2 involved adding an affidavit for plans submitted to the Metis Settlements Land Registry. He went on to say that in the time that the Standards Committee brought forth the recommendation the ALSA AGM, the Metis Settlements Land Registry added the affidavit to their Registrar’s Rules. The membership was advised that the only difference between the affidavit in the Metis Settlements Land Registry rules and the Standards Committee proposed one for the MSP is a reference to the Metis Settlements Act instead of the regulation. President George advised that Council felt it was not
necessary to have the affidavit in both documents and withdrew the recommendation.

It was MOVED by Mr. Boulanger seconded by Mr. Maidment, that the ALS Certification for Wellsites and Public Land Dispositions (Part E, Section 1 – Page 72) be amended as follows:

ALS CERTIFICATION FOR WELLSITES ON PRIVATE LAND AND PUBLIC LAND DISPOSITIONS
I, ____________________, Alberta Land Surveyor, of __________________, Alberta, certify that the field survey represented by this plan is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, has been carried out in accordance with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association Manual of Standard Practice, and the field survey was performed between the ___ day of ____________, 20___ and the ___ day of ____________, 20__.

Alberta Land Surveyor Date Signed Witness (name of witness)

Motion Carried

Mr. Boulanger advised that Recommendation #3 was a result of the previous year’s rewrite which identified grammatical inconsistencies in the wellsite certification. The changes made are to correct the inconsistencies.

It was MOVED by Mr. Boulanger, seconded by Mr. Schirrmacher, that Part D, Section 5.4 (Page 51), Section 5.5 (Page 51) and Section 5.8 (Page 52) be amended as follows:

Page 51 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)
5.4 Wellsite Control Plans

Wellsite Control Plans were formerly called Wellsite Traverse Plans or Wellsite Control Traverse Plans. Plans submitted prior to December 1, 1997 are still available from the Director of Surveys Office.

When performing a survey for a well location in Unsurveyed Territory, an Alberta Land Surveyor is required to prepare a plan of survey if the well location is more than two kilometres from an existing survey performed in accordance with the Surveys Act.

Page 52 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)
5.8–Wellsite Plan Monuments

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Manual, a Surveyor may elect to register a plan of monuments under Part C, Section 3.9 (Establishment of Monuments Plan) on page 19. However, the Surveyor must adhere to all other provisions of the Manual.

Motion Carried

Mr. Boulanger advised that during the rewrite of the Manual of Standard Practice it was realized that there was a conflict between two sections referencing the time line allowed to register an establishment of monuments plan. This conflict arises from the preparation of a monument plan for wellsite control in unsurveyed territory. Part D, Section 5.4 indicates an establishment of monuments plan must be registered within 180 days. Part D, Section 5.8 refers to Part C, Section 3.9 which is the time line of two years to register an establishment of monuments plan. The Committee felt there was still value in registering monument plans for wellsite control purposes within the 180-day time frame and proposed specifying this type of plan is an establishment of monuments for wellsite control plan and leave the time frame for this type of plan at 180 days.

The Committee also recommended removing Part E, Section 5.8 which will remove any conflict that existed.

Recommendation #3
(see Appendix E for rationale document)

Recommendation #4
(see Appendix E for rationale document)
It was MOVED by Mr. Boulanger, seconded by Mr. Con- natty, that Part D, Section 5.12 (page 57) be amended as follows:

Page 57 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)  
5.12 Mineral Surface Lease (MSL) Welle Site Disposition Amendment (MSL)

An Alberta Land Surveyor performing a wellsite (MSL – maximum 2 hectares) disposition plan amendment shall locate and confirm by measurement sufficient evidence within, on, or defining the disposition to allow the determination of the boundaries. The amendment field survey shall not span more than 24 months.

The Surveyor shall:
• indicate pre-existing disposition survey evidence as found, restored, or re-established; and
• indicate the actual dates of the amendment field survey in accordance with Part E, Section 1 (ALS Certifications – ALS Certification for Welle sites and Public Land Dispositions, page 72).

Motion Carried


It was MOVED by Mr. Boulanger, seconded by Mr. Yanish, that Part D, Section 4.15 be added to the Manual of Standard Practice:

Page 49 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)  
4.15 Facility Surface Lease

A facility surface lease may be for a wellsite, installation, or other appurtenance over which the ERCB has jurisdiction and that is associated with the recovery or processing of hydrocarbon-based resources or any associated substances or wastes. An appurtenance may be a plant, battery, compressor, dehydrator, separator, or treater as defined in the Oil and Gas Conservation Act or a central processing plant or satellite plant as defined in the Oil Sands Conservation Act. Pipeline rights-of-way are required under the Pipeline Regulation for hydrocarbon-based pipelines constructed outside a facility surface lease.

Motion Carried

Mr. Boulanger informed the assembly that the intent of Rec- ommendation #6 is to clarify the definition of facility surface lease and add it to the Manual of Standard Practice. The definition of facility surface lease and the interpretation of it currently spans many acts, regulations, directives, and so on. Therefore, a complete definition is not readily available. The definition is required to aid in the determination of when a pipeline right-of-way is required to be surveyed within a facility surface lease. There is not a requirement to survey a right-of-way for pipelines wholly contained within a facility surface lease.

President George asked the assembly to gather outside the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge for a group photograph.

On return from the photo shoot and a coffee break, President George asked Connie Petersen, ALS to present the new Cont inuing Competency Review Program.

Mr. George advised that there would not be a vote on the new program but encouraged the membership to provide ideas, feedback and questions. He added that feedback from the membership was important to relay back to the working group.

Ms. Petersen addressed the membership as follows:

In 1994, the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association instituted a Systematic Practice Review Program. It was designed to review every office every three years and the function was to be educational in nature.

The original Systematic Practice Review consisted of an internal review where the Director would come to your office and meet with the land surveyors. He would ask for several files, chose three per surveyor and then conduct a plan examination and a field examination on each product. The Director would then prepare a report and forward that report
to the practitioner for their response. Once he received the response, he would present that file to the Practice Review Board with a recommendation for action.

The program, at that time, employed four full-time staff and it cost about $375,000 a year to run. The problem that we are faced with today is that our membership has grown by 50% since the program started in 1994. As evidenced in the past few years, we’ve had an issue with finding staff and funding is a fraction of what it used to be. At the current rate of Phase 3, if we just continued on the way we are, it would take at least ten years to complete.

To recap the problem, in 1994 we had 264 land surveyors; we now have over 400. Phase 1 was designed to take three years to complete; Phase 3 started out at five years but would now take at least ten. We’ve gone from four full-time staff to two and we are looking for a solution.

Council asked the Practice Review Board (PRB) and a sub-committee for some answers. They conducted a think tank session in October of 2008. The results of this session went back to Council and the PRB for additional input and direction. At the same time, the Professional Development Committee (PDC) was presenting a recommendation to the membership for a continuing education reporting program. Since practice review and professional development are both designed to be educational, representatives from Council, the PDC and the PRB formed the Continuing Competency Working Group (CCWG).

The group decided to combine the best parts of practice review and continuing education into one program that was cost-effective, streamlined and, most importantly, sustainable. The new Continuing Competency Review (CCR) program will be land surveyor based instead of practice based. It will consist of assessment in four areas, practice review, education and training, professional association involvement and other accomplishments. Each land surveyor will be required to complete the program every four years. When your name is selected, you will be asked to complete an online questionnaire that covers all four parts of the review program using a secure website. You will have three weeks in order to complete the questionnaire. Some of the information is similar to what the Director would do in an office review. Some of the general information would be things like your name. Are you active? Do you author products? What is your area of practice? What is your primary role? With regards to staffing—what type of staff do you have? How do you manage them? What are your office procedures, protocols and administrative procedures? How do you handle project tracking? How do you handle original survey data

and archiving of field notes and plans? As part of the questionnaire, the land surveyor will be asked to provide ten pdfs or tiffs of recent registered or non-registered products that are of substantial complexity and represent the land surveyor’s practice.

The Director of Practice Review will choose one of those products and will notify the land surveyor to submit the accompanying field notes and any other pertinent data or plans that the surveyor feels should be included. Subject to available funding, the Director will have the ability to conduct random field inspections.

Under education and training, the land surveyor will receive credit for attending or presenting courses or seminars, attending or presenting at professional association meetings or annual meetings, reading ALS News or other survey-related publications and having an article published or mentoring article students or technical staff.

Under professional association involvement, the land surveyor would receive credit for serving on Council or committees, serving on other professional committees or governing bodies, authoring articles for ALS News or other survey-related publications and attending an AGM or a regional meeting.

Under other accomplishments, the land surveyor would receive credit for community involvement, volunteer work or any other activity that the land surveyor feels deserves recognition.

The results of the web-based questionnaire will be assessed by the Director of Practice Review and an independent assessor. It is anticipated that the independent assessor could be a member of the PRB but we’ve also allowed in our budget for this to be a contract position. The product review would be conducted by the Director of Practice Review. The independent assessor and the Director would know the identity of the practitioner but would be abiding by the rules of confidentiality. The Director would combine and average the results of the questionnaire, taking into account his product review. He would create recommendations and prepare a final sanitized report for presentation to the PRB. The mark will be a value judgement by the Director and the assessor (more like marking an essay rather than a multiple choice exam or a true/false exam). If one of the categories is not applicable, then it would not be factored into the assessment. For example, the land surveyor would not be penalized in the product review category if they don’t author products. The product review and the practice review will be given a greater weight than the other categories if they apply.
One of the benefits of the program is that it allows a land surveyor’s individual circumstances to be taken into account. Once the file is presented to the PRB, the Board may choose to close the file, close the file but make some recommendations, or direct that a comprehensive review be conducted. If there is something in the initial review that raises a question or potential concern, the PRB may direct that a comprehensive review be conducted. The comprehensive review is similar to the current systematic practice review with the exception that only one product will be involved.

The Director will telephone the land surveyor to arrange a face-to-face meeting and a field inspection will be conducted by a contract field crew. The Director will prepare a report and send it to the practitioner for their response and the practitioner will have three weeks to respond to that report. The review, report and response will then be presented to the PRB. As is currently the practice, the land surveyor will have the right to attend the meeting in which their comprehensive review is being considered.

The cost for continuing competency will be similar to systematic practice review except that we anticipate completing twice as many reviews per year. In Phase 3, we are dealing with about 50 practitioners. Under the new program we expect to deal with 100.

Just before the AGM, we conducted some beta testing. We had five volunteers from different areas of practice who agreed to go through this process. The review of the web-based questionnaire with the independent assessors came out at about the right time frame that we had anticipated. However, the plan review took a big longer than we had suggested that it might. Still, it works out to about 100 working days a year for the Director of Practice Review and the independent assessor so it still fits in with our number of 100 practitioners per year.

Any feedback that we receive will go back to the working group in early May and we will take that into account before we present our final program to Council. If Council endorses our recommended program, then we would look at implementing it no later than July 1st. The idea with this new program is that we would look at new members—members who have been practicing for a year or two that have never gone through the process before—and members who in previous phases indicated that they needed some additional attention.

The floor was opened up to the membership for questions and comments.

Mr. Marquardt commented that a long-time problem with the systematic practice review was the fact that the practitioners under review took a long time in responding. He referred to Ms. Petersen’s presentation where she indicated that the response time would be set at three weeks. Mr. Marquardt asked if there was a guarantee that would happen.

Ms. Petersen responded that there will always be some practitioners who have a good reason for not responding within the time frame which, of course, they need to communicate. If it becomes a case of the practitioner ignoring the time frame, then the PRB would look at alternatives in dealing with those situations.

Mr. Marquardt pointed out that the success of the program will be up to the practitioners. He added that the ALSA does not want to have an issues that has arisen over the years where time to respond back contributes to the success of the program.

Mr. Egger commented that it would be nice to have a method whereby a practitioner could keep track of professional development and the other components of the program instead of having to remember what has taken place over the last four years.

Ms. Petersen replied that it was a great suggestion which was also brought forward at a regional meeting. She advised that Mr. Marty Robinson, ALS adapted a spreadsheet that his subgroup had come up with for tracking all those activities mentioned in the presentation. Ms. Petersen added that the spreadsheet will be available for downloading from the website. It will be up to the practitioners to keep track of their time so that when they are called forward in the review, that information is readily available.

Mr. Metcalfe asked when the four-year time frame would start for a practitioner that had just gone through a review in the last year or two.

Ms. Petersen replied that if a practitioner has just gone through Phase 3, the chances are that their name will not come up until closer to the end of the first four years.

Mr. Schirmacher commented that it was his understanding, from the presentation, that the PRB reviews respondents who fail to achieve a certain level. He asked whether this was correct.
Ms. Petersen replied that the PRB will conduct a comprehensive review if the Director identifies something in a practitioner’s product review or in the questionnaire that warrants additional attention.

Ms. Sprott asked whether there has been any more discussion as to whether the marking scheme or evaluations will be made public for the membership.

Ms. Petersen thanked Ms. Sprott and indicated that the working group will receive that comment. She added that will be part of the feedback that the group will be addressing in early May before the program is finalized.

Mr. Deschamps asked whether it was considered effective for practitioners to hand pick files for review.

Ms. Petersen replied that the practitioner would be asked to provide the pdfs or tiffs of ten recent registered or non-registered products. She went on to say that, at this point, it would be up to the practitioner to pick the products for review. There have been comments made at some of the regional meetings that there may be a better way to randomly select products. Ms. Petersen suggested that if anyone has ideas of how to randomly select products for 400 members, she would be pleased to present them to the group.

Mr. Richard Wey, President of the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors, commented that one of the things he enjoyed about his practice review was meeting the practice review manager and having a fireside chat. He asked if there was a chance that every Alberta Land Surveyor would not be reviewed in the four or five year cycle.

Ms. Petersen replied that it was a very distinct possibility. She advised that it is hoped that there will be few face-to-face meetings that will be required so that the goal of completing reviews on 100 practitioner per year can be accomplished.

Mr. Wey asked whether it was a possibility that some practitioners would be interviewed more than once in the cycle.

Ms. Petersen replied that it is anticipated that the program would go through the membership just once in the four-year cycle. She added that the only time there would be a face-to-face meeting would be if there was a problem identified in the initial review that required a comprehensive review to be done.

Ms. Petersen personally thanked the members of the working group—Greg Boggs, Jacques Dupuis, Ron Hall, Greg Hebb, Jim Maidment, Marty Robinson, Kerry Barrett, Chris Everett and Brian Munday—who crammed a lot of work, discussion and effort into a short space of time (less than a year).

The meeting was recessed until Saturday, April 24th at 9:00 a.m.

President George opened the meeting by announcing that Registrar Dave McWilliam would be taking over the podium to conduct the elections.

Council was asked to step down from the head table.

Mr. McWilliam announced that he had appointed new members Sara Spence, Jeremy Park, Michael Louie, Greg Illchuk and Kevin Nemrava as scrutineers.

Mr. William advised that biographies of the candidates submitted by the Nominating Committee were received 55 days prior to the Annual General Meeting and were included in the March issue of *ALS News*. The slate of candidates was also included in the recommendations package.

Mr. McWilliam announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the name of Brian D. Ross, ALS for the position of president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2010-2011.

Mr. McWilliam asked whether there were any further nominations for the position of president for 2010-2011.

It was MOVED by Mr. Maidment, seconded by Mr. Larry Pals, that nominations for the position of president cease. 

**Motion Carried**

The assembly congratulated Mr. Ross as the 2010-2011 president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.
Mr. McWilliam announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the names of Bruce W. Gudim, and David R. Thomson, ALS for the position of vice-president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2010-2011.

Mr. McWilliam asked whether there were any further nominations for the position of vice-president for 2010-2011.

