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Newly Commissioned Alberta Land Surveyors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President</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>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>E.J. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>G.C. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE MEMBERS</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdel-salam, Mohamed</td>
<td>Cream, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amantea, David</td>
<td>Cream, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Ian</td>
<td>Cridland, Lloyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annett, Rocky</td>
<td>Cummings, Harvey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthurs, Robin</td>
<td>David, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball, Brian</td>
<td>Davidson, Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bansal, Nitin</td>
<td>Davies, Sandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barich, Jessica</td>
<td>De Jong, Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barvir, Adam</td>
<td>deBruyne, Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearisto, Bruce</td>
<td>Deis, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaugrand, Chris</td>
<td>Deschamps, Jason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, Kyle</td>
<td>Deslauriers, Dagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, Blaine</td>
<td>Dion, Francois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg, Adam</td>
<td>Dixon, Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blatz, Jeffery</td>
<td>Dixon, Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bode, Ralph</td>
<td>Doherty, Corey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boggs, Greg</td>
<td>Dudek, Michal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulanger, Scott</td>
<td>DuFour, Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourgeois, Matthieu</td>
<td>Dugand Barros, Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges, Ron</td>
<td>Dupuis, Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinsky, Travis</td>
<td>Durant, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broderick, Rosalind</td>
<td>Edmundson, Dwayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broderick, John</td>
<td>Edwards, LeMont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, J. Scott</td>
<td>Egger, Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryks, Ashley</td>
<td>Eklund, Darren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne, John</td>
<td>Ellis, Brandon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cammaert, Andrew</td>
<td>Engler, Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caraba, Rares</td>
<td>Ewoniak, Lesley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caraba, Horatiu</td>
<td>Fehr, Jeffery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card, Steven</td>
<td>Fennell, Marc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan, Norman</td>
<td>Flim, Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, Matthew</td>
<td>Foran, W. Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Dungen</td>
<td>Frederick, Les</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng, Fred</td>
<td>Gerein, Jerrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiasson, Chris</td>
<td>Gibbs, Eryn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiddy, Terry</td>
<td>Giesbrecht, Benjamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, W. Bruce</td>
<td>Gillis, Damian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleland, Ian</td>
<td>Gillmore, Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connatty, Darrin</td>
<td>Godard, J. Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon, Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gorelik, Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graham, Robyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grenkie, Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grover, Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hagen, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haggerty, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall, Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halliday, Jim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hals, Arne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harding, Tim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haub, Duane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heacock, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrie, Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hittel, Alex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hobbs, Geoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holtner, Roberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hortness, Lorraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard, Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howden, Jeremy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunter, Katie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hut, Victor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyatt, Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illchuk, Greg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson, Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James, Leanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamieson, Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janes, Hal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewett, Kristopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnston, Jeffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keddy, Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keong, Jiunhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koncan, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kroeker, Nathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kulyk, Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuntz, Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuzek, Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lachance, Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamarche, J. Bernard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen, Carl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Mackenzie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehnars, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin, Sirt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnell, Gordon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippitt, Warren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longo, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louie, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovse, Krista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund, Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAulay, Doug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald, Gordon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacIsaac, Wendy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKeen, Clive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLeod, Jim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madarash, Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahendru, Sachin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main, Allan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main, Jeffrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man, Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandaliya, Rohit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquardt, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, Patrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazurkewich, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEachern, Lindsay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKee, Donnie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenna, Bernie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon, Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meehan, Steve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalfe, Ross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles, Andrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misić, Jovan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moloney, Pat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motz, Troy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muniz, Hector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natt, Irwin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neufeld, Doug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ng, Rudy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen, Huong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols, Noah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, Len</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pals, Larry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pals, Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmar, Davinder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partridge, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton, W. Jeffrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paziuk, Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penner, Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins, Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersen, Connie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinkerton, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard, Brad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popadynetz, Kurtis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powley, William</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prins, Nathan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarmby, Glen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinlan, Jerry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachynski, Albert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regan, Dennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritchie, Kris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, Ashley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Marty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Tyler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronsko, Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Brian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy, Michelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands, Dana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savoury, Wayne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schirrmacher, Garry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Rob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Geoffrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexSmith, Mike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe, Jim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrivastava, Ravi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick, Lesley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkes, Nathan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siu, Javier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton, Jeffrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skinner, Iain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Randall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiers, Amy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiers, Amy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steeves, Tim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoliker, Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strozyk, Piotr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter, Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swabey, Kevin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney, Jim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szarmes, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarapaski, Arthur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle, Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Christy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tingley, Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker, Chris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Chris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Berkel, Steven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasynda, Andriy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vennard, Kevin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade, Jeffrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace, Bob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesolowsky, Wayne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlund, Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whaley, Gerald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Craig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiberg, Dwight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Brent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Cathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton, Bruce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Kin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolgar, N. Ross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workman, Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woychuk, Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanish, Steve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaver, Al</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziegler, Vince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td>Allred, G. Ken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RETIRED MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARTICLED PUPILS</strong></td>
<td>Bryan, Meredith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark, Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleary, Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diakow, Noelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dusyk, Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frame, Geoffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton, Mathew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healy, Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heffernan, Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horneman, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karbovnyk, Pavlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFFILIATE MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td>Simmonds, Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSOCIATE MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td>Erick, Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Members</td>
<td>.....................................................256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Life Members</td>
<td>.........................................................3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Member</td>
<td>.........................................................0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled Pupils</td>
<td>.........................................................35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate Member</td>
<td>.........................................................1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Members</td>
<td>.........................................................3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>.........................................................298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Tattrie, ALS</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td><strong>Standards Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Ritchie, ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Boggs, ALS</td>
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President Al Jamieson welcomed everyone to the 106th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. He asked the membership to rise for Canada’s national anthem.

Everyone was asked to turn off their phones and other devices. If they make a noise or vibrate a donation of $50 will need to be made to the JH Holloway Scholarship Foundation and it will be another $50 if they are answered.

Baseline Geomatics Group was thanked for sponsoring the morning coffee.

It was announced that the parliamentarian for the 106th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association would be past-president Rob Scott. Robert’s Rules of Order would be followed as interpreted by the president or parliamentarian, if requested.

The President advised that Active and Honorary Life Members may propose motions and resolutions and vote on all issues. Honorary Members cannot propose motions or resolutions and cannot vote. However, they may engage in the discussions relative to the motions and resolutions before the assembly. Retired members may propose motions and resolutions and vote on all matters except those that affect professional legislation. Articled students, affiliate members, and associate members may not propose motions or resolutions but may discuss and vote on all matters except professional legislation and standards of practice. Everyone was encouraged to participate in the discussion – including the new members, students, those who have not been to an AGM for a while and visiting delegates representing their respective associations.

Council and the public members on Council and the Practice Review Board were introduced and thanked for their support and effort over the past year.
Gregor Resch, General Manager of the Fairmont Chateau Lake Louise was introduced and brought greetings to the assembly.