_It was MOVED by Mr. George, seconded by Mr. Marquardt, that nominations for the position of vice president cease._

_Motion Carried_

Mr. McWilliam invited Messrs. Gudim and Thomson to present a five-minute speech to the membership.

Mr. McWilliam announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the name of John Haggerty, ALS for the position of Secretary-Treasurer of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2020-2013.

Mr. McWilliam asked whether there were any further nominations for the position of secretary-treasurer for 2010-2013.

_It was MOVED by Mr. Pratt, seconded by Mr. Rob Scott, that nominations for the position of secretary-treasurer cease._

_Motion Carried_

The assembly congratulated Mr. Haggerty as secretary-treasurer of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2010-2013.

Mr. McWilliam announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the names of Chris J. Chiasson, ALS, Damian Gillis, ALS, Duane M. Haub, ALS and Robert A. Pinkerton, ALS for the position of councillor of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2010-2012.

Mr. McWilliam called for further nominations from the floor for the position of councillor for 2010-2012.

_It was MOVED by Mr. Allan Main, seconded by Mr. John Wallace, that nominations for the position of councillor cease._

The nominees were invited to make a three-minute speech to the membership.

Mr. McWilliam advised that only honorary life members and active members may vote and the scrutineers were requested to collect the ballots.

Mr. McWilliam returned the chair to President Don George who asked Council to return and take their places at the head table.

President George called on Sarah Cornett, Executive Director of the Canada Council of Land Surveyors (CCLS) who made the following presentation on the new organization called the Professional Surveyors Canada (PSC). Mr. George indicated that it is important to understand what this new organization is planning on doing and what it is all about since the membership will have the opportunity to become a direct member in the new PSC.

Ms. Cornett addressed the membership by summarizing the activities of the Canadian Council of Land Surveyors over the past year. She advised that the website, Setyourboundaries.ca was launched almost a year ago and it is a youth-focused initiative that presents the surveying profession to junior and senior high school students. She encouraged the membership to have a look at the site and indicated that any feedback would be welcome. Mr. Cornett went on to advise the assembly that a new national academic syllabus was developed in cooperation with all of the associations and with a lot of input from the academic community and will be implemented in the fall of 2010 by CBEPS. As well, a working group is currently rewriting the CCLS accreditation program to create a process that combines industry best practices and lessons learned from the current CCLS program to create a more flexible and current tool for recognizing the numerous post-secondary institutions across the country that are providing our profession’s future.

The assembly learned that a second national mutual recognition agreement has been drafted through cooperation from surveyors and associations across the country.

Ms. Cornett touched on the online resource called the Loss Prevention Management Guide and pointed out that it is regularly updated with new bulletins. She added that CCLS is just finishing up a bulletin about condominium issues in BC and Alberta as there are some real distinct differences with new legislation on condominiums in both jurisdictions. CCLS is also in the process of completing a bulletin on professional liability insurance needs throughout a surveyor’s career.
Ms. Cornett expounded on the initiative of the new national body, Professional Surveyors Canada, which will replace the Canadian Council of Land Surveyors. She indicated that it was felt that there was a need to build an organization that would put the interests of land surveyors first and it will be structured in such a way that it will continue the important work done by CCLS on behalf of the eleven licensing bodies. It will have a committee specifically populated by representatives of the associations and will meet regularly to discuss the challenges faced by the licensing bodies. The Committee will also ensure that there is no duplication of effort at the regional and national level in any initiatives or policies of Professional Surveyors Canada that relate to licensing of professionals.

Ms. Cornett concluded by indicating that Professional Surveyors Canada will be member-driven and member-focused and will pool the resources of a potential membership of 3,000. She encouraged the membership to participate and become active in the new organization.

Mr. Bob Wallace advised that he represented Alberta on a committee to help the formation of Professional Surveyors Canada. He urged all members to consider being a member of the organization. Mr. Wallace added that associations had issues with CCLS and its activities. It was thought that a new organization was very important to represent the will of the land surveying profession as a single entity across Canada. He suggested that as ten or eleven disjointed bodies, it is very difficult to get our voice heard on a national scale. Mr. Wallace went on to say that the ALSA is a body that licenses practitioners but there really is no organization that stands up for land surveyors on a unified voice across the country. He again urged the membership to the support and play an active role in the new Professional Surveyors Canada.

Mr. Allred indicated that he presumed the requirements for membership will be membership in a professional land surveying association in Canada. He asked whether the new organization will be entirely funded by those members and will there be any connection with the professional associations or will it be totally run by the individual members.

Ms. Cornett responded that there will be a number of different types of membership—regular members, who will be the voting members and the ones who set the board of directors by voting for their director. There will be an associate membership category for any person who has an interest in the profession, the benefits of which will be discounts for seminars and so on. Ms. Cornett went on to say that there will also be a corporate membership category. The associations, at this point, have pledged to join as corporate members. With that membership will come a seat on the committee mentioned earlier, that will continue to provide a national forum for the associations to discuss common issues of licensing and regulation. She continued by indicating that will be the way that the associations will continue to have a national forum through a distinct committee structure. The associations will support the work of that committee through the same dues structure that exists for CCLS.

Ms. Cornett advised that individual members will have an individual member fee. Other financing will be garnered from the development of continuing education products that the associations and individual surveyors can take advantage of. Those will be developed on a cost-recovery basis and will generate enough revenue to produce the next set of professional education products. Ms. Cornett also advised that the organization is looking at a wide variety of revenue streams because it cannot run solely on membership dues.

Mr. Darryl Larsen, President of the Association of Surveying and Mapping Technologies was invited to address the assembly on the activities of the Alberta Society of Surveying and Mapping Technologies (ASSMT) over the past year.

Mr. Larsen advised that over the past year the ASSMT has taken care of a number of housekeeping details with respect to the Memorandum of Understanding and the progress towards a certification process. The assembly learned that ASSMT provides recognition and certification for all qualified personnel employed in surveying and mapping in related geomatics disciplines. He added that the Society strives to promote continuing education, recognition of its members in the geomatics industry and works to improve the standards and standing of surveying and mapping technologists and technicians.

Mr. Larsen advised that there was a Committee to address the following goals:

- To look at and decide upon a modification of the current tiered system of certification for technologists where each tier will correspond to an increasing responsibility and capacity on behalf of the registrant. The Committee concluded the current tiers adequately meet the Committee’s mandate.

**Level One:** There is a direct link between the existing post-secondary school programs for mappers and field surveyors. It would be in the best interest of ASSMT to
work very closely with colleagues to help develop a syllabus for a technician. Presently there are two educators who sit on the panel of four examiners who are involved in assessing a person’s educational component.

**Level Two:** The syllabus is also needed to address the post-college level more closely related to the level of responsibilities taken on by technologists and senior technologists such as project management, staff supervision and so on. These definitions are online under the grading criteria.

**Level Three:** Discussion initiated by the ALSA Council with respect to the advancement of a registered survey technologist level. The design of this level of the syllabus will need to be done in conjunction with the ALSA’s Professional Development Committee and other post-secondary institutions.

• Assessment of the continuing education requirements for continued membership in each tier and the creation of a mechanism for the auditing of registrant compliance with the requirements. It was agreed by the members that until a syllabus was designed and adopted, the continuing education requirements could not be adequately reviewed at this time.
• The establishment of a disciplinary procedure mechanism. ASSMT will have to amend its bylaws to incorporate that criteria.
• To reviewing funding and explore potential funding options related to the expenditures of the process. The Committee has estimated an amount of $20,000 to cover some of the technical writing associated with the development of the syllabus.
• Determine the means to ensure that the system is actually supported and utilized by the land surveying profession.

Mr. Allred asked Mr. Larsen whether ASSMT has any liaison or discussions with the pipeline locators group.

Mr. Larsen responded that ASSMT has not formalized any direct relationship with the pipeline locators group as well as not embarking on the development of any courses. He added that ASSMT does work closely with NAIT and SAIT and would like to see courses developed with respect to locating.

President George thanked Mr. Larsen for his presentation and then opened up the floor for an open forum session.

After the open forum session, Registrar Dave McWilliam announced that Mr. David Thomson, ALS was elected as vice president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2010-2011 and Alberta Land Surveyors Chris Chiasson, Damian Gillis and Rob Pinkerton were elected as councillors for 2010-2012.

The assembly congratulated the successful candidates.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Larry Pals, seconded by Mr. Allan Main, that the ballots be destroyed.*

**Motion Carried**

Mr. George thanked all the candidates who stood for election. He encouraged the unsuccessful candidates to run again and encouraged the membership to consider letting their names stand for the positions on Council.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Boulanger, seconded by Mr. McKenna, that the definitions of “boundary” (Page 75) and “parcel” (Page 76) and be amended as follows:*

**Page 75 (Part E: Appendices)**

**boundary**
a line determining the limits of a parcel of land (see parcel), defined thus:

- in the case of surveyed parcels, by the original monuments or other undisputed monuments governing the corners thereof. For the purpose of this definition, a corner is defined as a deflection point, the beginning or end of a curve, or any point that was defined by the original survey of the parcel. Original monuments are deemed to be those monuments purported to have been placed during the original survey of the parcel.
- in the case of unsurveyed parcels, by those lines that are or may be determined by reference to monuments of public record placed in accordance with the Surveys Act.
- as it relates to the Surveys Act, by a line between two monuments depicting a separation between two parcels. A line may be a straight line, a curved line, or a series of connected points used to depict a natural boundary. Parcels may be land surfaces, sub-surface regions, or airspace lying above parcels.
a line, plane, or curved surface that defines the limit or extent of a parcel or an interest in land, a sub-surface region, or airspace.

Page 76 (Part E: Appendices)

Mr. Boulanger advised that concerns with the current definition of parcel came to light during the plain language rewrite of the Manual of Standard Practice. He went on to say that it was identified that the current definition of boundary was lengthy and unnecessarily complex. Mr. Boulanger further advised that the current definition of parcel implies that a parcel of land can have innate capabilities whereas the definition actually refers to the administrative and legal activities that can be undertaken by authorized individuals with respect to the land. The assembly learned that the subgroup responsible for this term of reference was made up of senior members of the Standards Committee. The definition was sent to Council, returned to Committee and sent to Council again before it was accepted for presentation at the Annual General Meeting. As well, the new definition addresses a parcel that is an island.

Motion Carried

Mr. Boulanger advised that concerns with the current definition of parcel came to light during the plain language rewrite of the Manual of Standard Practice. He went on to say that it was identified that the current definition of boundary was lengthy and unnecessarily complex. Mr. Boulanger further advised that the current definition of parcel implies that a parcel of land can have innate capabilities whereas the definition actually refers to the administrative and legal activities that can be undertaken by authorized individuals with respect to the land. The assembly learned that the subgroup responsible for this term of reference was made up of senior members of the Standards Committee. The definition was sent to Council, returned to Committee and sent to Council again before it was accepted for presentation at the Annual General Meeting. As well, the new definition addresses a parcel that is an island.

It was MOVED by Mr. Boulanger, seconded by Mr. Amundrud, that Part C, Sections 7.4.2, 7.4.3 and 7.5.1 (Page 31), Part D, Section 2.2.1 (Page 38) and Part E, Section 3 (Pages 76) be amended as follows:

Page 31 (Part C: General Standards and Procedures)
7.4 Non-Monumented Survey

1. A survey shall not be carried out under Section 47 of the Surveys Act unless the survey is related to a minimum of two Alberta Survey Control Markers (ASCMs).

2. The density of ASCMs or reference control markers shall be such that no property corner established by the survey is more than 200 metres from the nearest reference control marker or ASCM.

3. When computing the accuracy of the control ties to property corners and reference control markers, the accuracies shall be determined thus:

- For survey control less than two kilometres to all property corners and reference control markers, the error of closure shall not exceed the greater of:
  - the product of 0.00014 and the direct distance between the two ASCMs used for the closure, or
  - 25 millimetres.

- For survey control greater than two kilometres to all property corners and reference control markers, the method of least squares shall be used (see Part C, Section 1.2 – Method of Least Squares, page 12) with the minimum standard value shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance in Metres</th>
<th>b value in ppm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2,000</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10,000</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20,000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 Plan of Non-Monumented Survey

Plans for surveys performed under Section 47 of the Surveys Act shall show, in addition to the requirements of any enactment, the following:

1. The location of all ASCMs, reference control markers, found monuments, and re-established monuments involved in the survey, together with their coordinate positions.

2. The location of all monuments that would have been placed if the survey had been carried out under Section 45(1) of the Surveys Act, together with their coordinate positions.

Page 38 (Part D: Standard Practice for Surveys and Plans)
2.2 Delayed Posting
Using the delayed posting provisions under the Surveys Act is optional. However, this option is recommended where the subdivision plan must be registered prior to the completion of construction.

In addition to other applicable standards, the following standards apply to the delayed posting of subdivisions:

1. The survey and reference control network shall be integrated with the surrounding and adjacent Alberta Survey Control Markers. Stable reference control markers shall be strategically placed to ensure their maintenance until completion of posting. The reference network shall be designed to provide for redundancy in observations and to avoid hanging lines or hanging networks.

[The subsequent portions of Part D, Section 2.2 are unchanged.]

Page 76 (Part E: Appendices)

reference control marker monument

a mark, other than a monument or Alberta Survey Control Marker, that is set in the ground as a reference to the position of a boundary or other line not marked by monuments under Section 47 of the Surveys Act.

New Definition

reference monument

a monument that is set in the ground at an offset location from a position that cannot be monumented as required under Section 45 of the Surveys Act.

Motion Carried

Mr. Boulanger advised that the Standards Committee flagged the lack of clear definitions for two different types of reference monuments as an item of concern. He added that there are two types of reference monuments commonly referred to. One is control set for the purposes of Section 47 delayed posting plans; the other is reference monuments set when a position of a statutory monument cannot be set for some other reason. To solve this discrepancy, the new term has been developed for the Section 47 control and its reference control marker. All pertinent parts of the Manual of Standard Practice have been updated to reflect this new term. The current heading for the definition of reference monument in the Manual has been revised to read “reference control marker” in the appendices and a new definition for reference monument has also been added to the definitions within the Manual to deal with those monuments set to reference a statutory monument that cannot be set for some other reason.

Mr. Cheng suggested that reference objects may not necessarily be reference monuments. He pointed out that in township surveys, there are objects such as bearing trees. He asked whether that could be incorporated into the new definitions as well.

Mr. Boulanger indicated that it was possible if the membership felt there was a need to incorporate bearing trees into the definitions.

Mr. Gillis suggested that the definition of monument defines bearing trees as monuments.

Mr. McWilliam spoke against the suggestion as he felt that bearing trees along with IP holes are evidence as to where the monument was. He added that monuments are to mark property corners.

Mr. Boulanger provided the definition of monument as it relates to the Surveys Act as “a statutory iron post, wooden post, mound, trench or anything else used by a surveyor to mark a boundary corner or line.”

Mr. Hansen commented that he believed bearing trees were not solely used to mark a corner, but used to reference a monument to allow close by evidence for re-establishment.

Mr. Michael Thompson suggested that bearing trees and pits are all covered under the definition of ancillary monumentation.

Mr. Duncan Gillmore suggested that, in many cases building corners have been used as reference monuments, especially when referring to old notes.

Mr. Allred suggested that the words “is set in the ground” are confusing the motion and should be removed so that the wording would be “a monument that is set at an offset location” would probably solve the problem.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Allred, seconded by Mr. Pinkerton, that the words “in the ground” be deleted. Amendment Defeated
Mr. Sutter agreed with the amendment but suggested that the words “in the ground” be replaced by “or exists.”

**AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Sutter, seconded by Mr. Amundrud that the words “in the ground” be replaced with “or exists.”**

*Amendment to the Amendment Defeated*

Mr. Haggerty suggested that all of the discussion falls under the non-monument survey section of the Manual of Standard Practice. He wondered what the validity would be in discussing bearing trees in a non-monumented survey subdivision. He suggested that this discussion should take place in new business.

Mr. Boulanger clarified that the new definition does refer to reference monuments outside of non-monumented surveys.

Mr. Ashton felt that the wording “or exist” is redundant as for it to exist, it must have, at one point, been set.

Mr. Gordon suggested that it appeared to him that there is some confusion between a reference monument and a reference to a monument. He indicated that the definition is dealing with a situation where there is no monument placed.

Mr. Larry Pals suggested that surveyors do not set building corners but do tie them in as a reference to where the actual monument may have been. He agreed with the amendment.

Mr. Maltais commented that the problem in the Manual of Standard Practice was that there were references to two types of reference monuments. The sub-group did a great job of clarifying the difference between a Section 47 reference monument and the reference monument that would be put along a lot line to reference a corner that could not be accessed for one reason or another. Mr. Maltais spoke against both amendments indicated that he had not placed any monuments anywhere but in the ground in his career. He added that building corners are not monuments and bearing trees are not being defined but are defining reference monuments. Mr. Maltais indicated that he was in favour of the main motion.

Mr. Allred suggested that there was confusion between a reference monument and a witness monument.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Allred, seconded by Mr. Bruce Clark, that the motion be tabled.

**Motion Defeated**

Mr. Engler felt that the original intent of the motion had been lost and commented that the motion was to differentiate between control set for Section 47 plans which were called reference monuments and those monuments that are set to reference a corner. He added that was all the terms of reference for the Standards Committee referred to and nothing was mentioned about ancillary monumentation. He felt that the main motion was very clear and differentiates between those items set in the ground to act as control for Section 47 plans and those monuments that are set specifically to reference a corner. Witness monuments are only set during a survey of township plans or original surveys of that nature. Mr. Engler stated that, in his opinion, a witness monument goes on a certain distance, where reference monuments are used to intersect two lines which intersect at the corner that they reference.

Mr. Amundrud indicated that he has come across instances where the actual corner is inside a building foundation in which case the actual building foundation becomes the reference monument with offsets inside of the foundation. He added that in this type of situation, the building corner often becomes the reference monument.

Mr. Gordon spoke with respect to the term “reference control marker” which was defined as “a mark, other than a monument or Alberta Survey Control Marker.” Mr. Gordon felt that means that surveyors cannot use a monument or an Alberta Survey Control Marker to serve that purpose. He went on to say that to him that it does make sense, when involved in a Section 47 plan that if there is existing evidence there that would serve the purpose, it cannot be used.

Mr. Boulanger clarified that the definition of a reference control marker was meant to be more inclusive rather than excluding statutory posts as reference control markers. He continued by stating that the definition allows the use of marks other than a monument or an ACSM.

Mr. Gordon felt that to make it clear and to include other monumentation, the words “a mark or a monument or a surveyor control marker” instead of specifying it has to be a mark.
AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Gordon, seconded by Mr. Kocher, that the words “a mark other than a monument” be replaced with “a mark or a monument other than an Alberta Survey Control Monument.”

Mr. Engler suggested that the wording in the main motion was not meant to exclude anything but was formulated to clear up the definition. If an existing monument, such as an iron post or ASCM exists, the definition does not state that it can’t be used.

Mr. Boulanger clarified that the definition was not changed from what existed in the Manual of Standard Practice previously.

Mr. Ashton advised that the Manual of Standard Practice under monumented survey, where it references using reference control markers or reference markers, it states that the density of ASCMs or reference control shall markers shall be such that no property corners established by the survey is more than 200 metres from the nearest reference control marker. He went on to say that, presently, that would mean that ASCMs or reference control markers should be used by this definition but that would exclude statutory iron posts. While the intent may have been to make it inclusive, as it stands, it does exclude statutory iron posts. Mr. Ashton felt that to be more inclusive, ASCMs and monuments need to be included in the definition or say that the density of ASCMs reference control markers or monuments.

Mr. Boulanger asked whether the amendment means that an existing statutory iron post cannot be used as a reference control marker.

Mr. Gordon concurred.

Mr. Pratt asked why amendments are being made to something was not part of the original recommendation. He asked whether anything and everything in the Manual of Standard Practice is open to debate and amendment.

In taking Mr. Pratt’s comments into consideration, President George ruled the amendment out of order.

Mr. Hansen pointed out that there was one minor change to the definition being that the word “lines” was replaced with the word “line.”

Mr. Barnes indicated that he has a great deal of respect and has enjoyed working with Council and especially outgoing President Don George.

Mr. Barnes indicated that he always has had respect for the land surveying profession even before he became a public member. He continued by expressing his recognition and of the commitment of the membership to the Association and the responsibilities taken on by the membership in being part of a self-governing profession. As well, Mr. Barnes pointed out and commended the value that members put into the Association by serving on committees as much as they do.

In conclusion Mr. Barnes thanked the membership for giving him the opportunity to serve as a public member.

Mr. George Schlagintweit, President of the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors, Mr. Dave Gurnsey, Past President of the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association, and Mr. Jacques Grondin, Vice President of the Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors brought greetings from their respective associations and presented a gift to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association on its centennial year.

President George reconvened the meeting after the Members’ Lunch by introducing Mr. Jim Smith, President-Elect of APEGGA who brought greetings from his organization and congratulated the ALSA on its centennial year with the presentation of a plaque from APEGGA.

Mr. George Schlagintweit, President of the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors took the podium to roast Don George as the ALSA outgoing president. Mr. Gary Hughes, President of the Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors followed as he and Mr. Schlagintweit became president of their respective associations on the same date.

President George asked for a round of applause to thank all committee member for their personal sacrifices and contributions made to the Association over the past year.

Mr. George continued by presenting a small gift of appreciation to the 2009-2010 committee chairs.
Oath of Office for Incoming President and the 2010-2011 Council Members

President’s Address

Mr. George also thanked Council for their support and hard work in making 2009-2010 a successful year. He presented each Council member with a small gift of appreciation.

Mr. George called incoming president Brian Ross to the podium to take the following Oath of Office.

Mr. George passed the gavel on to the new President, Mr. Brian D. Ross.

Mr. Ross presented Mr. George with the outgoing president’s plaque and pin signifying his faithful service as president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

President Ross addressed the assembly as follows:

Thank you, fellow members, for allowing me to serve as your president this coming year. Hopefully, I can avoid getting into too much trouble.

I completed this speech on Wednesday and since then, I’ve proceeded to hear everything I’ve written in some form in another presentation or other discussion. Hopefully you won’t remember them.

Two words I keep hearing are youth and change. The youngest president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association was Geoff Hamilton who was 28 years old in 1951. The oldest one, that we know of, was Charlie Snell who was 68 in 1948. The average age for a president is 47. Someone very smart once told me that you have to be at a certain point in your career to become president of this Association—preferably retired because the workload makes you want to retire. Yes, I agree, you have to be a certain age or at a certain point in your career to want to become and to be able to become president. But, that could be 25 or it could be 70. I think every one of you should strive to become president and to become active in our Association and to try and do it before you are 28. Then you’ll be the youngest president of the Association. I’m going to be looking for a member who is maybe 23—two years on Council, one year as vice president and president at 26 or 27. Anyway, you should all get involved because, believe it or not, it’s fun. The sooner you learn that, the more time you have to be involved.

The latest ALS News has an article titled 1953-1954 - New Lines of Thought written by J.H. Holloway. Although he says it much better than I can, he talks about an infusion of youthful blood creating such provocative ideas like allowing women at AGMs and mixing pleasure with the business of the annual meetings.

Today, we have over 400 active members. Last year we had 29 new members and this year we have 25. This means we should also have a substantial infusion of youthful blood. You younger members are our strength. The older members need to engage you by convincing you to run for Council, be on a Committee and to become involved. We need your young blood and your new thoughts in order to survive and prosper because youth seems to be able to adapt easier to change and our profession is always changing.

Some of the latest changes have been in the way we present and distribute the data we collect; the internet, the cellphone, amazing new communication methods all commonly used by our members today (at least the younger ones). Again, that’s why you are needed. You are much better equipped to keep up with technology changes. There are always new technology changes affecting the way we work. We seem to be able to survive with them in spite of the defense our older members put up against these changes. I don’t need an EDM; what’s wrong with my chain? I’m not going to use GPS. It’s too expensive. My EDM still works.

All of us have seen our measurement methods change, our plan production, our field equipment, our field transportation, even the people we are working with are changing. Today’s surveyor is totally different than the 1953 surveyor that J.H. Holloway wrote about. We are very well-educated, we are multi-cultural, we are multi-gender and we are multi-taskers. Going forward, we have to use these to embrace changes that just keep coming. Government is changing, industry is changing, education is changing and our clients are changing. Somehow, we have to juggle this change with our professional responsibility to protect the land of our clients. That’s really what we do; we protect the land. We don’t stand at the borders as soldiers but, in a peaceful society, we make sure our most costly and most precious possession is properly dealt with. Land development, transportation systems, shopping centres, mining projects, exploration projects; everything that we produce, and I mean everything, requires a surveyor.

Some of the issues that need attention during the next year:

• Copyright of survey plans; apparently in Australia, surveyors have a copyright. It is something that is coming up in Canada.

• Continuing competency review; it is getting its start here this summer. There’s going to be bumps and we’ll have to deal with those.
• CBC is back again; we have to be the ones that resolve this because if we don’t deal with it, somebody else will. We’ve got to be there.
• Professional Surveyors Canada has to be our new national organization. ALSA is one of the bigger contributors to this as far as numbers. We have to have active participation partly because of our strong provincial association.
• Association policies need review. We have to allow for the changing business and social environment of our members.
• Government and regulatory bodies are making changes monthly. We have to make sure we have input prior to implementation.

I only have one goal this year. I would like to see our Association become more visible to the public. We have to become more aggressive with our viewpoint and more vocal in the community. Most people know what a P.Eng., a CA or an MD is but you say ALS and they say Lou Gehrig? I don’t think they know who we are and we have to tell them. I want to spend this year moving our Association towards a goal of becoming a profession that the public embraces. Everything I do will be with more public exposure in mind and I need the help of all of you, especially the younger members to do this.

Once again, thank you.

Mr. Ross asked the retiring members to step down and asked the returning and newly elected members to take their place at the head table.

President Ross led the Council members in swearing the Oath of Office.

President announced that the meeting would enter into new business by advising that new business recommendations must be in writing and signed by the mover and seconder. He explained that new business resolutions are not binding on Council but Council is obliged to consider the matter, if passed by the membership. When members are voting, they are voting to have Council consider the matter. It does not necessarily mean that the decision will be implemented by Council (as Council may learn of new information).

It was MOVED by Mr. Andersen, seconded by Mr. MacDorman, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA review the Professional Practice Regulation within the Land

Motion Carried

Mr. Andersen spoke to the motion indicating that he was recently involved in a re-branding and re-naming of his firm with the goal of coming up with one corporation and identity. He added that because one firm was a Saskatchewan one and the other an Alberta firm, a few snags occurred during the creation of one corporation mainly dealing with the ownership of the majority of voting shares. The only way it could be handled at the time was to create one company that had “Alta.” attached to its name. Mr. Andersen continued by indicating that they had to hire a legal firm to handle the re-branding and re-naming. The website had to be very clear that there are two corporations involved. He asked if Council could investigate whether this section could be changed to make this type of transaction easier, especially with the advent of the Agreement on Internal Trade.

Mr. Kocher asked if the same type of situation exists the other way (i.e. going from Alberta to Saskatchewan) and suggested this may point to a national issue that could be dealt with by Professional Surveyors Canada.

Mr. Gurnsey, President of the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association indicated that the issue of business requirements came up in the labour mobility discussions under the Agreement of Internal Trade. He added that there are a wide range of different requirements across the country. In Saskatchewan, the legislation is silent on corporations and the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association does not attempt to control corporations in any way under its legislation.

Mr. Crews, President of the Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors advised that in June, his Association will be having a special sitting to address the issue. He went on to say that the corporations require 51% of ownership which eliminates fair partnership with lawyers, planners and others. It is proposed that the 51% ownership requirement be eliminated. Mr. Crews advised that what is being allowed at present is for engineering firms to have surveying practices so that a surveyor could work in a firm and be an owner but would not have to own 51%. In that case, a certificate of authorization is issued to the engineering firm. This provides other privi-
Mr. Andersen suggested that as long as the corporation is controlled by land surveyors, regardless of what land surveying commissions they have, he felt that would be enough. He added that, the way it is now, there are a lot of extra costs for a smaller firm with respect to accounting and administration. In answering Mr. Kocher’s question, he advised that in Saskatchewan, the only requirement is that a Saskatchewan Land Surveyor must be present in the office when it is open to the public.

It was MOVED by Mr. Jeschke, seconded by Mr. Maltais, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA consider doing away with affidavits, certifications, affirmations and statutory declarations. Alternatively, it is proposed the Association follow the APEGGA model, relying upon the professional’s signature and permit stamp to indicate the Alberta Land Surveyor has met all obligations for the product.

Motion Carried

Mr. Jeschke spoke to the motion by indicating that as a professional, the signature on the plan that affirms that due diligence was done in creating the product is enough.

It was MOVED by Mr. David Hagen, seconded by Mr. Olson, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA consider establishing an independent committee to produce a report in regards to the feasibility and implications for the public and profession of the Director of Surveys implementing integration with a five centimetre absolute accuracy.

Motion Defeated

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Hagen did not feel that anyone was against integration but felt that the absolute five-centimetre accuracy would mean plans could not be surveyed by conventional means because survey control does not offer that absolute five-centimetre. In addition, it was felt that, with respect to GPS, it would be difficult, time-consuming and not feasible at this point. Mr. Hagen felt that before the Director of Surveys goes ahead with implementation, some indication of what the implications would be to the profession and the public should be provided. He added that he would also like some consideration given to changing the policy given by the Director of Surveys to something that is more realistic.

Mr. Hagen clarified that he would like a study done independently of the Director of Surveys regarding what the effect will be to the profession and the public.

Mr. Maltais spoke against the motion. He felt that the Director of Surveys has done an excellent job over the past years in bringing the profession forward and moving it to the forefront of technology. He went on to say that he would not support putting roadblocks in front of good policy which will advance the profession.

Mr. Boulanger also spoke against the motion as he believed that the new liaison committee has been struck to work with and not against the Director of Surveys.

It was MOVED by Mr. David Hagen, seconded by Mr. Olson, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA consider instructing its solicitor to provide a legal opinion on whether the Director of Surveys has the power to implement integration of plans for registration at Land Titles Office without the approval of the membership.

Motion Defeated

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Hagen felt that rather than being dictated to, the membership should have some input in what policies the Director of Surveys is going forward with.

It was MOVED by Mr. Kocher, seconded by Mr. Dion, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA resurrect one of the great traditions of the Association, that would be “volunteering” of new members to serve drinks and snacks to guests in the hospitality suite. It is imperative that the new members realize that their “indebted servitude” does not end with the attaining of their commission. It, in fact, should continue on as social service to their newfound peers and esteemed guests. We propose that new members must fulfill this unwritten symbolic and implied requirement of the completion of their articles by serving drinks, etc, to all guests of the hospitality suite and learn valuable and important life skills.

Motion Carried

Mr. Larry Pals spoke against the motion and indicated that he understood that there has already been a separate committee established by Council to be a liaison with the Director of Surveys office.