Guests and visiting delegates were introduced as follows:  
**Bronwyn Denton, President**  
Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors  
**Ryan Maloney, President**  
Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association  
**Paul Burtnick, President**  
Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors  
**Travis Hartwick, President**  
Association of Ontario Land Surveyors  
**Daniel Bérard, President**  
L’Ordre des Arpenteurs-Geometres du Quebec  
**Robert Frenette, President**  
Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors  
**Jody Isenor, President**  
Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors  
**Wayne Hodder, President**  
Association of Newfoundland Surveyors  
**Gordon Stark, President**  
Association of Canada Lands Surveyors  
**Jean-Claude Tetreault, Executive Director**  
Association of Canada Lands Surveyors

The following individuals were also introduced:  
**Curt Sumner, Executive Director**  
National Society of Professional Surveyors  
**Darryl Larson, Vice-President**  
Alberta Society of Surveying & Mapping Technologies  
**Lesley Ewoniak. ALS**  
NAIT  
**Dr. Elena Rangelova**  
University of Calgary  
**Ravi Shrivastava, ALS**  
Director of Surveys  
**David Jardine, Association legal counsel**  
Shores Jardine

President Al Jamieson invited Mr. Gord Stark, President of the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors, to provide information regarding the Canada Lands surveying profession. Mr. Stark thanked Mr. Jamieson for the opportunity. He informed the assembly that the situation in Alberta is that there are 45 First Nations on 140 reserves, five national parks covering 53,000 square kilometres and 115 licensed CLSs in Alberta to do the work. He informed the assembly
of the ACLS requirements for those holding and not holding a provincial commission. Over 140 survey instructions were issued in 2014 to 2015. The tangibles include: being part of a national network of surveyors, a national surveyors conference and GeoEd for continuing professional development. The deadline for submissions for the David Thompson National Geomatics Awards is the end of March. The website is still evolving. Thank you for your time. All the best with your meetings. Thank you.

Al Jamieson confirmed there were no questions and thanked Mr. Stark for his presentation.

The assembly rose to observe a moment of silence in memory of the following:

- **Honorary Life Member Ken Pawson, ALS #246, who passed away April 29, 2014.**
- **John Lovse, ALS #345, who passed away June 3, 2014.**
- **Bill Mintz, ALS #503, who passed away July 5, 2014.**
- **Past-President Reg Watson, ALS #255, who passed away November 16, 2014.**
- **Bob Mayne, ALS #315, who passed away December 30, 2014.**
- **Honorary Member Alec McEwen, who passed away March 29, 2015.**
- **George Munro, ALS #303, who passed away April 22, 2015.**
- **Darwin Moss, ALS # 581, passed away April 10, 2015.**

*It was MOVED by Mr. David Hagen, seconded by Mr. Larry Pals, that the 2014 Report of Proceedings be adopted.*

**Motion Carried**

President Al Jamieson delivered the following address to the assembly:

I would like to thank the membership for the privilege of representing the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association as your president this past year.

The one year duration has been a bit of a blur, what with a start in May that included Executive, Council, Steering and attending out of province meetings in New Brunswick, Saskatchewan and Newfoundland. This gave way to me thinking: what the hell have I got myself into?

However, as the term progressed it got a little less hectic and Council waded through a myriad of issues, including
the policy manual review and update, the integration of the new articling process, and the continual challenge of staying current with government liaison, and dealing with a revolving door of appointed ministers. This was in addition to the usual business of approving applications for corporations, memberships, retirements and the like. This year was the first with the Association employing a full-time registrar, and by all reports, the role filled by Rosalind was extremely useful and productive. Kudos to Brian for making the new roles fit within his staff budget, while keeping services to the members affected as little as possible.

The sister provincial meetings and corresponding presidents’ forums proved to be extremely informative, exemplifying the differences in both the historic evolution and present nature of land management systems and surveying across the country. It was interesting to see the additional role played by the surveyor in the deeds registry system of Nova Scotia, or in the 400 years of history in Quebec City.

The commonalities across the country included concerns on demographics, digital plan submissions, geo-referencing, digital signatures, invasion of title insurance, mandatory professional development – all issues in varying degrees of advancement within the various associations.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge all the dedication and professionalism of both our Council members and our ALSA staff. Special thanks to Brian & Michelle for their direction and assistance in planning this Annual General Meeting. Also, thanks to Dawn Phelan for her contribution to Council and for her exceptional ability to formulate a sensible motion from a bunch of discombobulated discussion. Dawn, congratulations on your twenty years with the Association and you are indeed an invaluable cog in the wheel of this organization.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank all the committee chairs and committee volunteers for their contributions this past year. We have been blessed in the past with tremendous volunteer participation, and it is great to see it continue.

I would like to acknowledge my colleagues at Global Raymac Surveys, and thank them for allowing me the time away required to act as your president this year.

Barb and I have enjoyed representing Alberta this past year and have garnered many cherished memories and formed
many new friendships throughout our travels. Barb has been my travel agent, organizer, and travelling companion throughout and I would save the final acknowledgement and thank you for her! Thank you.

President Al Jamieson invited the principals of articling students who were present to introduce their pupils and any labour mobility candidates present to introduce themselves.

*It was MOVED by Mr. David Marquardt, seconded by Mr. Alex Hittel, that the committee reports for 2014-2015 be received as circulated.*

**Motion Carried**

President Al Jamieson informed the assembly that there was time for a bit of random discussion. The question for discussion was **Should ALS News be published in digital only format?**

Mr. Ken Allred spoke against publishing it in a digital only format as it is a great publication and a public relations tool that needs to be maintained. When it is in a digital format, people do not read it but when it is on their desk they read it cover to cover.

President Al Jamieson confirmed that it is distributed to the municipalities and there could be a reduction in advertising if it was only digital.

Mr. Gord Stark, President of the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors suggested considering a national magazine with jurisdictional content.

Mr. David Hagen commented that the *ALS News* is a valuable resource. It gets passed around and read cover to cover. It would be a shame to get rid of it for cost saving measures. He is not comfortable reading it off a screen.

Mr. Larry Pals commented that he did not receive it when he was in Phoenix so he would like to be able to access it digitally. He suggested that just one copy should be sent to each office instead of multiple copies.

Mr. Vince Ziegler wondered about the actual costs of hard copies versus digital format. Mr. Munday responded that it costs about $30,000 and 75 to 80 percent of the cost is for printing. If it was in digital format the printing, postage and courier costs would be saved, not including the staff time to design and proofread it. Digital format would save about $25,000 per
Mr. David Marquardt suggested that there could be a compromise between digital format and hard copies. He is comfortable with digital format and being able to search for certain topics.

Mr. Warren Lippitt wondered about the advertisers’ response to a purely digital publication.

President Al Jamieson confirmed that other groups have seen a decline in advertising revenue when switching to digital instead of hard copy printing. It is somewhat of a concern. Mr. Bob Wallace suggested leaving it to the individuals to decide if they want the *ALS News* in digital or hard copy format. Three or four copies per office would be fine. The digital format would not be read at the municipalities so hard copies would still need to be provided to them.

Mr. Bruce Clark suggested that perhaps a compromise would work. The advertising revenue is down about $8,000. Printing is the largest cost and postage is the second largest cost. There may be lost advertising revenue as advertisers do not pay the same for digital advertising. It is a compromise worth considering.

Mr. Scott Partridge commented that he subscribed to the paper and digital version of the *Calgary Herald*. He prefers the paper version. However, he would prefer the *ALS News* in digital version and wondered if it would work on an Apple device soon.

President Al Jamieson asked the exhibitors to introduce themselves and their firm.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Bruce Clark, seconded by Mr. Larry Pals, that the Review Engagement report be received.*

*Motion Carried*

Secretary Treasurer, Bruce Clark indicated that the numbers were for the 2013 to 2014 term due to the timing of the Association’s fiscal year end. He spoke to the 2013-2014 financial statements.

Revenue over expenses was $447,000. 2013-2014 was a very good year. The historical numbers show that the Association was managed prudently and made money for the members.
The 2014-2015 Pro-Forma financial statements show the projections for the year to date. The year ends April 30 and starts May 1. Unfortunately it is not as good news and there is a slight loss when factoring in the Boundary Panel loss of $65,000. The net income above expenses is expected to be about $330,000. Not as good as last year but still making money. Investment income is expected to be $266,000 for the year. It is what has kept the Association in the black the last couple of years. A surplus of $330,000 is being projected.

Mr. Ken Allred commented that a few years ago there was a surplus from the Boundary Panel and some money had to be given back to the government. This year there will likely be a deficit. He wondered if the Association could get some of the money back.