Mr. Hagen clarified that he would like a study done independently of the Director of Surveys regarding what the effect will be to the profession and the public.

Mr. Maltais spoke against the motion. He felt that the Director of Surveys has done an excellent job over the past years in bringing the profession forward and moving it to the forefront of technology. He went on to say that he would not support putting roadblocks in front of good policy which will advance the profession.

Mr. Boulanger also spoke against the motion as he believed that the new liaison committee has been struck to work with and not against the Director of Surveys.

It was MOVED by Mr. David Hagen, seconded by Mr. Olson, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA consider instructing its solicitor to provide a legal opinion on whether the Director of Surveys has the power to implement integration of plans for registration at Land Titles Office without the approval of the membership.

Motion Defeated

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Hagen felt that rather than being dictated to, the membership should have some input in what policies the Director of Surveys is going forward with.

It was MOVED by Mr. Kocher, seconded by Mr. Dion, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA resurrect one of the great traditions of the Association, that would be “volunteering” of new members to serve drinks and snacks to guests in the hospitality suite. It is imperative that the new members realize that their “indebted servitude” does not end with the attaining of their commission. It, in fact, should continue on as social service to their newfound peers and esteemed guests. We propose that new members must fulfill this unwritten symbolic and implied requirement of the completion of their articles by serving drinks, etc, to all guests of the hospitality suite and learn valuable and important life skills.

Motion Carried

Mr. Larry Pals spoke against the motion and indicated that he understood that there has already been a separate committee established by Council to be a liaison with the Director of Surveys office.

Mr. Hagen clarified that he would like a study done independently of the Director of Surveys regarding what the effect will be to the profession and the public.

Mr. Maltais spoke against the motion. He felt that the Director of Surveys has done an excellent job over the past years in bringing the profession forward and moving it to the forefront of technology. He went on to say that he would not support putting roadblocks in front of good policy which will advance the profession.

Mr. Boulanger also spoke against the motion as he believed that the new liaison committee has been struck to work with and not against the Director of Surveys.

It was MOVED by Mr. David Hagen, seconded by Mr. Olson, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA consider instructing its solicitor to provide a legal opinion on whether the Director of Surveys has the power to implement integration of plans for registration at Land Titles Office without the approval of the membership.

Motion Defeated

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Hagen felt that rather than being dictated to, the membership should have some input in what policies the Director of Surveys is going forward with.

It was MOVED by Mr. Kocher, seconded by Mr. Dion, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA resurrect one of the great traditions of the Association, that would be “volunteering” of new members to serve drinks and snacks to guests in the hospitality suite. It is imperative that the new members realize that their “indebted servitude” does not end with the attaining of their commission. It, in fact, should continue on as social service to their newfound peers and esteemed guests. We propose that new members must fulfill this unwritten symbolic and implied requirement of the completion of their articles by serving drinks, etc, to all guests of the hospitality suite and learn valuable and important life skills.

Motion Carried
Mr. Kocher spoke to the motion by suggested that new members’ servitude does not necessarily end with getting their commission. Serving drinks and snacks to the members and guests at the hospitality suite translates into continuing to serve society. Mr. Kocher concluded that it is also a good way to meet the rest of the members of the Association.

Mr. Dave Gurnsey, President of the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association, felt that the ALSA members should support the motion. He commented that although, Lana Bily received her commission in Alberta first, her commission as a Saskatchewan Land Surveyor was presented to her in Saskatchewan four weeks ago and she was serving drinks at the AGM. He added that, over the last number of years, articled students and new members have been involved in looking after the hospitality suite. Mr. Gurnsey felt it was a great way for the existing members to meet the up and coming members.

It was MOVED by Mr. Gordon, seconded by Mr. Kocher, That it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA refer the definition of reference control markers as it pertains to Section 47 plans to the Standards Committee. This would be specifically to resolve the apparent exclusion of found and set monuments to serve this purpose.

Motion Defeated

Mr. Hansen suggested that for Section 47 plans a surveyor would have control other than the back corners of the lots as the control for the subdivision.

Mr. Rob Scott, concurred and felt that Section 47 plans have to have independent control reference monuments.

Mr. Gordon advised that the Manual of Standard Practice just refers to reference control monuments as marks and does not stipulate what should be used except that a monument cannot be used. He felt that it was the land surveyors’ responsibility to make sure that what they are using is suitable. He did not feel that iron posts should be excluded and if they are, then perhaps it should be specified that those reference control markers need to be superior to iron posts. He concluded that there is nothing that says that they have to be.

Mr. Bode spoke against the motion as he felt that the issue was dealt with earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Henrie read a relevant quote from a 1999 document by Mr. Brian Ballantyne as follows: “real property boundaries can only be uniquely defined, that is, by one legally sanctioned method and not by a multitude of legally sanctioned methods.” Mr. Henrie felt the issue was a legal one and asked what the governing monument would be.

President Brian Ross declared the 101st Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association closed.
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REVIEW ENGAGEMENT REPORT

To the Members of
Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association

We have reviewed the statement of financial position of Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association as at April 30, 2009 and the statements of operations, changes in net assets and cash flows for the year then ended. Our review was made in accordance with Canadian generally accepted standards for review engagements and accordingly consisted primarily of enquiry, analytical procedures and discussion related to information supplied to us by the Association.

A review does not constitute an audit and consequently we do not express an audit opinion on these financial statements.

Based on our review, nothing has come to our attention that causes us to believe that these financial statements are not, in all material respects, in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles.

Edmonton, Alberta
July 17, 2009

Chartered Accountants

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION
(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

April 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash—Note 3</td>
<td>$712,112</td>
<td>$556,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities—Note 3</td>
<td>1,749,376</td>
<td>1,893,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>270,011</td>
<td>328,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses—Note 4</td>
<td>26,673</td>
<td>29,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,748,066</td>
<td>2,806,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT—Note 5</td>
<td>42,705</td>
<td>48,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,800,775</td>
<td>$2,855,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT LIABILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>$269,417</td>
<td>$401,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>22,802</td>
<td>19,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions—Note 6</td>
<td>489,259</td>
<td>349,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>781,478</td>
<td>760,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT—Note 7</td>
<td>23,592</td>
<td>27,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUE TO RRIF INDEX REVOLVING FUND—Note 8</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in equipment</td>
<td>42,705</td>
<td>48,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally restricted</td>
<td>1,961,769</td>
<td>2,029,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,004,474</td>
<td>2,058,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,800,775</td>
<td>$2,855,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASE COMMITMENTS—Note 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL

Chartered Accountants
# Statement of Operations

**Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association**

**Year Ended April 30, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Budget 2009</th>
<th>Variance Over (Under) 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue—Schedule 1</td>
<td>$2,217,773</td>
<td>$2,111,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and levies</td>
<td>400,108</td>
<td>327,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>24,690</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gain on marketable securities</td>
<td>16,776</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on disposal of marketable securities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,659,356</td>
<td>$2,458,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of marketable securities</td>
<td>185,786</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized loss on marketable securities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and Committees—Schedule 2</td>
<td>179,047</td>
<td>183,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic practice review—Schedule 3</td>
<td>260,582</td>
<td>518,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses—Schedule 4</td>
<td>641,742</td>
<td>650,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses—Schedule 5</td>
<td>1,537,845</td>
<td>1,414,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of equipment</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,807,418</td>
<td>$2,766,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internally Restricted Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue/Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Improvement Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Revolving Fund:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary recoveries</td>
<td>52,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary expenses</td>
<td>(64,754)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>(7,059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors Levy Fund:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>7005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>(5,231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Council of Land Surveyors Fund:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>25,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>(25,726)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Survey Textbook Fund:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book sales</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing expenses</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100th Anniversary Project Fund</td>
<td>(34,773)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral Research Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel Fund:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>170,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>(3,099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>(10,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$144,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revenue Under Expenses**

$ (53,861) $ (193,892)
STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS
(Unaudited)
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Year Ended April 30
2009 2008

CASH PROVIDED BY (USED IN)
Operating activities:
Revenue under expenses $(53,861) $(193,892)
Charges (credits) not affecting cash:
Amortization 12,874 15,843
Amortization of deferred lease inducement (4,528) (4,528)
Loss on disposal of equipment 2,416 0
Net changes in non-cash working capital items--Note 11 208,685 99,824
Total $165,586 (82,753)

Investing activities:
Purchases of equipment (9,487) (8,391)
Investment in RPR Revolving Index Fund 0 (585)
Total (9,487) (8,976)

CASH INCREASE (DECREASE) 156,099 (91,729)
Cash at beginning of year 556,013 647,742
CASH AT END OF YEAR $712,112 $ 556,013

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Unaudited)
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION
April 30, 2009

NOTE 1—PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION
The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association is a non-profit, self-governing professional association legislated under the Land Surveyors’ Act. The Association regulates the practice of land surveying for the protection of the public and the administration of the profession. As a non-profit organization under the Income Tax Act, the Association is exempt from income taxes.

NOTE 2—SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES
Basis of Presentation
These financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles.

Marketable Securities
Marketable securities are classified as held-for-trading investments. They are initially recognized at acquisition cost and subsequently re-measured at fair value at each reporting date. Unrealized gains or losses on re-measurement are recognized in the statement of operations.

Donated Services
Volunteers donate time to the Association to assist the Association in carrying out its services. Due to the difficulty in determining their fair value, donated services are not recognized in the financial statements.

Equipment
Equipment is recorded at cost. Amortization is provided over the estimated useful lives of the assets using the declining balance method at the following rates:

- Office equipment 20%
- Furniture and fixtures 20%
- Survey equipment 20%
- Automotive equipment 30%
- Computer equipment 30%

A full year’s amortization is taken in the year of acquisition and none in the year of disposal.

Revenue Recognition
The Association follows the deferral method of accounting for contributions. Contributions are included in revenue in the year they are received or receivable, with the exception that contributions to fund a specific future period’s operating expenses are included in revenue in that later period.

Use of Estimates
The preparation of financial statements, in conformity with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles, requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the amounts reported in the financial statements. By their nature, these estimates are subject to measurement uncertainty and actual results could differ.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Unaudited)
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION
April 30, 2009

NOTE 3--CASH AND MARKETABLE SECURITIES
Cash and marketable securities include $1,961,768 (2008--$2,009,826) which have been designated for specific programs that are described in Note 10.

NOTE 4--PREPAID EXPENSES
Prepaid expenses are comprised of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent deposit</td>
<td>$18,627</td>
<td>$18,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td>5,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$26,570</td>
<td>$29,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 5--EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>$53,693</td>
<td>$41,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>32,202</td>
<td>19,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>33,138</td>
<td>25,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119,033</td>
<td>85,958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>3,101</td>
<td>2,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey equipment</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>5,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive equipment</td>
<td>40,826</td>
<td>35,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>16,786</td>
<td>14,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67,028</td>
<td>57,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$186,061 $143,355 $42,706 $48,509

NOTE 6--DEFERRED CONTRIBUTIONS
The Association assesses its members an annual membership fee at the beginning of its fiscal year. Membership fees and levies received in advance for the subsequent fiscal year are recognized as deferred contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at beginning of year</td>
<td>$346,870</td>
<td>$305,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions received during the year</td>
<td>489,299</td>
<td>346,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts recognized as revenue</td>
<td>(346,870)</td>
<td>(305,053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$489,299</td>
<td>$346,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 7--DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT
The Association moved to its present office space in June of 2004 and received one year rent free as a lease inducement. The Association amortizes the tenant deferred lease inducement on the straight-line basis over the term of the lease which expires on June 30, 2014. The current year’s amortization of $4,527 (2008--$4,527) was credited to rent expense.

NOTE 8--DUE TO RPR INDEX REVOLVING FUND
The due to RPR Index Revolving Fund represents the Association’s net equity in the fund. At the end of the current year, the fund was in a deficit balance.

NOTE 9--LEASE COMMITMENTS
The Association leases office space under an operating lease agreement which expires on June 30, 2014. The Association also pays a proportionate share of operating costs.

The Association leases a photocopier under an operating lease agreement which expires on September 30, 2013.

Future minimum lease payments, including operating costs, due within the next five years under these operating leases will be approximately as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 / 2010</td>
<td>$61,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 / 2011</td>
<td>62,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 / 2012</td>
<td>62,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 / 2013</td>
<td>62,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$248,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Unaudited)
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION
April 30, 2009

NOTE 10--INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS

Financial Stabilization Fund
This fund is used for special projects, overruns of expenses of the operating budget and any other approved non-budgeted expenses. Surpluses from the operating accounts are transferred to the Financial Stabilization Fund at year end. Any year end deficit in the operating accounts shall be balanced with funds from the Financial Stabilization Fund. Council may allocate funds for extraordinary expenses.

Discipline Revolving Fund
This fund is used for expenses relating to discipline hearings, discipline related education seminars and administrative matters pertaining to the Discipline Committee. At the start of each fiscal year, Council sets the fund at $20,000.

Communications and Public Relations Development Fund
This fund is used for special initiatives that promote the profession to the public. At the start of each fiscal year, Council sets the fund at $50,000.

Technology Transfer and Education Fund
This fund is used for non-capital expenses that allow the Association to take better advantage of technology and to educate members about subjects that will allow them to better serve the public.

Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund
This fund is used to reimburse members who are either acknowledged delegates, invited speakers or participants at conferences or meetings outside of Alberta. Council sets the fund at $10,000.

Centennial AGM Fund
This fund was established to reduce the ticket price of events so that more members may attend the centennial AGM, bringing in high profile guest speakers and putting together displays or other materials associated with promoting the Association’s centennial.

Seminar Presenter Revolving Fund
This fund was established to reimburse members who develop and present Association approved seminars to the membership, other professional organizations or the general public.

Alberta Survey Textbook Fund
This fund was established to fund the research, writing and publication of an Alberta-written survey textbook.

Canadian Council of Land Surveyors
This fund was established to accumulate surplus funds collected on behalf of the Canadian Council of Land Surveyors. The surplus may be applied, at the discretion of the Council, to reduce future levies to members.

AGM Stabilization Fund
This fund is to be used to cover excess expenses incurred for the annual general meeting up to $15,000 per year at the discretion of Council.

Leasehold Allowance Fund
This fund is to be used at the discretion of the Executive Director, to update or maintain the Association’s office space. Funds received from any unused leasehold allowance from a landlord shall be put in the Leasehold Allowance Fund.

Cadastral Research Fund
This fund was established to provide support for research projects by MSc and PhD students in cadastral studies at the University of Calgary by providing a maximum of $30,000 each year for three years.

100th Anniversary Project Fund
This fund was established to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Alberta Land Surveyors Association in 2009.

Boundary Panel Fund
The Boundary Panel Fund was established for the purpose of funding investigations of boundary uncertainties or alleged errors in surveys.

Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors Levy Fund
This fund was established to accumulate surplus funds collected on behalf of the Canadian Council of Land Surveyors. The surplus may be applied, at the discretion of the Council, to reduce future levies to members.

NOTE 11--CASH FLOW INFORMATION

Net Changes in Non-Cash Working Capital Items
Changes in non-cash working capital items and their effect of increasing (decreasing) cash are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities</td>
<td>$143,661</td>
<td>$(11,214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>52,760</td>
<td>(47,367)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>11,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>(135,697)</td>
<td>106,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>(777)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions</td>
<td>142,429</td>
<td>41,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$208,685</td>
<td>$99,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 12--SCHEDULES

Schedules 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 compare actual revenue and expenses for the year to budgeted amounts. The budgets were prepared by management and approved by Council.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION
April 30, 2009

NOTE 13–FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS
For cash and short-term investments, accounts receivable and accounts payable, the carrying amounts of these financial instruments approximate their fair values due to their short-term maturity or capacity for prompt liquidation.