Secretary Treasurer, Bruce Clark responded that the ministerial order was signed a number of years ago. There was a surplus on post sales and they fund some of the activities of the Boundary Panel. The Association provides a report to government every two years regarding the expenses and revenue. Hopefully the balance is zero at the end of the two years. The Association has started discussions with the minister regarding review and amendment of the ministerial order and they are willing to consider it.

Mr. Ravi Shrivistava, the Director of Surveys informed the assembly that yes he is aware of it and he is also reviewing the policy related to the post sales revenue. The two-year window is there but the minister has unfettered discretion to use this amount and in fact in the last reporting period there was a surplus amount of $7,000 and the minister agreed to carry it forward for the next two-year cycle. Essentially as long there is not a reason to do so, the minister will try to remain flexible in that regard.

Secretary Treasurer, Bruce Clark thanked the members for putting their trust in him four years ago when he was elected to Council and two years ago when he was elected Secretary-Treasurer. The Secretary-Treasurer position is a three-year term. It is the end of his second year so he is going into his third year so someone will need to replace him.

The Secretary-Treasurer annually sees the report and budget and spends many hours reviewing, discussing and revising it. The Association has a 110 page policy manual that directs the actions of Council, committees and staff. The Steer-
ing Committee meets in May and reviews the policy manual. Council wants to make sure the policy manual is current and remains relevant and spent months reviewing it. That is the genesis of the first recommendation.

The policy manual contains job descriptions but there is not one for the Secretary Treasurer. He followed his predecessor Mr. John Haggerty. The Secretary-Treasurer works with Mr. Brian Munday and most of the hard work is done by him. The Secretary-Treasurer is a member of the Executive Committee and Council. The financial information is reviewed and discussed in detail at Council.

The policy manual has extensive details about the financial policies of the Association. The Association is committed to the sound governance of the actual expenditure of funds and financial activities through controlling and reviewing the actual expenditures. Working with the Executive Director, the budget and actual revenue and expenditures are provided to Council for their consideration. The financial statements, balance sheet, fund revenue sheets, investment revenue sheets and post sales are reviewed, reported and discussed at Council. The Secretary-Treasurer also signs off on the annual review engagement report.

The 2015-2016 budget was reviewed. The fees revenue is the most stable but it is only 22 to 25 percent of the total operating revenue and it is largely received at the beginning of the year. Operating revenue is about 70 percent of the revenues. It is highly variable, especially post sales, which are 70-80 percent of the operating revenue and fluctuate highly. The number of posts planted in Alberta is expected to decrease as the hybrid cadastre and the cadastre itself will require fewer posts to be planted in the ground. With 70 percent of the operating revenue coming from posts it is a serious problem. The Association has talked about changing the funding model for a number of years.

Currently, about $3,000,000 is invested and the investments have done very well. The average return is about five percent over the last five years but the current fiscal year it was almost nine percent return. Discussions with Morgan Meighen regarding the investments are done quarterly over the telephone.

The *ALS News* expense is expected to be about $26,000.
Iron post expenses are the costs associated with iron post sales.

Administration expenses are the costs of running the Association. Salaries for staff are about 50 percent. For comparison, he is also a member of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors. The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors has slightly more members and has eleven full-time staff and four consultants. The ALSA has seven full-time staff and service unmatched in Canada.

The committee expenses are comprised of the annual wish lists from the committee chairs. The External Relations Committee has a large line item taken up by the government relations consultant, which is great but not cheap.

The Continuing Competency Review program costs are slightly above what was projected last year but are still under $300,000.

The internally restricted funds are comprised of funds that are collected and set aside and then passed along.

The stabilization fund is for projects that may not have been included in the budget and for cost overruns during the year. Currently the balance of the fund is about $2,500,000. If there was a catastrophic event it would be used to fund the Association. Any revenue over expenses each year is added to the fund. When the fund is above $2,500,000 it goes back into the investments.

The Discipline Revolving Fund is $30,000. Some years nothing is spent but when there are costs they are paid out and the fund is then topped up. Money back from a discipline case is put back into the fund. It is balanced at the start of each year.

Mr. Bob Wallace wondered if the $2,500,000 was in a separate account. Mr. Munday responded that the financial stabilization fund is not in a separate account. It is a paper fund.

Mr. Bob Wallace responded that there is a lot of money in the Association and it is too much money. The idea is to protect the Association from future rainy days. He wondered if some of the money could be applied to lessen the burden on the members during tough times. Companies were unable to afford to have pupils and ALSs attend the AGM. He wondered if Council has considered using some of the money to help people out in tougher times.
Mr. Bruce Clark responded that the Association is a not for profit organization and should not be making money. Council looks at where it can be applied. Council and the Executive constantly discuss it. The budget for the coming year includes a loss and they are projecting that $77,000 will be transferred from the stabilization fund to balance the budget.

The investments cannot continue funding the operation. The projected budget is based on some of the most conservative numbers in the past ten years and the lowest post sales in twenty years. Seventy percent of the operating revenue is from post sales so the Association has to be very cognizant of what that number could be. A graph of the post sales from 1993 to 2015 was displayed.

Mr. Ken Allred commented that the Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund of $10,000 has not been used for about ten years. The purpose of the fund is for an ALSA member to go and deliver a paper at a national or international conference. Members of the Association have much to contribute to other conferences. He encouraged, particularly the younger members to take advantage of the funds and make a presentation to another conference about the great things happening in Alberta. Mr. Clark read out the policy for the Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund.

Mr. Dave Thomson wondered if the stabilization fund was the right size and what the objective was. Mr. Clark responded that he speaks for himself but he believes that about $2,000,000 is needed so it would cover the annual operating budget. Mr. Munday responded that the Council policy was that the Association would keep approximately one year of revenue in the financial stabilization fund in case there were no post sales for one year so the Association could continue and figure out what to do. Mr. Clark responded that it would be about $700,000 worth of post sales. If there were no post sales, that is the amount of revenue that would be lost.

Mr. John Haggerty commented that it is clear that it is the right budget for the time. He commended the Secretary-Treasurer and Council for seeing what was coming and making the right decisions.

Mr. Travis Harwick, President of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors commended Council for their budget. It is being very fiscally responsible. They strive to have a balanced budget also. A large reserve draws attention from the accounts and attention from government. In Ontario, they
do not have post sales but they have sticker sales and every cadastral plan that is completed has a sticker on it. About $540,000 of revenue comes from sticker sales. The remainder of the $2,000,000 budget is from membership dues. They also have some problems and challenges ahead as their sticker sales are dwindling along with the membership. It will be interesting to see how the ALSA Council streamlines and revamps that process. Other associations could take lessons from the ALSA or there could be a discussion to generate ideas together.

President Al Jamieson informed the assembly that the last recommendation at last year’s AGM dealt with the a special levy to be added to every land surveyors membership dues with all the money collected going to Professional Surveyors Canada to fund their activities. He asked Hal Janes, the Alberta Director for Professional Surveyors Canada to come forward and tell the assembly what PSC has been up to and what they plan to do over the next year.

Mr. Hal Janes, the Alberta Director for Professional Surveyors Canada, informed the assembly that they still face major challenges to build the financial base. Their primary areas of focus are promoting the value of professional surveying and geomatics to government, industry, professions and the public, coordinating and initiating educational forums to advance professional surveying and geomatics, strengthening the exchanged of information and knowledge in Canada and internationally, providing a national forum for discussion and developing a national organization that provides significant benefits to its members.

There is a board of eleven directors representing various regions. The directors are elected by the members for a maximum term of four years.