The Association does not believe it is subject to any significant concentration of credit risk. Cash is in place with a major financial institution. Accounts receivable are generally the result of services to members.

 Marketable securities are exposed to market risk and currency risk. Market risk relates to the possibility that marketable securities will change in value due to future fluctuations in market prices. Currency risk relates to the possibility that marketable securities will change in value due to fluctuations in foreign exchange rates. Senior management and the Council, in consultation with investment advisors, reviews the Association’s marketable securities and establish a diversification mix in order to earn the best possible return at an acceptable level of risk.

NOTE 14–INFORMATION REQUIRED BY MINISTERIAL ORDER
Ministerial Order 54/88A was amended by Ministerial Order 27/2008 effective November 1, 2008 setting the mark-up that the Association can charge on the sale of posts and indicating the use of the mark-up for the purposes of maintaining and enhancing professional practice, education, public awareness and quality, the technical capability of land surveyors in Alberta, and funding investigations of boundary uncertainties or alleged errors in surveys.

The following accounting of revenue and expenditures has been provided pursuant to sub-section 7(5) of the Ministerial Order:

November 1, 2008
To April 30, 2009

REVENUE
Post sales $ 493,634
Education 30,625
524,259

EXPENSES
Post sale administration 437,915
Systematic practice review 132,454
Education 51,573
Public awareness 40,922
Enhancing professional practice 29,837
Section 47 plan monitoring 9,606
Field note / dormant plan repository 3,091
705,598

REVENUE UNDER EXPENSES $ (181,339)

OPERATING REVENUE
(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION
Year Ended April 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Budget 2009</th>
<th>Budget Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts</td>
<td>$1,437,464</td>
<td>$1,248,750</td>
<td>$188,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts</td>
<td>458,830</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>8,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>159,518</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>(26,482)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>47,825</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>(5,175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>44,405</td>
<td>86,170</td>
<td>(41,765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>24,305</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(5,695)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>21,754</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>11,280</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>(5,220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>6,119</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>5,703</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>(11,097)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>(170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,217,773</td>
<td>$2,111,970</td>
<td>$105,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## COUNCIL AND COMMITTEES

### Schedule 2

(UNAUDITED)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Year Ended April 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>41,726</td>
<td>36,500</td>
<td>5,226</td>
<td>32,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and examination</td>
<td>35,259</td>
<td>43,680</td>
<td>(8,421)</td>
<td>36,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Board</td>
<td>24,888</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>14,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s travel</td>
<td>23,192</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>25,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>17,668</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(12,332)</td>
<td>56,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>7,531</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>4,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5,607</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(817)</td>
<td>4,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(994)</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention and social</td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>(2,098)</td>
<td>2,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and biographical</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(1,168)</td>
<td>3,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>(1,050)</td>
<td>3,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Tour within Alberta</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>5,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Council of Land Surveyors</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomatics Engineering Liaison</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(398)</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Surveys</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$179,047  $183,480  $(4,433)  $202,097

---

## SYSTEMATIC PRACTICE REVIEW

### Schedule 3

(UNAUDITED)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Year Ended April 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>223,535</td>
<td>447,871</td>
<td>(224,336)</td>
<td>341,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and transportation</td>
<td>17,153</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(2,847)</td>
<td>14,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>7,107</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>(16,893)</td>
<td>14,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3,885</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>(1,515)</td>
<td>3,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>3,802</td>
<td>5,103</td>
<td>(1,301)</td>
<td>5,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and plans</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>(4,978)</td>
<td>6,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(1,148)</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>(1,022)</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>(489)</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field supplies</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(363)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and dues</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>(2,600)</td>
<td>1,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rentals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>(400)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$260,582  $518,474  $(257,892)  $389,879
### ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES
(Unaudited)

**ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION**

Year Ended April 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Budget 2009</th>
<th>Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, benefits and contract staff</td>
<td>$ 402,477</td>
<td>$ 379,999</td>
<td>$ 22,478 ($ 22,478)</td>
<td>$ 387,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building operations</td>
<td>126,615</td>
<td>123,287</td>
<td>3,328 (3,328)</td>
<td>113,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies and photocopying</td>
<td>24,065</td>
<td>29,851</td>
<td>(5,786) (5,786)</td>
<td>27,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and donations</td>
<td>14,825</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>(6,175) (6,175)</td>
<td>18,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and courier</td>
<td>11,156</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>(8,544) (8,544)</td>
<td>15,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>9,072</td>
<td>12,979</td>
<td>(3,907) (3,907)</td>
<td>10,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>(4,386) (4,386)</td>
<td>19,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, Internet and database</td>
<td>6,991</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>491 (491)</td>
<td>7,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6,476</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>(824) (824)</td>
<td>6,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery</td>
<td>6,284</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>284 (284)</td>
<td>11,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5,625</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(375) (375)</td>
<td>5,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>5,524</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>(676) (676)</td>
<td>6,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and subscriptions</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>(113) (113)</td>
<td>3,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical file management</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,353 (1,353)</td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>7,175</td>
<td>(4,894) (4,894)</td>
<td>1,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,109 (2,109)</td>
<td>9,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence and travel</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>(1,611) (1,611)</td>
<td>3,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(925) (925)</td>
<td>2,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training and library</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(933) (933)</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 47 monitoring</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>699 (699)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Board of Examiners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Professional Surveyors Levy</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>(642) (642)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Administration Expenses**

$ 641,742 $ 650,791 ($ 9,049) $ 659,336

---

### OPERATING EXPENSES
(Unaudited)

**ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION**

Year Ended April 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Budget 2009</th>
<th>Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts</td>
<td>$ 803,560</td>
<td>$ 693,750</td>
<td>$ 109,810 ($ 109,810)</td>
<td>$ 865,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts</td>
<td>333,568</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>9,568 (9,568)</td>
<td>346,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>247,927</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>12,927 (12,927)</td>
<td>176,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>43,907</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>(8,093) (8,093)</td>
<td>46,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges and management fees</td>
<td>28,707</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>2,707 (2,707)</td>
<td>29,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>23,108</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(6,892) (6,892)</td>
<td>21,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>22,484</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>1,484 (1,484)</td>
<td>18,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>15,914</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>(586) (586)</td>
<td>15,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>15,828</td>
<td>13,620</td>
<td>2,208 (2,208)</td>
<td>17,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>500 (500)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>207 (207)</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Operating Expenses**

$1,537,845 $1,414,005 $ 123,840 $1,539,196
Any summary of Association activities in 2009-2010 must begin with finances. The membership saw a big decline in their activity and, for the first time in a long time, we saw land surveyors being laid off. The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association office was not immune from the effects of a poor global economy.

When we put the 2009-2010 budget together, we projected sales of 130,000 iron posts. This is a significant drop from even last year’s sales of 195,570 iron posts and a freefall from 2005-2006 when the Association sold 295,540 iron posts. The reality is going to be that we won’t even hit budget; at this time, we are projecting 2009-2010 iron post sales to be 111,000.

Marker posts tell a similar story. We projected sales of 30,000 marker posts for 2009-2010 and we will end up being very close to that number. However, that number is less than half of the marker posts that we sold in 2005-2006.

Naturally, such a big decline in the major source of the Association’s revenue is going to have an impact. Thankfully, the membership under new business at the 2009 AGM, requested that Council develop a contingency plan. The contingency plan has been an invaluable document in making sure that the Association’s finances remain on track.

The Association implemented a number of changes to systems and initiatives in order to bring our expenses in-line with falling revenues. The most obvious change to the membership has likely been the fact that non-statutory committees are holding internet meetings instead of face-to-face or even telephone conference call meetings. The savings have been significant. It has also meant less travel time and greater productivity for committee members and ALSA staff. Even the statutory committees have held a couple of meetings through our internet service. While there have been a few technical glitches along the way, the experience, I believe, for everyone has been very positive.

Besides online meetings, we have cut back on some public relations initiatives and trimmed some other committee terms of reference. The intent, always, was to ensure that priority items still get done but that other non-strategic matters perhaps get put on the backburner. Likewise, a number of Association working groups or ad hoc committees did not get the same level of administrative support that they might have in past years. Our smaller Association office staff continues to focus on providing support for the Association’s statutory and standing committees.
ALSAs staffing levels have gone down. The administration side of things is down one person from the same time last year and Systematic Practice Review is down 1.5 people. Compared to when I started in this position many years ago now, our staffing levels are actually lower now than they were then.

Staff involvement in Association committees is perhaps our most high profile work. However, we also spend a great deal of time handling inquiries from the public. We might get questions on what a flying level is, how do you convert UTM to 3TM co-ordinates or how do I resolve a boundary dispute with my neighbour. The Association office is at the forefront of ensuring that non-land surveyors are not practicing land surveying. It is also our role to ensure that our own members are practicing within the confines of the Act and the Code of Ethics.

Over the course of the last year, the Association has done a presentation or two and had representation at other various meetings and functions.

As we look forward, we must continue to try to find ways to communicate with and serve both the public and the membership. No doubt we will have to continue to take advantage of new technologies as they come along as we cannot rely on an increase in revenues any time soon.

B.E. (Brian) Munday
Executive Director

Registrar’s Report

Practicing Alberta Land Surveyor Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increases/Decreases to Number of Practicing Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2009, the average number of years of experience of an active Alberta Land Surveyor was 16.1 years. Alberta Land Surveyors who received their commission in 2009 had articled for an average of 40.9 months.

Member Locations During 2009 (Calendar Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Articled &amp; Affiliate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande Prairie</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industry Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Surveyor’s Corporations &amp; Partnerships)</th>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Head Offices</th>
<th>Branch Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male/Female Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Receivd</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1999</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1994</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1989</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*up to February 19, 2010

Membership Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled Pupil</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Life</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*up to February 19, 2010
Committee Reports

BOUNDARY PANEL
In May 2009, Council approved new terms of reference for the Boundary Panel in line with the ministerial order that allows the Association to collect $2.50 from each iron post and marker post sold toward investigating alleged errors in surveys and boundary uncertainties.

In 2009, five cases came forward to the Boundary Panel and two cases were holdovers from previous years. Of the seven cases in total, three were referred by Alberta Land Surveyors, three were referred by the Director of Surveys and one came from a landowner.

In one case, the practitioners involved were able to resolve their concerns without a Boundary Panel hearing. In three cases, the Association retained an independent Alberta Land Surveyor to conduct additional research and search for additional evidence. One matter was resolved after the independent investigation was done, one matter was referred back to the Director of Surveys to confirm the proposed resolution to the matter and another independent investigation will assist the Boundary Panel in preparing its findings.

Of the seven cases, two cases are waiting for a decision, two files have been closed, one file is scheduled for a hearing, one file may lead to a re-survey or monument plan and one case is with the Director of Surveys.

Now that the Association has had the Boundary Panel in place for several years and under updated terms of reference for the last year, Council directed that the Association investigate developing a scope of work document to examine how the Boundary Panel functions and operates and make recommendations for change.

J.E. (Jerry) Rasmuson, ALS

BURIED FACILITIES WORKING GROUP
This small group of three individuals and Ken Allred, MLA met only once this year to determine the working group’s mandate. A number of emails were passed around and a notice to request photographs or anecdotal evidence of buried facility strikes was forwarded to the general membership. The group hopes to set up a conference call with the Calgary Region Utility Damage Prevention Committee in the near future. The group will also review the ALSA buried facilities position paper to see if its position has changed in any way in the present working environment. At present, the group believes that it is prudent for the practitioner to either have
their staff trained in underground location techniques and ground disturbance techniques or alternatively to utilize Alberta One-Call services.

G.A. (Greg) Boggs, ALS

CANADIAN COUNCIL OF LAND SURVEYORS

Most of CCLS’s activity has been regarding the following categories:

Professional Surveyors Canada (PSC)
Over the past year and a half, many people have worked on a plan to develop a new corporation which will replace CCLS. Many provincial associations have been disillusioned with CCLS over the past number of years resulting in the provincial association presidents discussing the need to develop a replacement body.

In 2008, CCLS had developed a plan which was rejected by many associations. This plan relied too heavily on financial support from the associations as well as its proposed mandate encroached into that of the provincial associations. A PSC strategic planning session was held in Toronto on October 2-4, 2009. Representatives from across the country took part in developing a new strategic plan for the PSC. The focus of the new PSC will be member driven. While the provincial associations’ mandate is protection of the public, registration, peer review and discipline, PSC will be a voice and platform for all registered surveyors across Canada. It will also deliver member specific services which may fall outside the scope of the provincial associations or that are not financially viable at a smaller scale. It will enable professional land surveyors in Canada to have a voice at the national and international levels. It will also be a larger body that will assist provincial associations to deal with issues at the provincial and local levels.

To address the needs of its individual members, PSC will undertake to provide services such as public awareness and professional development on a larger, more effective scale. PSC aims to enhance the professional image of the profession. It will also continue to be the coordinating body for the licensing bodies in Canada. It will be respectful of the authority and legislative mandate of the provincial bodies.

PSC will have representation from all provinces and the ACLS. The current CCLS dues structure will remain intact. The dues will cover the administration of PSC but any larger initiative will require fundraising to ensure professional quality.

Over the next year, PSC will create its new structure and start to formulate professional development courses as well as a public awareness campaign. It will continue to work on national issues such as labour mobility and accreditation. Considerable effort was given to the design of this entity to ensure its survival. By supporting the needs of the individual professional surveyor, it is hoped that PSC will succeed where other organizations have failed.

Your input will make this entity stronger. Please forward your comments to Dave McWilliam our CCLS representative or Bob Wallace, our current PSC representative.

Professional Liability Insurance Committee (PLIC)
This committee continues to have a unique privilege of direct input to the process of the PLI program. The program has members in nine provinces and two territories, and negotiates policy premiums, review claim trends, and provide risk management seminars on a rotational basis. Monroe Kinloch, of Sherwood Park, has been the Alberta representative for the past nine years and is being replaced by Jim Halliday of Cochrane, Alberta, in October 2010.

D.R. (Dave) McWilliam, ALS
Alberta Director to CCLS

CANADIAN BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS (CBEPS)
By the time of the AGM, the provincial associations should all have received and approved the new CBEPS syllabus. This new syllabus should be in place for the October 2010 exam sitting.

Our sister associations are now all members of CBEPS with the exception of the OAGQ. Quebec has an observer on the CBEPS Board of Directors and there is interest. The new survey law textbook should be completed by the fall of 2010.

There were 111 candidates at the last exam sitting. There are 316 active candidates, and 153 of these are in Alberta.

L.M. (Larry) Pals, ALS and J. (John) Haggerty, ALS

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCERS
The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association has representation on two committees of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. The Resource Access Committee (John Wallace) and the Geomatics Committee (Al Jamieson). In each case, the Association is there to represent the land survey profession with respect to any applicable issues.
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CONTINUING COMPETENCY

The Continuing Competency Working Group was formed
by Council in November 2008. The Working Group is the
result of the 2008 polling of the membership concerning the
future of Systematic Practice Review and a think-tank ses-
tion held in October 2008 when there were no applicants for
the Director of Practice Review position.

The purpose of the Working Group is to develop a new
continuing competency program for the Association. The
past year (2009-2010) has seen the group come together to
develop a new program that is cost-effective, sustainable
and flexible enough to achieve the desired results in times of
economic unrest.

The new program proposes to incorporate practice re-
view, continuing education and association involvement and
is designed to accommodate members in all areas of con-
tribution to the Association and the public. Throughout the
year, many concepts were investigated and the group feels
that the final result will address the needs of both the mem-
ers and the public in regards to ensuring that each practic-
ing member is subject to a review and has access to contin-
uous education.