In 2014, one of the main focuses was on building the financial management that is needed in order to address the funding issues. They focused on promoting the all-in model, the formation of the Ad Hoc Finance Review Committee and the implementation of budget and cash flow controls. Total revenue was approximately $180,000 with a deficit of about $15,000. The budget revenue for 2015 is about $290,000 which reflects the associations that adopted the all in model in 2014. Revenue growth remains a priority. Increasing the membership in Ontario and Quebec is a priority and 25 percent of Ontario Land Surveyors are members. The financial report and budget will be presented during the AGM on April 29.
The governance structure was another major area of activity, especially regarding the transition to the *Canadian Not for Profit Corporations Act*. The Policy and Administration Committee was also formed.

A strategic planning workshop was held in September 2014 and focused on advocacy, community building and improving communication.

Terms of reference were developed for the committees and volunteers were sourced.

The goal of advocacy is to emphasize the importance of an integrated and dynamic surveying profession and promote the value of surveying and geomatics in Canada to government, industries, professions and the public. Issues included the preservation of monumented boundaries, the coordinate cadastre and liability associated with ground disturbance. Community building activities included the Canadian Geomatics Community Round Table and moving that organization towards GeoAlliance Canada. Collaboration also occurred with the Canadian Council of Geomatics, the United States National Society of Professional Surveyors, Department of Fisheries and Oceans and Transport Canada regarding hydrographic charting and arctic navigation, the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors and the provincial land survey associations.

The Professional Liability Insurance Committee issued a request for proposals for insurance broker services and selected CG & B Group Inc. Self-insurance is a future possibility and a position paper containing the pros and cons will be prepared.

The goals for 2015 include increasing the membership from Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick and corporate memberships, completing the terms of reference for the committees and recruiting volunteers, presenting advocacy position papers on monument preservation, the role of coordinates and ground disturbance liability issue, formalizing the memorandum of understanding with key land surveying partners regarding collaboration, strengthening linkages with the Canadian Council on Geomatics and GeoAlliance Canada, soliciting member feedback on national trends, issues and needs and improving communication via the web and the *Horizons* newsletter.
He thanked Council for the opportunity to speak and encouraged everyone to participate in the web based Annual General Meeting that will take place at 11:00 a.m. on April 29. However, contact information must be provided to register. Details are available on the Professional Surveyors Canada website.

President Al Jamieson thanked Mr. Janes for his presentation.

Mr. Gordon Stark, President of the Association for Canada Land Surveyors informed the assembly that ACLS has four staff and asked Mr. Janes to describe their staff. Mr. Janes responded that they have one full-time administrator, a part-time executive assistant and a part-time financial advisor.

President Al Jamieson informed the assembly that Council has been fortunate to have the Director of Surveys, Mr. Ravi Shrivastava, attend most of the Council meetings this year and provide updates about what is happening within his department and throughout government. Mr. Shrivastava has also brought a number of questions and asked for ideas and comments in trying to answer these questions.

President Al Jamieson asked the Director of Surveys to inform the membership of what he and his department are working on.

The Director of Surveys, Ravi Shrivastava, addressed the assembly as follows:

Mr. President, good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. Before I begin, I must acknowledge that within government we are in a peculiar sensitive situation right now. The provincial election is on its way and there are special rules about what a government employee can or cannot do. For example, I cannot respond to questions related to any election issue or campaign promise. I can speak for the government program as to what it is today but I cannot speak about what it should be or what it will be. So having said that, I will start my presentation.

It is the most difficult time to start a presentation, after lunch. I know it is goodnight time. Feel free but when you get up please observe your manners and say good morning. Also, in case of my boring monotonous voice, if you start sleeping and snore the $50 fine applies as much for the snoring as the cell phone.
Agenda
For ease of understanding and better simulation, I will be talking in five distinct phases about my presentation. First I will mention updates and then outputs. The next one, which is ongoing issues, I really want to spend a lot of time on this particular part because it is important. It is important today, it is important tomorrow and it is important for our future. Then I will talk about a few housekeeping details. Again, and depending on the time as I know there will be lots of questions, I will try to address a few questions as much as I can but beyond that I will be available to talk to any one of you.

Organization Update – DOS Office
So I mentioned that I have two things to talk about. One is what is going on with my shop right now, the Director of Surveys office and then riparian issues. Within my office, there is reorganization so I do not deal with technical services any more. That means that any matters related to oil & gas related energy go to the Alberta Energy Regulator. Anything which is provincial approval, for example leases for agriculture and commercial industry purposes, are dealt with differently. Often I get e-mails asking for my opinion or input on things. That position becomes very difficult because I do not have that responsibility but by making an opinion I am making myself accountable. So imagine the situation that you are accountable without being responsible. I continue to be responsible for policy, standards and advisory functions. Obviously, those that involve discretionary and non-discretionary powers or authorities from various statutes I continue to do.

Organization Update - Leadership Challenges
Times are changing and the biggest thing that is changing is the leadership challenges and one of the biggest leadership challenges we face is being under two major government directions. One is what we call responsible resource development and the other is called reserve based budgeting. So the government and Albertans are asking, “Are you efficient?” and my entire focus on this particular challenge will be “Are you really efficient?” So whatever you are doing you need to be efficient in terms of technology and I can say for sure, surveyors are very efficient as for the technologies concerned. Are you efficient in terms of cost? What about time? What about results and outcomes? These are the fundamental questions being asked all of the time that are part of my leadership challenge.
The next good question is, “are you effective?” Efficiency is fine. There is a mechanical ratio but “what about your effectiveness?” Are you effective in what you are doing every day? Are you effective economically? Are you effective legally? Yes, I can say that you are very much legally effective because we do not see many court cases so the surveying system is very effective legally. What about politically? What about socially? Those are the fundamental questions being asked all of the time as part of my leadership. I am being asked by my senior management as they are being asked by the public.

And the last but not the least one, “are you relevant?” We may have been relevant five years ago but “are we equally relevant today?” Relevancy is not defined by what we think and what we think our client needs. Our clients decide whether or not they consider us relevant based on the services we are providing to them.

Organization Update – Riparian Group
The second part of this is about the riparian body. You must have heard in the past that ESRD or SRD in those days used to have a riparian group, which was responsible for the water bodies. There were a lot of talks going on as to where this should be done. This is part of the organization changes and the riparian group has amalgamated with Wetlands. Wetlands was more environmental type policies so we were never concerned with that. The riparian group and Wetlands, they merged together and became part of the provincial programs branch, which is not working under me. It is a unit which is parallel to me but they are responsible for riparian rights as well as wetland issues.

There are a lot of challenges going on right now because of the business continuity issues. There are people retiring and, as a result, Wetlands is unable to sustain the level of services and again government is asking the same questions, regarding efficiency, effectiveness and relevancy. So obviously there have been some changes. The riparian group is not the same. We have succession issues. We have business continuity issues and as a result there is a big backlog.

The other day I got an e-mail from a surveyor saying that okay, your riparian group told me that they can answer the question in six months. It has been six months and your riparian group is still saying that it is going to take another six months. From the client’s point of view this is suicidal and I know it is unacceptable but I also know from the inside that the riparian group does not have the capability to handle everything. Pri-
orities keep changing. So what is the solution? The solution is probably that this is an opportunity for us as surveyors to look into more development in riparian areas. We are boundary experts and we need to focus our energy so that we can really deliver riparian functions. Riparian functions need boundary experts and often we see the difference in quality. Some surveyors are very diligent but others are completely careless. They do not even think about what has gone. They do not see the slow gradual principals of riparian ones. They just draw lines with the least amount of research. Some are so good that their work is like gospel to me. So this is an opportunity for us to grow and we are trying to basically partner with you. Essentially, whatever corporate knowledge we have we are trying to encapsulate it in the form of a binder that should be made available to all of you and should give you what is generally accepted principals for the riparian boundary as far as ESRD is concerned.

The other issue is the availability of the records and I am going to explore how those records can really be made available. For example, historic photographs from the fifties “How can that really be made available to the service community and to the public so you can make well informed decisions?” The bottom line is here is an opportunity for us to learn and grow.