I would like to thank the group for their tireless efforts,
their open discussions and their commitment to developing
this program.

J.D. (John) Wallace, ALS
D.A. (Al) Jamieson, ALS

CONVENTION & SOCIAL

The Convention & Social Group is chaired by the execu-
tive director with the president and vice-president and their
respective spouses working to plan the AGM. Michelle
Woywitka provides administrative support – which means
she does most of the work. The Convention & Social Group
worked on the following tasks this year:

1. Organized the 45th annual ALSA golf tournament. The
weather was cool and windy with light drizzle, but all 113
golfers and sponsors made the best of it. Thanks to the gener-
osity of the participants, the J.H. Holloway Scholarship Foun-
dation raised $1,681 through the sale of mulligans and draw
tickets. A special thank you to George Smith for his continued
support in helping organize the tournament. Congratulations
to George Smith, Colleen Smith, Eamon McCann and Len
Becker who won in a pull-off.

2. The 101st annual general meeting will be held at Jasper
Park Lodge from April 22-24, 2010. We know that the 101st
meeting doesn’t have quite the same allure as the 100th but
President Don and his wife Eileen have done their best to put
together a program that will be exciting and entertaining.

3. The 102nd AGM will be back at the Jasper Park Lodge. The
2012 AGM will be at the Banff Springs Hotel. We are hav-
ing difficulty negotiating a suitable contract for 2013; many
venues are not suitable for a convention such as ours while
other venues contain financial clauses which could be quite
punitive.

B.E. (Brian) Munday
Executive Director

DISCIPLINE

Between February 19, 2009 and the date of this report be-
ing written, February 22, 2010, there were four complaints
lodged with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. One of
the complaints was withdrawn after the Registrar began his
investigation. One was withdrawn by the complainant after
initial investigation by the Chairman. One complaint is in the
process of being investigated by the Registrar. The Chair-
man’s decision on the remaining complaint is being appealed
by the complainant and a hearing has been scheduled during
the 2009-2010 term.

There was one complaint outstanding from the previous
term. The Discipline Committee’s decision was appealed to
Council. Council’s decision on the appeal hearing is forth-
coming.

R.O. (Ron) Hall, ALS
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Richard Andrews
DORMANT PLANS WORKING GROUP
Dormant plans have been a problem for our Association for many years, with no resolution. Countless articles have discussed the subject in detail and the PRB has been monitoring the problem for years. As a result, Council decided to create the working group to solve the problem of dormant plans.

The group has just started working and is considering a combination of many different options including the following:
- Discussions with LTO to drop or relax the “consent” requirements
- Education of the most affected parties, including land surveyors, land men, pipeline operators and production engineers
- Streamlined filing of monument plans
- Requesting ERCB enforcement
- Internal ALSA enforcement

Our next meeting is on March 17th and we invite your comments or ideas towards finally getting this problem resolved. I would like to thank the members of this group for their frank discussion and commitment to resolving this issue.

J.I. (Jim) Maidment, ALS

EXECUTIVE
It is the role of the Executive Committee to ensure that recommendations from committees and other matters are ready to be presented to Council. This ensures that Council meetings are more efficient and effective and that Council is able to focus on critical issues. As such, most matters that came before the Executive Committee this year were dealt with by Council and Council’s decisions were published in Council Report.

The Executive Committee met seven times throughout the year; four times by online conference call and three times face-to-face. The face-to-face meetings were held to deal with committee terms of reference and volunteers and the budget. The other face-to-face meeting was held in conjunction with the golf tournament.

At its first meeting of 2009-2010, the Executive Committee identified a number of issues to be dealt with by the Association in the upcoming year. Some issues could easily be assigned to a committee or working group. Other issues required more deliberation and debate. These were issues such as: Association finances and a contingency plan in case of poor post sales, dial plan registration and the future of Systematic Practice Review and continuing education.

The Executive Committee played an important role in prioritizing issues and streamlining matters for Council.

With fewer dollars and human resources available this year, it was critical that the Executive Committee help identify the priority areas.

The Executive Committee does not make decisions on any of these items but ensures that Council has enough information for them to make a well-informed decision.

I thank the other Executive Committee members for their hard work and dedication in making my job much easier.

D.R. (Don) George, ALS
President

GEOMATICS ENGINEERING LIAISON COMMITTEE
The Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee last met on March 13, 2009. The next meeting is scheduled for March 12, 2010.

At the 2009 meeting, the Department gave an overview of new faculty members, new courses and a proposal submitted to the provincial government to establish a centre of excellence for integrated resource management.

Feedback from the last Geomatics Survey Camp was presented and discussed. Reports were presented at the meeting from the provincial associations (AMLS, ABCLS, ALSA), as well as the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors and the federal government. There was an update on FIG, including Mike Barry as one of Canada’s representatives on Commission VII.

B.D. (Brian) Ross, ALS

GNSS GUIDELINES WORKING GROUP
This is the second term for the GNSS Guidelines Working Group. The group was tasked with investigating issues surrounding the use of GNSS in land surveying and establishing guidelines on the suggested use and interpretation of GPS technologies and data.

The Working Group reviewed literature, developed an outline and developed the text for the guidelines document. A large amount of data was researched and shared amongst the group. The outline of the chapters was developed and group members were assigned a chapter to further develop the text. The chapter titles are as follows: Record Keeping for RTK & Static Applications, Data Management, Basics of RTK and Static GNSS Observations, Do’s and Don’ts of GNSS Observations, Validation Process, Equipment, Redundant Measurements, Coordinates Systems & Datum’s, Network Adjustments and Virtual GNSS Reference Networks. Research has begun in preparation for writing the chapters. The Working Group will continue to work on this valuable
HISTORICAL & BIOGRAPHICAL
The Historical & Biographical Committee met on three occasions during the past year. The main topic on each agenda was the Making Their Mark traveling historical exhibit which was unveiled at the 2009 AGM in Banff. During the past year, the exhibit has been shown at the Alberta Legislature, the Grande Prairie Heritage Discovery Centre and the Peace River Museum. The next two venues are in High Prairie and Medicine Hat. The feedback we have been getting from the public on the exhibit has been very positive. The Committee is still actively acquiring and cataloguing survey equipment and memorabilia to add to the collection. We are in the process of discussing ideas to display the collection.

The terms of reference for the upcoming year were prepared and a draft budget for 2010-2011 was prepared and passed onto Council for approval.

I would like to personally thank all the members of this committee for their dedication and commitment to this committee and also for volunteering to assemble and disassemble the exhibit at the venues during the past year.

L.J. (Les) Frederick, ALS

NOMINATING
The following slate of nominations has been received by the Registrar of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association pursuant to Section 28 of the bylaws of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association:

For President:
- B.D. (Brian) Ross

For Vice President:
- B.W. (Bruce) Gudim
- D.R. (David) Thomson

For Secretary-Treasurer:
- J. (John) Haggerty

For Council:
- C.J. (Chris) Chiasson
- D. (Damian) Gillis
- R.A. (Robert) Pinkerton
- D.M. (Duane) Haab

Additional nominations may be made by two Alberta Land Surveyors, with the consent of the nominees in each case, up to and including at the Annual General Meeting being held between the dates of April 22nd to 24th, 2010 at The Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge.

The following offices are to be filled:
- President one-year term
- Vice President one-year term
- Secretary-Treasurer three-year term
- Three members of Council two-year term

R.O. (Ron) Hall, ALS

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD
The 2009-2010 term for the PRB has been very challenging. The current Phase 3 review process has been active for over seven years. The Board identified early on that under the current format, the Phase 3 SPR program would take an additional four years to complete. This was due to the increase in membership and difficulty in maintaining a consistent SPR staffing level. While the current DPR, Chris Everett, has undertaken to open and inspect over 30 files in this term, the departure of the Assistant to the Director of Practice Review, Mr. John Ironstone and our technical assistant in October 2009 has negatively impacted the process.

Mr. Rudy Palovcik is now into his third year as our public member and is a key contributor to our Board discussions. Ms. Kerry Barrett, our administrative assistant, has now been with the Board for over two years and has been a key factor in the continued operation of SPR.

In order to facilitate the conclusion of Phase 3, the PRB made a recommendation to Council to streamline the remaining 30 reviews by reducing the number of products inspected per practice. It was also decided not to initiate an additional 32 files in Phase 3 and move those practitioners to the forefront of the next program. This recommendation was approved and the Phase 3 SPR program is expected to wrap up in 2010.

The PRB chair has been working with the Continuing Competency Working Group (CCWG), consisting of members of Council and the PDC, to develop the next round of peer review. The CCWG has been working closely with Council to develop a process that meets the needs of the public, the membership and is sustainable and efficient.

The PRB has held several successful web based meetings in place of the usual face-to-face meetings. This new format has reduced travel costs and time demands of the Board members. It is expected that this trend will continue.

The Board is to report to Council respecting any “common areas of non-compliance.” In 2009, the PRB made a recommendation to Council identifying dormant plans as a serious
issue. The Board has found that over 20,000 dormant plans may exist and requested that Council take action.

During this term there was one formal hearing and no files were referred to the Discipline committee. Two Guardpost articles were published and a third has been approved for March 2010. No Interpretive Bulletins were issued.

**J.P. (Jacques) Duputs, ALS**

### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The PDC (PDC) had a busy year in 2009-2010. The committee met a total of seven times from June 9, 2009 to February 9, 2010; once face-to-face in June and the remaining six meetings were online through GoToMeeting.

By the 101st Annual General Meeting in April 2010, the PDC will have held seven seminars and two Exam Preparation study groups:

- Exam Preparation (September 12, 2009 in Red Deer and March 2010 in Sherwood Park utilizing web delivery)
- Getting it Right (June 11 and 12, 2009 in Edmonton and March 25 and 26, 2010 in Calgary)
- Administrative Law (August 12, 2009 in Edmonton)
- Remote Sensing (October 22, 2009 in Edmonton)
- Real Property Reports (November 18, 2009 in Calgary)
- Field Notes (February 24, 2009 in Calgary)
- Riparian Boundaries and the Surveyor as an Expert Witness (April 22, 2010 AGM, Jasper)

This year, the number of regional meetings was reduced from twelve to eight (two each for Medicine Hat, Calgary, Edmonton and Grande Prairie). In 2010/2011 the Medicine Hat regional meetings will be moving to Lethbridge.

A one-day Getting it Right has been offered to SAIT/LCC. This year they were held at LCC on January 25, 2010 and one is scheduled for SAIT on April 6, 2010. NAIT will be looking after it in-house this year.

The PDC is still pursuing an educational consultant and are hoping to have modified terms of reference to present to Council before the AGM this year.

The PDC went through a few changes this year. We have broken the Committee down into subgroups as a means of keeping things moving forward between meetings and having a group assigned to the main components of the PDC.

The main subgroups of the PDC this year are:

- Mandatory Reporting
- Seminars
- Exam Preparation Seminars
- Getting it Right
- Educational Consultant

The PDC is planning the following seminars for 2010-2011:

- GPS (October 2010 in Calgary)
- RPR (November 2010 in Edmonton)
- MGA Video Conference (January 2011 in Edmonton/Calgary)
- Boundary Case Law (April 2011 AGM in Jasper)
- Exam Prep (September/March, TBA)
- Getting it Right (March in Calgary and June in Edmonton)

At the current time, we will stay with eight regional meetings for 2010-2011 in Lethbridge, Calgary, Edmonton and Grande Prairie.

**G.B. (Greg) Hebb**

### PUBLIC RELATIONS

This year the Public Relations Committee was blessed with an abundance of volunteers, a situation shared by a number of the other committees I understand. Perhaps this is reflective of the downturn in the economy, allowing members some additional time away from work to devote to their volunteer projects.

Of course the recession has also had the effect of significantly reducing budget expenditures from previous years. For example, this year’s budget was over 50 percent less than our 2007-2008 budget. Some of the bigger-ticket items that were cut include the Trig-Alta Math contest, the Christmas reception and the U of C First Year BBQ. Savings have also been realized through the use of online meetings (using GoToMeeting.com) versus face-to-face meetings. In fact, this year, our only face-to-face meeting was our first meeting, held at the Red Deer Lodge.

Despite these cutbacks, the majority of our terms of reference have been relatively unchanged from previous years. The U of C Beef and Bun reception had a good turnout, with many new signups for student membership in the ALSA. Networking was encouraged by providing the land surveyors with refreshment tickets, thereby requiring students to chat up the land surveyors in order to get a ticket. The Career Fair was held the following day, with good student turnout and many handing out resumes looking for work.

Speaking of careers, the ALSA Career PowerPoint presentation has undergone a major overhaul and those who are attending career fairs or doing presentations at schools are encouraged to access this helpful resource.

The real property report brochure was updated and reprinted along with a reprint of the easements and rights-of-way brochure. Our very own Bruce Drake, ALS was involved in a video commercial project in conjunction with the Edmonton Real Estate Board, resulting in a segment discussing the Real Property Report as part of the real estate transaction. You can view the video at http://www.ereb.com/Media/RealProperty.mov.
Two additional brochures are in final development. That is, a fence building brochure and a lot grading brochure. These will initially be available only through the ALSA webpage as electronic downloads in order to avoid the expense of hard copy prints. However, they will be formatted for print media should this be desired in the future. A condominium brochure is also on the “to-do” list.

Science Alberta’s Made to Measure crate program is now in its sixth year (normal lifespan is five years) and will be retired shortly, despite its success. Keep an eye open for an article in an upcoming issue of ALS News chronicling this project. Discussions will be happening shortly exploring new opportunities with Science Alberta.

We eliminated the ALSA scholarship at the University of Lethbridge and are investigating the creation of a new scholarship that would be available to a Mount Royal University student transferring to the University of Calgary’s Geomatics Engineering program.

ALSA geocaches containing brochures, pins and survey information are being established around the province. The idea is that those people who enjoy geocaching may have many of the same qualities that would suit them well for a career in the field of land surveying.

Many of the Public Relations Committee’s ongoing tasks are handled quietly in the background by ALSA staff. This would include things like writing and distributing the Boundaries newsletter, distribution of brochures, posters and presentation information to high schools, organizing booths at trade fairs, continual updating of survey career information on various internet sites, a letter to the Red Deer Advocate outlining concerns about title insurance and letters to new ministers. Suf-

Some may not realize that our Committee is guided by a five-year plan that has been developed in conjunction with Rose Country Communications. The plan is based upon empirical data gathered through polling of our target audiences. At present, we are nearing the end of the latest iteration of this plan and will be looking at how to keep it current as we move forward in the context of the present economics of our Association.

One new way we will be getting good bang for our buck is through the addition of the following item to our 2010-2011 terms of reference: investigate the use of networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter as a means of getting information to the general public.

J.A. (Jarl) Nome, ALS

REGISTRATION

I am pleased to report that the 2009-2010 Registration Committee had a large and diverse number of committed members who worked hard to constantly improve and streamline the examination and registration process. While under fiscal restrictions, we continued our vision of streamlining the articling process while completing our regular workload. Work that the Registration Committee dealt with during the year included the administration of our statutory duties, the marking of project reports and the registration and examination of articulated pupils and members falling under interprovincial labour mobility agreements. We were busy with all of these areas, but firstly with administration of our statutory duties. 2009-2010 was an above average year for the Committee when it came to the administration of approving articles and transfers, performing initial, transfer and annual interviews and approving affidavits of service. We were helped this year by the full implementation of the group interview approach throughout Alberta. We again received excellent feedback during these sessions and we look forward to improving the upcoming sessions.