Organization Structure
Next is regarding reorganization change. This is my most current organization and the three red boxes are the ones which do not have a surveyor right now. The two top ones do not have a surveyor manager. We do not have a land surveyor. The one which is land survey disposition, essentially the one which is the top one is a manager’s position, which is empty right now. The second one is a land surveyor’s position, which we have reclassified as a surveying geomatics engineer so the one disposition we have converted to the survey geomatics engineer position so we do not need a surveyor designation. We prefer to have someone with a geomatics engineering degree and who is planning to become a surveyor. The third one is a geomatics technologist position and very likely, considering the constraints, I will be losing the position very soon.

We have problems right now and I am not trying to promote to get a surveyor for the position because government has a hiring restraint. The restraint is not a freeze but we have a lot of restrictions for hiring. As a result we cannot hire a surveyor but I am trying to get this position opened up so that we can have competent manpower. Right now, as you see from this
organization structure, I am running at about 75 percent of my strength.

Here I come to the end of the first phase, where I just talked about updates and the organization. Essentially I talked about reorganization, new functions of the riparian boundaries, opportunities for you and the leadership challenges.

**Outputs 2014-2015 – Land Surveys Unit**
This part will go rather quickly because it is just an update. Essentially we did 12 TLE projects. We are engaged in about 22 official surveys. We have 94 different projects and advisory services and 223 open files. This 223 is important because when you communicate with my office, often there is an unreasonable wait time. We cannot handle all of the projects together and there is always a delay.

**Outputs 2014-2015 – Geodetic Control Unit**
We have another completed geodetic control. In the City of Calgary, we completed five high position networks and five are ongoing right now. We are doing integration of commercial GNSS base points. It is basically a service provider agreement we are implementing in Alberta. Vertical adjustment is due this fall. There is ongoing maintenance of NAD83 (CSRS) and, of course, MASCOT.

In the last part, I just quickly updated you on what is going on and these slides will be available so you can see the figures.

**Ongoing Issues**
Now we are coming to the ongoing issues, which is very important. In this part, I will be talking about the GPS location plan policy rescindment. I will talk about the hybrid cadastre, the cadastral mapping fee and obviously the monument levy. The monument levy is going to be connected to what the secretary-treasurer talked about this morning because it ties to the major source of our revenue.

**GPS Location Plans – Stakeholders Consultation**
GPS location plans, for those of you who have been around longer than me then know that in 2010 because of certain pressures government decided to accept GPS location plans by surveyors and non-surveyors. When I came, I met your two visionary presidents, President Connie Petersen and later, President Rob Scott. I asked this question ‘What are you expecting out of me?’ They gave me two answers. One was regarding the GPS location plans and for me that became the priority from day one of me taking over my position as
Director of Surveys. So essentially, what happened in 2010 was that we did GPS location plans. There was an outcry from a lot of you. Obviously, the survey community had valid challenges and legal challenges but what to do about it had to be decided. Government of the day decided to do industry consultations. We invited four industry groups and the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association chaired the meeting. The outcome was, and it is very important to note, that the forestry group wanted their staff to do the GPS surveys. The rural electrification associations and gas co-ops felt they could attain accuracy and again wanted their staff to do the survey. Gentlemen and ladies, I am asking “are we relevant or maybe I should ask were we relevant at that time?” because these two client groups did not feel that we were relevant at that time.

What about CAPP (Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers)? They felt there was no benefit to the plan and wanted ALSs to use the coordinate based system. Large utility companies, they again wanted the coordinate based system rather than placing monuments. Forestry and REAs wanted their staff to do the survey. CAPP supported the coordinate based system and the large utilities also supported the coordinate based system. Our Association was very much proactive. We were very much open to the new technologies and we wanted them. Yes, we are willing to do all these things but the survey will be and shall be done by the Alberta Land Surveyors. Essentially, these four groups did not converge. Then what is next?

**GPS Location Plans: Agree or Not**

Whether you agree or not the development of crown land must go on. Joint recommendations included working towards a coordinate based system that is independent of technology and integrated with the existing land survey system. It should not be CBC only and it should match with the existing survey system. It must be cost effective and must be prepared by an Alberta Land Surveyor. I took those four principals as the guiding gospel for me and started working. At that time it was decided, like it or not, that development must go on. The status quo on GPS location plans meant that plans prepared by surveyors or non-surveyors would be accepted by ESRD or SRD at that time. They gave direction that remotely sensed and a coordinate based type of system should be created. Those were the guidelines and of course the direction from the two past presidents that I started working into it.
GPS Location Plans: Policy Review
I undertook the policy review and started looking at what factors needed to be considered. In my policy review, the very first and the driving force was the litigation. The litigation was not what is the legal basis. I was more interested in focusing my energy on the reason and why that litigation was there in the first place. I started looking into the reason why this litigation was in place, rather than making the definition of boundaries an interpretation of acts. Then we opted for a legal opinion and this is where we got. Yes, the Land Surveyors Act applies everywhere in the province but public lands is very specific of legislation and the legal team decided no specific legislation holds regarding this legislation. As a result, the director, not the Director of Surveys, the director under the Public Lands Act can accept plans prepared by non-surveyors. There are about a dozen directors under the Public Lands Act.

In my case, when I started looking into legislation, once again I found myself in a conflict of interest situation. I up front talked to my deputy minister about it because my position required me to be an Alberta Land Surveyor and that is the law. In my position as an Alberta Land Surveyor, I am required and bound by the Code of Ethics of the Association. One of the things it tells me is that as a land surveyor I am supposed to stop the unauthorized practice of land surveying and, in my humble opinion, accepting a GPS location plan was the unauthorized practice of land surveying and I really worked hard to convince my senior management. As a result, they agreed. I started communicating very openly and transparently with every organization including the ALSA, CAPP and including both the forestry colleges and the AFPA. I had more than one presentation and discussion with them. It was not a pleasant job but I did it. I talked to everyone and tried to convince them of what we are doing and where we are going. Essentially, I tried to get them on board but not necessarily everyone was on board.

Finally, based upon those four criteria we came up with and developed the hybrid cadastre model. It was implemented in 2011 and again it followed the joint recommendation that it should be free of technology, coordinate based, link with the existing cadastre, be cost effective and prepared by an Alberta Land Surveyor.

GPS Location Plans: Rescindment
Finally, the great day came. It was July 2014. We rescinded the policy. We said thank you very much but from this day
onward we will not be accepting GPS location plans by any-
one, surveyor or non-surveyor. There was a grandfathering
period and that period expired in October. Hopefully things
would work normally but this did not happen.

GPS Plan Rescindment is not “The End”
Ladies and gentlemen, you do not have to like me to listen
to me but the pressure continues. Industry is still challenging
those things. Regarding GPS location plans, I will not call
them history but I will say they were killed but the question
remains and I am getting a lot of pressure. For example,
forestry contributed to the LiDAR imagery for the province.
They wanted to do a pilot but their condition was that they
wanted to do it. They said “We will do the pilot and we will
do fine but why does a surveyor have to sign off on it. My
condition is no and I am not even prepared to start the pilot
unless we iron out this issue because in my humble opinion
surveyors are one of the key elements in defining the bound-
ary. It cannot be done without them. So if you are defining
the boundaries, I am not thinking that you can do it without
a surveyor.

Employment Restrictions on Land Surveyors
The next question came and it is a very controversial issue
and I was told that the issue came up in the AGMs three or
four times but the issue is still there. The question was “okay
we will use the surveyors but why do I have to go and get
one?” Why can’t I get survey services of an employee? I
can employ a surveyor on my board. Why can’t I employ
a surveyor? It became difficult to convince them that a
surveyor cannot be employed in a forest company. They said
“no we can employ a surveyor and we will be doing it so
your requirement of the ALSA will be fulfilled but we want
to employ a surveyor rather than going and contracting out
to the surveyors.”