The second area we were busy with was project reports. The Committee received an almost overwhelming number of project reports this past year. We were as diligent as possible when dealing with the reports by having turn-around targets on marking and by using 100 percent digital submission. The Committee has some ideas on the table for future improvement in dealing with project reports. It will also continue to provide as much feedback as possible to articulated pupils to help them with the expectations of the Committee.

The last area that kept the committee busy was registration and examinations. The regular two sessions of written exams were held, along with monthly to bi-weekly qualifying exams. Along with the regularly scheduled meetings, it was definitely a challenge to make sure we had enough members to cover off all the sessions. We continued to work on the processes for examining and registering survey professionals from BC under TILMA and from the remaining jurisdictions under AIT. Largely due to our collaboration with the ABCCLS in implementing TILMA, the initial stages were no problem to implement. In order to further streamline this area, we merged the examining subgroups and have added to our ongoing terms of reference the development of questions that can be used in employing computer-based testing. We are also looking into the application of computer-based testing on the regular written examinations.

Overall, the Registration Committee had a busy and productive year. We have been meeting the challenges of fiscal...
Chair: V.G. (Victor) Hut
Vice Chair: M.A. (Michael) Stewart, ALS

SAFETY
The Safety Committee continues to be made up of a mix of ALSA members and survey company safety representatives. The group is a proactive and diverse group of perspectives that works very well together in cross-examining the safety and training topics at hand. The group should be commended for their efforts and their commitment in sifting through reams of material and information to come up with the reference material that ends up posted on the Safety page of the ALSA website.

In addition to providing regular Safety Sense articles in ALS News throughout the past term, the committee has broached the following issues:

Oral Drug Testing: The Committee began exploring options for companies to consider should they be required to incorporate oral drug testing into their respective employee safety management systems or drug and alcohol policies.

Chainsaw Safety: The Association continues to have a seat at the table (officially representing the CCLS) with the Enform committee in charge of chainsaw faller safety. There are no changes to report with respect to their current requirements.

Driving Distractions: It may be another year before the Alberta government has a proposed piece of legislation regarding driver distractions. The Committee will continue to observe and report as more information comes available.

Federal Transportation Safety Legislation: As directed by Council, the Safety Committee was tasked with developing a proposal to be sent to the CCLS to apply for exemptions for all surveyors and their work vehicles from the federal hours of service legislation. This proposal was tabled until changes announced in Alberta’s new Commercial Vehicle Safety Regulation, in July 2009, could be reviewed and evaluated. Upon review of the regulations repealed and those moved to other pieces of legislation, the Committee concluded that the changes did not remove the need for a proposal to the CCLS. The proposal to the CCLS continues to be a work in progress.

Worker Fall Protection: The Committee reviewed legislation regarding if a deck on the back of a pickup truck would be defined as a permanent work area. As such, this could potentially require additional measures to protect workers from falling a distance of 1.2 metres or more. The initial committee review was inconclusive.

Review of Specific Truck Tires: Allegations regarding a specific brand of truck tire were reviewed and deemed unfounded at this time.


Safety Incident Reporting: The framework exists for members to share their safety incidents in a manner that preserves the identities of those directly involved. It is felt that sharing such information that occurs within our profession and industry would be of great benefit to all our members and employees. We can collectively help each other to be aware of and avoid hazards that could potentially harm our employees or ourselves. Let us do what we can to stop making the same mistakes over and over again. Please submit your incidents.

Thank you for the opportunity to chair this Committee for the past year.

V.G. (Victor) Hut, ALS

STANDARDS
It has been a very busy year for the Standards Committee. The Committee has worked hard to complete the assigned terms of reference. In 2009-2010, the Standards Committee consisted of 34 members. Subgroups of the Committee were formed to investigate the terms assigned by Council. The Standards Committee completed 14 of the assigned 15 terms of reference.

1. Assist the Director of Surveys in publishing Public Lands plan amendment requirements on the Sustainable Resource Development website.
   A manual was completed and will be posted on the Sustainable Resource Development website.

A manual was completed and will be posted on the Sustainable Resource Development website.
2. Review standards for well sites over two hectares and make recommendations to Council.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

3. Investigate revising the definition of “well” within the Manual of Standard Practice to include the definition stated in the Oil Sands Conservation Regulation and make recommendations to Council.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

4. Liaise with the ERCB (the approving authority for well sites on private land) to determine the appropriate timelines for submission of monumented survey plans.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council that no action was required on this item and that it should be removed from the Standards Committee’s terms of reference.

5. Investigate the possibility of an alternative post for urban subdivisions and the possibility of an alternative post for areas in muskeg or otherwise unsuited to establishing an iron post.  
This item will be carried over to the 2010-2011 terms of reference.

A document outlining the results of the investigation into this item was forwarded to Council for review along with comments from the Director of Surveys Office. The document outlines a possible framework moving forward.

7. Review Part D, Section 5.4.4 of the current Manual of Standard Practice in regards to the inconsistency of referencing 180 days versus two years.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

8. Review Manual of Standard Practice to determine if Section 5.8 on Wellsite Plan Monuments is redundant and make recommendation to Council.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

9. Investigate the creation of a Métis Settlements Land Registry affidavit.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

10. Review the well site certification to correct grammatical inconsistencies.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

11. Review the definition(s) of reference monument.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

12. Review the definition of parcel.  
While reviewing this term of reference, the subgroup noted that the definition of “boundary” should also be reviewed. Council agreed and new proposed definitions for “parcel” and “boundary” were developed. A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

13. Investigate the monument requirements for a surface facility lease as defined in the Pipeline Act with the goal of recommending changes to pertinent parts of the Manual of Standard Practice.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

A recommendation was forwarded to Council to leave the references to page numbers in the Manual of Standard Practice. It was felt that removing them would compromise the quality of the document.

15. Consider adding references to the Métis Settlements Land Registry, and Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (Lands Division), everywhere applicable to those instances where only registration at the Land Titles Office is mentioned in the Manual of Standard Practice.  
A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the subgroup leads and the Committee in general for their hard work and dedication this year.

S. (Scott) Boulanger, ALS

The following committees did not meet in 2009-2010 as there were no tasks assigned to them by Council:
- Legislation Ad Hoc
- Oil and Gas Ad Hoc
- RPR Ad Hoc
RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to revisions regarding references to the Métis Settlements Land Registry and Sustainable Resource Development in the Manual of Standard Practice:

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation?
   During the rewrite of the Manual of Standard Practice it was identified that the Manual does not refer to the Métis Settlements Land Registry and Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (Lands Division) where ever Land Titles Office was mentioned.

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
   The Manual of Standard Practice does not mention the Métis Settlement Land Registry and Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (Land Division) every place it may be applicable. Adding these registries makes the Manual more inclusive to all possible options.

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   To increase clarity to the Manual of Standard practice by including all possible registries that may apply.

4. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
   The Director of Surveys was involved in determining these changes as part of the Standards Sub-committee. The Director approved these changes. The Land Titles Office also had a member on the Standards Sub-committee.

5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
   This recommendation will have no impact on the public interest. This only has value and impact on the survey community.

6. What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
   Minimal financial costs will be incurred by the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association as part of the update to the Manual of Standard Practice. There will be no additional costs to the Alberta Land Surveyor.
Consequential Amendments

If Recommendation #1 is passed by the membership, “Métis Settlements Land Registry” and “Métis Settlements Land Registry Registrar’s Rules” will be added to the Index. Also, the list of items on Page 74 will have its numbering adjusted to reflect the addition of the two new items.

RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to an ALS Affidavit for Plans Submitted to Métis Settlements Land Registry be added to Part E, Section 1 of the Manual of Standard Practice:

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation?

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
   The current affidavit most commonly used for plans registered with the MSLR incorrectly states that the plan was prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Land Titles Act. In fact, these plans are prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Métis Settlements Land Registry Regulation.

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   The intent of the recommendation is to correct the error and create a unique MSLR affidavit.

4. Was anyone outside the Association membership consulted? What was that person’s reaction?
   Terry Wywal and Registrar Lisa Chartrand of the MSLR were consulted and have approved the wording of the new affidavit and the recommendation to include it in the MSP.

5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
   The public interest is always well served by clarifying confusing text in the MSP and ensuring that the templates for ALS affidavits are written correctly.

6. What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
   Costs are minimal. Alberta Land Surveyors will have to update their drafting templates and the ALSA will have to update the MSP. There will be no ongoing financial commitments.

RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to amending the the ALS Certification for Wellsites and Public Land Dispositions (Part E, Section 1 – Page 72) in the Manual of Standard Practice:

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation?
   The wellsite certification was changed at the 2007 AGM after Council had instructed the Standards Committee to identify when the field work was performed and when the document was actually signed.

   During the rewrite of the MSP into plain language this certification was flagged as being grammatically incorrect and Council instructed the Standards Committee to “review the wellsite certification to correct grammatical inconsistencies” during the 2009/2010 term.

On August 1, 2009 the Director of Surveys introduced a requirement that all public land surveys submitted to SRD must use a new certification that references the Surveys Act and the MSP. Since the certification that the Standards Committee was looking at is actually more than a “Wellsite Certification” but is in fact the “ALS Certification for Wellsites and Public Land Dispositions” the Standards Committee requested that Council revise the Terms of Reference to:

1. Review the Wellsite and Public Lands Disposition Certification to correct grammatical inconsistencies; and
2. Review the Director of Surveys policy dated August 1, 2009 and make recommendations as to whether or not the two certifications can be combined.”

   Council agreed, and the Director of Surveys agreed to change his certification to agree with any grammatical changes that the Standards Committee might make to it (once passed at an AGM).

   The Committee expressed strong reservations regarding the use of the new Public Lands version of the certification as they felt that any surveyor using it would, in essence, be signing a false certification. They did not
feel that all wellsite and public land surveys follow the Surveys Act regarding intersections, monumentation requirements, etc. and recommended that the two certifications not be combined.

2. What problem is trying to be solved?
The wellsite certification as written in the MSP and the new certification for Public Lands are both grammatically incorrect.
The Current Certification in the MSP reads:

\( I, \) Alberta Land Surveyor, of \( \ldots \), certify that the survey represented by this plan is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, has been carried out in accordance with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association Manual of Standard Practice, and the field survey was performed between the \( \ldots \) day of \( \ldots \), 2\( \ldots \) and the \( \ldots \) day of \( \ldots \), 2\( \ldots \).

Alberta Land Surveyor
Date Signed
Witness (name of witness)

The new Public Lands version adds …“the Surveys Act and”… before …“the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association Manual of Standard Practice,”…

Explanation of Grammatical Error
In the sentence above, the following is a noun clause functioning as the object of the verb “certify” in the principal clause, “I certify [something].”

…that the survey represented by this plan is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, has been carried out in accordance with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association Manual of Standard Practice, and the field survey was performed…

As a clause, it has a subject and verb. The subject is “survey” and the verb is a compound verb, consisting of the verbs “is,” “has been,” and the problematic portion, “the field survey was.”

…the survey is [something], has been [something], and [the field survey was performed]...

Simplifying the statement to its core grammatical components, you can say, “the survey is [something]” and “the survey has been [something]” but you cannot say “the survey the field survey was performed.”

Solution
I certify that the survey is [something] and has been [something]. [period] [Then create a new sentence for the third portion.] I also certify that the field survey was performed…

or

I certify that the field survey is [something], has been [something], and was [something]. [This series of three compound verbs has grammatical parallelism and is the solution recommended because we can avoid saying, "I also certify…" and can keep a one-sentence certification.]

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
The intent is to make the wellsite certification grammatically correct.

4. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted?
Lola Mehlenbacher, the technical writer who did the MSP plain language rewrite under the supervision of Mr. Irwin Maltais, ALS, provided the explanation of the grammatical error and provided two alternate solutions to the problem.

5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
The public will likely be completely unaffected, as this is basically a housekeeping issue.

6. What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta land surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
There are no financial costs or commitments associated with updating this item in the MSP. Hard copy users can simply replace page 72 in their MSP, while electronic users can download the entire replacement document. Alberta Land Surveyors will have to update their wellsite templates.

Consequential Amendments
If Recommendation #1 is passed by the membership, the name of this certification will be amended in the following locations:
RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the amendment of Part D, Section 5.4 (Page 51), Section 5.5 (Page 51) and Section 5.8 (Page 52) of the Manual of Standard Practice:

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation?
During the rewrite of the Manual of Standard Practice it was identified that there was a conflict between sections with reference to when an establishment of monuments plans should be registered: one section identified this to be within 180 days, while another section referred to this being within 2 years.

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
The Manual of Standard Practice refers to the registration of an Establishment of Monuments Plan within 180 days and within 2 years. Two different time frames for the same plan created confusion. Registering monuments placed for well site control within 180 days has it merits, as this may be beneficial to other Land Surveyors and SRD. Registering an establishment of monuments (typically for a cancelled survey) within two years has its own merits, as the project could experience various types of delays that would typically extend/delay the decision to cancel the survey beyond 180 days.

This recommendation recognizes the need to register these monuments within the two different time frames, by distinguishing between the two types of plans. For monuments placed for wellsites control, a monument plan would be submitted to the Land Titles Office for registration as an “Establishment of Monuments for Wellsite Control” plan. In addition, Sec. 5.8 was deleted as this created conflict with the need to register an Establishment of Monuments Plan within 2 years.

It was also noted that during the rewrite of the Manual of Standard Practice one of the references did not get updated when the sections numbers were revised. Section 5.5 incorrectly referred to Part C, Section 3.9 (Establishment of Monuments Plan) when it should have been 3.10 (Wellsites and Related Facilities), as per the Manual of Standard Practice April 2008 version.

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
First, the intent of the recommendation is to distinguish between the requirement to register monuments placed for wellsites control within 180 days, and the requirement to register an Establishment of Monuments plan within 2 years.

Second, the intent is to fix a typographical error that references an incorrect section of the Manual of Standard of Practice.

4. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
The Director or Surveys was involved in determining these changes, as part of the Standards Committee. The Director approved these changes.

5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
This recommendation will have no impact on the public interest. This only has value to and impact on the survey community.

6. What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta land surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
Minimal financial costs will be incurred by the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association as part of the update to the Manual of Standard Practice. There will be no additional costs to Alberta Land Surveyors, as they are already incurring the cost of registering an Establishment of Monuments plan.

Consequential Amendments
If Recommendation #3 is passed by the membership, the existing sections 5.9 thru 5.12 will be renumbered accordingly to reflect the deletion of 5.8.
**Recommendation #5**

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the amendment of Part D, Section 5.12 (page 57) of the Manual of Standard Practice:**

1. **What is the genesis of the recommendation?**
The Director of Surveys, at the May 21, 2008 Council meeting, requested Standard’s Committee review Part D - Section 5.12 of the MSP dealing with standards of well-sites - maximum 2 hectares. The Director felt that situations over 2 hectares was not currently being addressed by the MSP. Changes were also required to stay consistent with a new ASRD Surveys Manual—Public Land Disposition which was being developed in assistance with the Standards Committee—Public Lands Subgroup.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
The area of maximum 2 hectares limits the size of well-sites covered under the MSP 5.12 standards and does not include potentially larger padsites and/or oilsands sites. Increasing the size to 10 hectares ensures most situations will now be covered under the Section 5.12 standard. Revising the Section 5.12 heading provides better clarification of the type of MSL being addressed in the standard; specifically wellsites.

The statement to reference the ASRD Surveys Manual—Public Land Dispositions provides the membership with a document and/or website for other types of disposition amendments not covered under MSP Section 5.12.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
The overall intent is to revise the area of wellsites to include larger padsites and/or oilsands sites that currently do not fall under the MSP 5.12 section; and as well, stay consistent with the new ASRD Surveys Manual—Public Land Dispositions document.