So the question was “Why can surveyors not be employed by
a company which is not a survey corporation?” People then
started talking about the professional engineers and wondered
about other organizations as there is no restriction as to where
an engineer can work and I know there will be more questions
coming regarding it. Surveyors have a very specific rule and
are not only protecting their client’s interests they are pro-
tecting their neighbour’s interests also.

I heard this and I am on board with that last bullet. Public
interest is seldom protected by regulating the employment of
professionals. All the acts, including our own act, give very
clear guidelines. A member can only be disciplined for unskilled practice or unprofessional conduct. That content does not change whether you are employed by a company or you are employed by another contractor. It does not change.

Most self-governing regulations regulate the employment of their professional or they regulate the business of the profession if and only if you are providing services directly to the public. For example, a close friend of mine is working for an insurance company. Day and night he sees plans and designs and tries to figure out the faults with those designs. He is practicing engineering but the insurance company is not a registered corporation for engineering.

Take the case of doctors. Doctors come on CBC and give medical information. The Canadian Medical Association considers the doctor to be giving advice. He is practicing medicine but the CBC does not need to be a medical corporation.

I have chosen to use the likes of CNN and BBC. They are not even Canadian corporations, they are international corporations. They do exactly the same thing. These organizations do not need to be a registered medical corporation. What about accountants and lawyers? They are employed. They are protecting their clients. Well I asked this question and I have got this answer from some experienced surveyors. The surveyors DNA work is different. You are not just working for your client; you are also working for those adjoining your clients who are not your clients. It makes a very convincing argument.

I was told, “what happens if a surveyor is working for an employer and the employer tells him no, no, no you have to ignore your adjoining interest?” I talked to a lot of people and in fact I started believing it. If an employee and employer relationship is there then there are several pieces of federal legislation and provincial legislation that govern the employee/employer relationship. For sure, I am not thinking that the Surveyors Act (sic) designed to govern that employee/employer relationship. In other words, this needs to be examined again. If you are talking about public lands, who is the adjoining owner in public lands? Who owns the land? It is the crown. So if you are talking about public land and if you are saying that some surveyor is surveying on public land and is employed by one of the forest companies, the crown has no problem with that and the Public Lands Act gives mechanism thereby that if the existing interest is there, subsequently the boundary can be moved, respecting the prior interest. That is the law. So the
issue is not on public land. If a surveyor is working for a survey company, I do not see any major challenges. Maybe I am having tunnel vision right now but maybe this is an area where we need to look collectively and try to figure it out. Remember the underlying questions are “Are we relevant? Are we effective? Are we efficient? If we are not, people are trying to look at those matters.

Another big area that is coming with the government’s direction is integrated resource management. Integrated resource management essentially means not looking at one thing at a time. You do not see the oil and gas industry or forestry or biodiversity but think collectively together. So from that point of view people started thinking about interrelation carbon footprints and the best way to do resource management, integrated resource management is by a kind of GIS type of approach.

So questions started coming in asking, “can we think about crown land dispositions and GIS-based cadastre. My answer is no because I am a conventional thinker. I am willing to think forward but at the same time I know how the boundaries are created. I see there is more risk than divorce today but “Is that opinion going to be there five years from now or ten years from now?” I do not know. The bottom line is that there are different risk parameters. We are in a different dynamic time.

**Hybrid Cadastre**

When I took my GPS location plans policy binder to my deputy minister and said, hey I am here to rescind this policy as this is not going to work. He told me Ravi do not criticize a plan unless you have a better one to offer. I thought for a minute. Yes GPS location plans are a bad policy but what is there for me to offer. This was in 2011 when I started thinking and came up with the concept of the hybrid, which is inviting considering the recommendation made by the four industry groups headed by the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association members. We came up with the hybrid concept and it is a hybrid. You may say it is a hybrid of the existing monuments and the coordinates but I think it is a hybrid beyond that. How I see it is as a hybrid of the law. Monuments govern and this is the law. It is a hybrid of the technology or the mathematics. This is the hybrid of the law and technology. This is the hybrid of the monuments and advanced thinking. Hybrid is having advantages and hybrid is having options.

So the question came, “why now because we are constantly
being driven by those factors?” The cost effectiveness, time effectiveness and availability of surveyors are all factors. Today’s time is different but maybe two years ago that availability was questionable. So how did we do it? My team, along with a very dedicated consultant and a team of your sounding board members, who are very experienced surveyors, put our heads together and came up with the concept of hybrid initial guidelines. It was focused only on public lands and at that time we took a baby step that it would only be the limited type of dispositions. Dispositions progressed further. We started in July 2014 and that is the time that I mentioned that we rescinded the GPS location plans. We started doing only certain dispositions and only on unsurveyed land. Then six months later we increased certain dispositions to about 75 percent of the dispositions and then we included the entire crown land. That was the significant step that crown land was included, including unsurveyed and surveyed.

**Hybrid Cadastre – the Pilot at a Glance**

Where next? A month or two from now, we are going to remove the 75 percent and change it to all crown land dispositions. Every disposition will be covered by hybrid cadastre. We have opted for a legal opinion because the *Pipeline Act* very clearly mentions that it must be done under the *Surveys Act*. The legal opinion was favorable. It said very clearly that yes it can be done so long as it is on crown lands. So very likely in two months’ time I will be coming up with a new set of guidelines, which will cover 100 percent of crown land.

The project is scheduled to be reviewed in March 2016. There are three possibilities. We will accept this project, we may extend this project or we will entirely cancel it. I am optimistic about it because cancellation is not an option in March 2016. Either we will extend it or we will accept it.

So what were the numbers? Initially when we started the project for the first six months, July to December 2014, we only received 14 hybrid plans. In the next six months, from January 2015 to March 31, we received about 30 plus plans. Basically in three months we are seeing exponential growth. Fifteen surveyors submitted the plans and in fact one of the surveyors alone submitted 15 plans. People started doing it. If there is one single message you want to take from me it should be that this is probably the direction. I am becoming a little bit of a sales person here but explore the future.

When it comes to cost savings some say it is less than five percent, some say it is more than 50 percent but I think it is
reasonable to assume that we are getting about 20 percent savings on the costs. My expectation was a savings of about one third but maybe we are in the early stages or maybe I was ambitious.

We have three types of dispositions, typically what we refer to as new, renewal and amendment and about half of these are for amendments and the other half is for new and renewals. We also have three stages, the application stage, the authorization stage and the final stage. It is about one-third application and authorization and the final stage is about two thirds. The most frequently used dispositions are EZEs, MLLs and LOCs and the rest are still under ten percent. The numbers are not very much but I do not want to take any statistical references out of it. They are maybe fifty plus but it is too early to say anything. What is most interesting is, until now I have not received any show stopper and there are no major challenges. Of course this is a warning that when you do your first plan, it may be costing you more as you will have to set up your complete cadastre drawings and that takes a lot of effort.

We have been asking for feedback and based on the feedback, we are typically having increased awareness of the clients and as I said it is likely to stay. I have heard that the clients are even demanding it now. It is a well-received alternative, which at least for me is very good because when someone is pushing the GPS location one, for me this is an option. Remember what my deputy said. All for something better. So I think that battle has been won.

**Cadastral Mapping Fee: Renewal**

The next important thing is about the cadastre mapping fee renewal and this is an issue. The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association has been talking and I have seen previous conversations on this subject. The cadastre mapping fee is essentially part of the *Surveys Act*. The minister can implement a cadastre mapping fee when the plans are registered at the Land Titles Office. I am jumping from crown land to private land and the Land Titles Office. Any plan or descriptive plan when it is put into the Land Titles Office gets a cadastral mapping fee for what we call parcel mapping purposes. This was done through regulation, which was set to expire on March 31. We made two changes, actually one. We changed this mechanism from regulation to ministerial order because that is a convenient way to do it. We made that change but we retained the fee of $100. This is the fee we started using in 1999. So in the last fifteen years or sixteen years the fee has not changed. There are good arguments
from the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and I buy them entirely because technology has changed. The old system of scanning the whole plan was there. It was a new thing. Today we are very much mature and obviously my office asked for a few updates. For example, structured files and SPOC your online one so all of these things cost you money and as a result the backend work reduces to update those ones. I am pretty much on board with that. I have no issues. I strongly recommended and finally the minister accepted that the plan price be retained at $100 but it is not sustainable. The $100 cadastral mapping fee is resulting in us incurring losses of about $16,000 a month. We did some number crunching from June 2011 to November for about forty-four months and $662,000 was the loss, of which we had an arrangement at that time with SDW. They basically covered for $200,000 and the rest was covered by us. We have renewed the contract and now any losses will be an even split. Issues are still there but what I am thinking is, I am getting a lot of pressure about reviewing the price hike. You must have seen recently that the Land Titles Office fee for a typical $500,000 property with about an eighty percent mortgage used to be under $500 but now it is about $900 so it is close to double. The same goes for public land dispositions. Earlier it was about $400. Today the fee is about $900 so despite my being on board with you, I am very likely to review the fees again with my internal colleagues and very likely this fee may go up. I am going to ask for a solid justification but I know this is an ongoing issue.

**Monument Levy: MOU Review**

I am coming to the last very important part. This is not the last of the presentation but the last part of what the ongoing issues are and this is the monument levy fee. As we have seen this morning, it’s the major source of revenue for the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. About $1,500,000 to $1,700,000 is the revenue side of it. The *Act* defines what is the monument and requires that the monument must be purchased from the source at a price recommended by the minister. We used to distribute those plans and posts but because of the MOU this undertaking was taken over by the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. At that time there was a monument levy fee of $2.50 but the *Act* defines monument and the question came “Are we also charging for the markers?” So out of the $1,600,000 to $1,700,000 about twenty-five percent of the levies are for the markers. The question is “Is the marker a monument within the meaning of the *Act*?” Those are the legal challenges.
In 2008, we renewed this agreement and made it two-fold. So instead of charging $2.50 we started charging $2.50 for certain purposes such as those purposes typically incidental to the *Surveys Act*, including boundary maintenance, survey error investigation and another $4.00 for enhancing professional practice, education, public awareness and technical competence. Those are the activities that typically can be grouped under the *Land Surveyors Act*. Remember, this money you are paying is used for your purposes. What is the issue? It is only the minister of ESRD’s impoverishing making you pay that. The question is “is the minister empowered to do it or does he need to do it or not?”

Typically the fee is used for Section 47 compliance. The agreement requires that every year you will file an annual expenditure report and every two years the Association will file a report giving the entire picture of how much of the monies are surplus and then give it back to us. The one annual report was not being filed by the Association. They were filing every two years and it is not a very big thing. They have been providing the same information every second year and obviously whatever the money, as mentioned this morning $7,000 for the previous one, we essentially allowed them to carry it forward. This agreement does not have any expiry date. Remember efficient, effective and relevance. Government wants to really show that you are forced to review it. The minister, when he saw that one, said it needs to have a best before date so you need to have this agreement. It must have a date by which you have to review it and if you do not review it, it is set to expire automatically.

This can be terminated with twelve months’ notice, without any cause. The minister can do it. The minister can just come up with a new order but the minister does not want it to be done that way and we do not want it to be done that way as we want to really do it. Right now we are reviewing this particular issue and there are a few legal challenges. The legal opinion is essentially, “What is the definition of a monument?” Is the marker a monument? If the marker is not a monument, remember it is going to impact your revenue by about twenty-five percent. The next big question is, “is the minister of ESRD responsible for the *Surveys Act*?” Can he make an order, which is essentially collecting money for the purpose of the *Land Surveys Act*, (sic) which the minister does not administer? There are likewise issues but I will be communicating with the Council and I have already talked to them. We will be keeping in good humour and working together and trying to figure out the best way to do it.
So I come to the end of the third phase where I talked about the GPS location plan, a little bit of history, why we did the hybrid cadastre, the cadastre mapping fee and finally the monument levy.

**Housekeeping**

So this is the fourth part. It is about housekeeping. They are not that critically important but just for example, Section 50(3). As I mentioned, 223 projects, seventy-five percent of people and one land surveyor working for three make it practically impossible for me to handle all of your inquiries in a timely fashion. I really want to be proactive and reply to your telephone calls and all of your e-mails but it is more than the norm these days if you do not hear from me for weeks. So typically I need more information to go to my team. We created a generic e-mail account. I encourage you to please use it. If it is something for which you want my personal attention, send it to me. There is no harm if you cc me but to send it to the Director of Surveys account is a very efficient way of working because you will get it earlier as somebody from my team will be looking and when I am reviewing your e-mail I will already have the data with me.

**Surveys Act – Section 50(3)**

Section 50(3) is basically the double monumentation and permission to remove monuments. Basically before removing the monument, whether it is a surveyor or not, you need to have the permission of the Director of Surveys and if you do not there is a fine of up to $10,000. Most people follow it very nicely because we do not give permission and removing the monuments means, in most cases, moving the boundaries. Moving the boundaries is not easy and it should not be easy because this is our profession. This is our bread and butter. So before giving permission to remove a monument we do due diligence. We ask you questions. We try to do it but sometimes it becomes very cumbersome. Sometimes you do not like the correspondence but other times the surveyor moves the monument without asking and then asks my permission to move the monument. Already something has happened. You are already liable for the $10,000 fine. I am not saying that I will not give permission but you will be asked more questions. So my request to all of you is, think twice, maybe five times before removing a monument. It is better to ask permission.

This is something to really think about and I think it is really important. We have lots of GPS location plans in our system. My question to you is, “How to deal with those GPS loca-
tion plans?” Do the GPS location plans create boundaries? If someone has created a GPS location plan, he has to do a final plan stage. If someone is signing a statutory declaration is it acceptable? There are many issues. I don’t have answers. I need your advice and guidance. So please do me a favour. Look at all of the slides and if you can give it some thought, drop an e-mail to me regarding what you think about it. Thank you.

President Al Jamieson thanked Mr. Shrivastava for his presentation and informed the assembly that there was time to entertain some questions.

Mr. David Hagen commented that regarding the digital mapping fee. The digital mapping system is that ALSs collect the information, rotate it, georeferenced it, insert it and then pay money for that privilege. You say you are losing $600,000 a year on it. How is that efficient? You are losing money on a product Alberta Land Surveyors are paying you to take. Alberta Land Surveyors do all the work and government is losing money on it. How is that efficient? How is that effective? How is that relevant?

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava responded that he completely agrees with the statement. He is asking the same questions and he didn’t get the answer. The reality is that it is true. How they are losing money he does not have the answer and that is what he is looking for. He will continue to ask the same questions. When he is asking the surveyor to give him the structured file and the geo-referenced file, in his wisdom, having had that photogrammic digital mapping background, I know what it means to just slap that existing parcel picture into the existing database. I one hundred percent agree with you and I will be constantly asking those questions but today I do not have any answer.

Mr. Hagen responded that if the provider is losing money they need to change the provider. The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association could provide the same service and would not lose money on a free product that they are selling. Something is rotten in Denmark.

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava responded that it is absolutely true and I am constantly looking for it and I don’t have any answer today.

Mr. David Marquardt wondered, regarding the hybrid cadastre project if it is successful and he has every reason to be-
lieve that it will be, “what would be the next step after that?”
Would there be any thought to doing a resurvey of the town-
ship corner project that was done in the 1980s and 1990s to
weed out all of the adjustment errors that were proliferating at
that time to get a more accurate ATS fabric?