4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**
No-one outside the Association was consulted. The Director of Surveys was involved in determining these changes, as part of the Standards Committee. The Director approved these changes.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**
This recommendation will now have an affect on those applying for MSL wellsite amendments between 2 and 10 hectares, potentially higher costs. The change to stay consistent with the ASRD Surveys Manual will ensure surveyors produce plans to the standard required by the governing body.

6. **What are financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?**
No costs will be incurred by the ALSA other than updating the MSP. Potentially additional costs to survey would be passed on to the ALS’s clients.

**Recommendation #6**

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the amendment of Part D, Section 4.15 to the Manual of Standard Practice:**

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation?**
This recommendation is the result of a motion carried at the 2009 Annual General Meeting and referred to the Standards Committee by Council.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
Pipeline rights-of-way are required under the Pipeline Regulation for hydrocarbon-based pipelines constructed outside a facility surface lease. However, the definition of “facility surface lease” spans three Acts and is therefore not readily available.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
A definition of “facility surface lease” is required in order to define the circumstances in which a pipeline right-of-way is required. Although it is generally considered good practice to extend pipeline rights-of-way into facility surface leases, it is not mandatory to do so under the provisions of the Pipeline Regulation.

4. **Was anyone outside the Association membership consulted? What was that person’s reaction?**
No one outside the Association was consulted on this issue.
5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
Improvements to the content of the MSP are always in the public interest.

6. What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?

The ALSA will have to add the recommended text on page 49 of the MSP but there will be no ongoing financial commitments.

**MONUMENT STANDARDS FOR FACILITY SURFACE LEASES**

This document is intended to clarify the existing monument standard for facility surface leases. The committee concluded that the monument standard in the MSP is sufficient but will benefit from clarification regarding various issues discussed by the committee.

**Crown Land**
Facility surface leases on Crown (public) land are addressed by the monument standards published by Alberta Sustainable Resource Development. The Standards Committee may have to re-visit this topic if significant changes are made to the ASRD standard. Land surveyors will benefit from having one standard for both freehold and public land.

**Freehold Land**
On freehold land, the land surveyor will probably continue to use iron bars or iron spikes for temporary leases (well-sites) and may use statutory iron posts for permanent leases (plants and installations). A plan of survey for a related facility would have to be registered at the Land Titles Office when the surveyor uses statutory iron posts to mark an installation or a plant site.

As the definition states, a plant site may be “a plant, battery, compressor, dehydrator, separator, or a treater as defined in the Oil and Gas Conservation Act or a central processing plant or satellite plant as defined in the Oil Sands Conservation Act.”

There are special cases where the client owns a plant site within a parcel such as a Quarter Section or a Settlement Lot. Unless the plant site boundaries are established as a separate facility surface lease within that parcel, the entire parcel will be considered to be the facility surface lease.

**Pipeline Rights-of-Way within Facility Surface Leases**
Land surveyors have an ethical responsibility to advise their clients of the impacts of routing pipelines within facility surface leases. The legislation does not require pipeline rights-of-way within a facility surface lease but it is generally considered good practice to extend the right-of-way into the lease. However, it is difficult in this circumstance for the land surveyor to ensure that the pipeline is constructed within the surveyed right-of-way.

**Intersections**
If the facility surface lease boundary is surveyed, the land surveyor should intersect that boundary. If the pipeline right-of-way terminates on the facility surface lease boundary, the land surveyor must intersect that boundary.

**Ground Disturbance**
Land surveyors may place reference posts or add a notation to the plan indicating that they were unable to post because of ground disturbance issues within the facility surface lease.

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the amendment of the definitions of “boundary” (Page 75) and “parcel” (Page 76) of the Manual of Standard Practice:**

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation?
The recommendation for the revised definition of “parcel” arose from the plain language rewrite of the Manual of Standard Practice in 2008. The recommendation for revising the definition of “boundary” arose during the review of the definition of “parcel” in 2009.

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
The current definition of “parcel” is inadequate because it implies that a parcel of land has innate capabilities, whereas the definition actually refers to administrative and legal activities that can be undertaken by authorized individuals with respect to the parcel. Furthermore, the current definition does not address a parcel that is an island.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation #8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The current definition of “boundary” is lengthy, cumbersome, and difficult to comprehend, and it is unnecessarily complex.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
The intention of the recommendation is to make the definitions of “parcel” and “boundary” more accurate and precise.

4. **Was anyone outside the Association membership consulted? What was that person’s reaction?**
The existing CLS, BCLS, and SLS legislation and instructions were reviewed, as were definitions available in Black’s Law Dictionary, Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (10th Edition), and The Law and Practice of Land Surveying in Alberta.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**
The public interest is always well-served by improving the accuracy and precision of text in the Manual of Standard Practice.

6. **What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta land surveyors’ Association and Alberta land surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?**
Costs are minimal. The ALSA will have to update the Manual of Standard Practice but there will be no ongoing financial commitments.

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT** for the motion pertaining to the amendment of Part C, Sections 7.4.2, 7.4.3 and 7.5.1 (Page 31), Part D, Section 2.2.1 (Page 38) and Part E, Section 3 (Pages 76) of the Manual of Standard Practice:

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation?**
During the plain language rewrite of the Manual of Standard Practice the Standards Committee flagged the lack of clear definitions for two different types of “reference monument” as an item of concern. Like several other items requiring content change to the Manual, this item was held over to this year.

2. **What problem are we trying to solve? Does the recommendation solve the problem?**
There are two different types of “reference monument” referred to in the Manual but at present only one definition. The recommendation solves this problem.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
The intent is to remove confusion and ambiguity in the Manual.

4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**
Land Titles Liaison to the Standards Committee Akrim Din was consulted. He did not see any concerns or issues with making a minor revision to the Land Titles Procedures Manual.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro or con)?**
This recommendation does not affect the public interest except to remove confusion regarding the types of reference monuments.

6. **What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta land surveyors’ Association and Alberta land surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?**
There is no financial cost to the Association or its membership unless a cost is incurred to update the Manual. There are no ongoing financial commitments.

**Consequential Amendment**
If Recommendation #8 is passed by the membership, “reference control marker” will be added to the Index.
Mr. Ken Allred made the following presentation to the new members.

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen, and especially to the new members and their partners.

Today marks an historic day in your lives! You have persevered through your academics, you’ve fulfilled your articles—applying the theory to practical problems, you’ve completed your professional examinations and finally sworn your oath of office before a member of the judiciary.

Now you get to practice. Practice? That may sound odd. You get to practice. Isn’t that what you’ve just been doing? Well no, you’ve just been learning how to practice. Now comes the real thing! But why do they call it a practice? Because you are continually practicing; as they say, practice makes perfect but, you can strive for excellence; and you should but nothing will ever be perfect. So just keep on practicing!

Don’t be alarmed if you make a few mistakes along the way but if you do, own up to them and, above all, learn from them. We all make mistakes.

I like to think that I’m awfully smart because I’ve made so many mistakes but I keep making them. One mistake I didn’t make was choosing the survey profession as a career. It has been very rewarding. The survey profession provides interesting and challenging opportunities—the outdoors, history, mathematics and science, new technology, art, business, and the opportunity to work with all sorts of interesting people. Speaking of mistakes, you’ve heard the saying: lawyers hang their mistakes, doctors bury their mistakes but surveyors monument theirs.

Monuments are the surveyor’s legacy. They represent your professional opinion. Your integrity, your competence, your diligence in executing your duty to society are all bound up in that monument. Have you done complete research in retracing the footsteps of your predecessors in establishing that boundary? That boundary is not just the boundary of
your client but also that of the client’s neighbour and potential adversary. Are you prepared to stand up in court and swear that you diligently, faithfully and to the best of your ability conducted that survey giving due consideration to the rights of all persons, accurately locating and recording all evidence without prejudice towards or against any landowner, conducting yourself truly and with integrity upholding the law and the interest of the public? I trust you will!

You have been commissioned—a term that means through the authority of the Crown—by virtue of the power and responsibility of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association through the Land Surveyors Act.

One last thing I’d like to add. Jump at every opportunity to communicate with your co-workers, your peers, your clients and the general public. You learn so much by communicating and you have an obligation to communicate to educate the public on what surveying is all about, what your client needs and how you can assist them to accomplish those needs. You also need to communicate to protect yourself. So many problems are caused by a lack of communication; a lack of understanding. A client needs to understand what you are doing for him and you need to understand what the client wants from you. Failure to do so often results in misunderstanding and unfortunate results.

The surveying profession is evolving—moving from measurement to management. Measurement these days is probably the least of our worries with ever expanding technological developments as surveyors become spatial data managers. Having pioneered some of these new roles in land management and land information management, we are continually challenged by other professions in these new evolving disciplines but surveyors have a basic understanding of cadastral and land related systems that is unique and essential for the comprehensive management of land and land resources.

The future is yours to carve out based on your vision of how you can apply your hard earned skills to solve society’s complex problems. You follow in the footsteps of your predecessors but you are empowered to set the footprints for those that follow!

Congratulations and good luck!

Executive Director Brian Munday addressed the awards luncheon as follows:

Twenty-five years ago, in 1985, the annual general meeting was held in Jasper. President Bob Fulton reported to the membership that it was his opinion that the public was demanding ever-increasing responsibility on the part of the professions and he lamented the absence of adequate written standards within the profession. While the Association had a Code of Ethics and good practice resolutions, it was felt there was a need for clear standards for wellsite surveys, condominium surveys, building location certificates and the like. The new members that year were also treated to debates on the expanded profession and a proposed new associate member category.

Twenty-five years ago, six Alberta Land Surveyors received their commission and four have been active practicing land surveyors since that time.

Fifty years ago, in 1960, six Alberta Land Surveyors received their commission and two are still members of the Association—both honorary life members.

M.R. (Michael) Grosz, ALS was not able to attend the AGM to receive his 25 year pin.

D.E. (Doug) Barnett, ALS (Hon. Life) and T. (Tak) Okamura, ALS (Hon. Life) were not able to attend the AGM to receive their 30 year pins.
In 1995, the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association established the President’s Award. The President’s Award is handed out solely at the discretion of the president of the year. The award recognizes an individual, or individuals, who have, in the opinion of the president, gone above and beyond the call of duty to serve the Association.

It is not awarded every year but I have decided there is a deserving recipient this year. Council assigns committees with plenty of terms of reference each year. Some committee assignments can be pretty straight-forward and get done quickly; some can be a little more complicated and take an extra meeting to get finished.

This year, Council created a new committee—a working group we called it—and said go create something new; something out of the box. In reality, there were no terms of reference—just a mandate to do something different.

Now all of us know how much land surveyors like working without a manual of instructions or clear directions. We also know how independent-minded some land surveyors can be.

We needed someone who was going to be able to lead a group of elite people, get them to bring out their best and brightest ideas and turn it into something the whole Association could be proud of. It was not an easy job but this Alberta Land Surveyor has done just that. It required lots of meetings, lots of back and forth, lots of consensus and analysis; but when you’re talking about the Association’s flagship program in practice review and the possibility of another in continuing education and trying to combine the best elements of both programs, you want to make sure you’ve got the right person for the job. I am very pleased to say that we did!

Connie Petersen, as chair of the Continuing Competency Working Group, took all of the different ideas and thoughts for a new program and was able to lead the group into creating something new which will be formally presented to the entire membership tomorrow.

In the meantime, I would like to present Connie Petersen with the 2010 President’s Award for going above and beyond the call of duty for the Association in putting a new program together for us.

Ms. Petersen addressed the luncheon as follows:

I really don’t have any words to say how much I appreciate this award. It has been a challenging year and I had an excellent group of people to work with and, quite frankly, I would share this with all of them.

Thank you.
Council may award honorary life membership to any Alberta Land Surveyor or retired member who has rendered signal service to the Association and the betterment of mankind.

But what does “signal service” mean? It’s not a term we use that often anymore. So Council sat down and tried to define what signal service is. And this is what Council came up with. If you’ve been an Alberta Land Surveyor for 45 years, that’s signal service. If you’ve served on Council, that’s signal service. If you’ve also served as president of this Association, that’s signal service. If you have been Executive Director and Secretary-Treasurer of this Association, that’s signal service. If you’re the only Alberta Land Surveyor who has been president of the Canadian Council of Land Surveyors, that’s signal service. If you’ve been the author of numerous articles and reports on the surveying profession in Canada and around the world, that’s signal service. If you’ve been a vice-president of FIG, the international federation of surveyors, that’s signal service. If you’re a past director of the J.H. Holloway Scholarship Foundation, that’s signal service. If you have served on city council, regional planning commissions and now serve as the MLA for the riding of St. Albert, that’s signal service.

If you have done all of those things, your name is Ken Allred and you are the newest honorary life member in the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

Marge, would you please escort Ken to the front so both of you can receive this award.

Mr. Allred addressed the luncheon as follows:

Thank you very much, Don. I guess that explains the frequent phone calls to my wife over the last month or so.

I don’t know if it’s signal service or just perseverance. Like I said earlier, I am very proud to be a member of the survey profession. As Don said, I’ve been a member of this Association for 45 years and I’ve enjoyed every moment of it. The surveying profession offers so many things that are not available to other professions. Unfortunately, we are not recognized and particularly young people and a lot of the general public don’t understand what surveying is all about.

Again, as I said earlier, communication is so important. We have to educate the public about what surveying is. As the Honourable Justice Cote said in one of our seminars a few years ago, the surveying profession is unique. We are like the advocates in Quebec in that we don’t simply serve a client, we serve society as a whole and there are very few other professions that have that uniqueness. Certainly lawyers are there to advocate and serve their client; doctors are there to serve their patient—not the general public. That makes us so unique and I guess that’s one of the reasons I am so proud to be an Alberta Land Surveyor.

Thank you very much.
Appendix “K”

List of Exhibitors and Sponsors

EXHIBITORS:
Abacus Datagraphics Ltd
Airborne Imaging Inc.
Alberta Locators Inc.
Bench Mark Equipment & Supplies Inc.
Butler Survey Supplies Ltd.
Cansel Survey Equipment
Corrpro Canada Inc.
D W Technologies Ltd.
First Order Measurement Solutions Inc.
Gemini Positioning Systems Ltd.
Hilti Canada Inc.
IHS Canada
IMAGINiT Technologies
Jardine Lloyd Thompson Canada Inc./ENCON
Jones Brown Inc.
LMS Land Measurement Systems Inc.
Oce-Canada Inc.
Russel Metals Inc.
Seco Manufacturing Company Incorporated
Sharpline Print Solutions Ltd.
Spatial Technologies Partnership Group

SPONSORS:

Platinum—$1,000+
Abacus Datagraphics Ltd.
Challenger Geomatics Ltd.
DRIVING FORCE Vehicle Rentals, Sales & Leasing
IHS Canada
Jardine Lloyd Thompson Canada Inc.
Land Measurement Systems Inc.
Russel Metals Inc.
Trimble Navigation Limited
Universal Surveys Inc.

Gold—$500+
All-Can Engineering & Surveys (1976) Ltd.
Baseline Geomatics Group Ltd.
Caltech Surveys Ltd.
Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge
Global Surveys Group Inc.
Longhorn Geomatics Limited
MMM Geomatics Alberta Limited
Menzies Printers Ltd.
Millennium Geomatics Ltd.
Olson Surveys Ltd.
Shores Jardine LLP

Silver—$250+
Peterson Walker LLP

Bronze—$100+
Map Town/Framing Matters
Rose Country Advertising & Public Relations