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava responded that he has not given it as
much thought. If the township was done and the monument
was there the genesis of hybrid is that the monument that was
placed, right or wrong, it governs. The monument location will
be observed and it will become an observed coordinate, not
the governing one but they are not planning to do the primary
that is Part 2 surveys with the hybrid one. Part 2 surveys, even
on crown land; we have not reached a stage where they will be
replaced with a coordinate. Part 2 monuments will continue to
be the physical monument the way it is defined today.

Ms. Ashley Robertson wondered if Mr. Shrivastava could
comment on his previous comment earlier when he was talk-
ing about GPS location plans. He had mentioned that there
was pressure from the forestry group as to why an Alberta
Land Surveyor needs to sign a product that may show bound-
daries as well as forestry wanting to know why they cannot hire
a land surveyor directly. She asked Mr. Shrivastava to quantify
what the pressure is exactly, who is asking those questions and
how often.

Mr. Ravi Shrivistava responded that the questions are often
being asked by a forest industry and typically either by the for-
estry colleges and he has talked to the forestry college coun-
cils, both technologists and technicians and also the AFPA. He
met with their executive director and some of their executive
members and the question comes. They often receives an e-
mail or letter from one of the senior members from one of
the companies, typically the president or vice president and
normally it is addressed to the minister. His answer to that
question is the briefing notes.

Ms. Ashley Robertson wondered if it was the same question
coming from the same groups.

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava responded that the groups are mostly the
same and as he said earlier it is coming mostly from the for-
estry industry and the people associated with it.

Mr. Michael Thompson commented that he is concerned
with the way the hybrid cadastre plans are coming along.
The twenty percent cost savings are generally from the ac-
tual marking of the boundaries. All the other work is done but the boundaries are defined by the coordinate. He is concerned that when it is time to build a fence or clear a parcel when they are dealing with the parties who do not find the role of the surveyor relevant or prudent, they are not going to contact a land surveyor to define those boundaries.

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava responded that he has also heard the question. People have expressed concern about someone taking GPS and trying to find out the coordinates. His answer is, so what if someone takes a hand held GPS to find the coordinates. There is risk involved. The Alberta Land Surveyor can educate the client but people may still take a risk. About ten years ago, at one of the American Medical Association meetings the question was, “What if people start asking questions of Doctor Google and what if they tried to treat themselves?” It would be a big risk and Google should be stopped from giving medical advice. That was ten years ago. Now they comment about how wonderful Dr. Google is as their patients are now well aware and know the consequences and are well informed. There are a few people who take risks but if they take the risk they take the reward or lose on it. Think ten years ago and ten years from now. If someone tries to take the GPS coordinate and locate the boundary corner, they are taking the risk. They cannot be stopped from doing it but land surveyors can educate to the extent possible.

President Al Jamieson thanked Mr. Shrivastava and informed the assembly that there may be an opportunity for more questions later.

It was MOVED by Mr. Bruce Clark, seconded by Mr. Mark Sutter, that Section 40(1) of the Association’s bylaws be amended as follows:

**Expenditures**

40(1) Except as authorized by Council, no money shall be withdrawn from the Association’s account except by cheque signed by the Executive Director for amounts under $5,000 or, in the absence of the Executive Director, by any two of the following officers: President, Vice-President, Past-President or Secretary-Treasurer. A cheque for $5,000 or over must be signed by any two of the following: the Executive Director, the President, Vice-President, Past-President or Secretary-Treasurer.

40(1) Except as authorized by Council, money shall only
be withdrawn from the Association’s account by cheque. The Executive Director may sign for amounts under $5,000 or, in the absence of the Executive Director, any two of the following officers: President, Vice-President, Past-President, Secretary-Treasurer.

Except as authorized by Council, amounts for $5,000 or over must be signed by any two of the following: Executive Director, President, Vice-President, Past-President, Secretary-Treasurer.

(2) Monies belonging to the Association shall only be expended on the authority of the Council, but a majority of Alberta Land Surveyors at an annual general meeting or special meeting may make recommendations to the Council advocating expenditures for purposes connected with the objects of the Association.

_Motion Carried_

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Bruce Clark informed the assembly that expenditures could only be done by cheque. There are now a number of payments that are done by direct deposit and electronic transfer. It is simply housekeeping to keep it in line with the policy manual.

It was _MOVED by Mr. Paddy Marshall, seconded by Mr. Hugo Engler; that Form D of the bylaws (Affidavit of Service of an Articled Pupil) be amended as follows: (see Appendix E, Page 138)

_Motion Carried_

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Paddy Marshall informed the assembly that the recommendation comes from the articling pupil process report that was approved by Council in November 2013. The affidavit of service takes the Registration Committee a long time to review and there was no standardized form for the pupils to complete. They are proposing to standardize the form and make it easier for the pupils and principals to complete and easier for the committee to review. The main changes include that the date the articles were signed and the pupil’s signature box have been removed. The form also now emphasizes that only twelve months can be claimed in a year.

Mr. David Marquardt wondered about the portion regarding the date that the articles started and if it was important for the committee to immediately know how long the articled
pupil has been under articles.
Mr. Patrick Marshall responded that each pupil has their own file and the committee keeps track of everything so they know when the pupil started and how much they have accumulated each year for their affidavits so it was of no use to the committee. They rely on the Alberta Land Surveyor who has sworn the affidavit that that is how much the pupil did that year.

Mr. David Marquardt responded that many legal documents have time frames but if it is not a concern that is fine.

Mr. Alex Scovill wondered about the table and how it would be calculated in terms of months instead of days.

Mr. Marshall responded that they will need to decide the number of days per month.

Mr. Ed Scovill confirmed with Mr. Marshall that the total months would be completed by the Registration Committee.

It was MOVED by Mr. Ian Cleland seconded by Mr. Nitin Bansal, that Part C, Section 5.5 of the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:
(see Appendix E, Page 140)

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Cleland informed the assembly that the recommendation had originated from the Practice Review Board. The Board had tried to develop an Interpretive Bulletin regarding double monumentation but found that there were too many circumstances to address. The Manitoba Manual of Good Practice addresses it. The recommendation addresses the issues of boundary uncertainties, double monumentation and the lack of communication between surveyors. The recommendation requires practitioners to solve boundary uncertainties in a timely manner. The intent of the recommendation is to help reduce the number of incidents where positional conflicts between surveyors do exist and cause boundary uncertainties.

Mr. Alex Gorelik commented that it is common sense to not intentionally double post and they need to communicate with each other but they do not need to include it in the Manual of Standard Practice. During his articling process, he received the message from many people that you just do not do it. If it had been on the qualifying exam and he had hesitated he probably would have failed.

| Recommendation #3: Double Monumentation  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(see Appendix E for rationale document and original motion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Cleland, ALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Ravi Shrivastava informed the assembly that he was speaking in his personal capacity and not as the Director of Surveys. He wondered if the last paragraph would be Item 5.

Mr. Cleland replied that it would not be Item 5 but just a paragraph at the end.

Mr. Shrivastava read out the last statement in Section 5.5 and commented that it already exists. He wondered if it was not just being repeated. However, the word timely had been inserted.

Mr. Cleland replied that there does appear to be some repetition but the last paragraph is just in closing and the timely manner portion of it is different from the introductory paragraph.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Ravi Shrivastava, seconded by Mr. Rob Cream, that “It is the responsibility of the Alberta Land Surveyor to resolve such conflicts objectively by considering the following:” be removed and replaced with “It is the responsibility of the Alberta Land Surveyor to resolve such conflicts objectively, in a timely fashion, by considering the following:” and “Positional conflicts between Alberta Land Surveyors shall be resolved in a timely manner.” be removed.

Amendment Withdrawn

Mr. Mark Sutter wondered if the sentence highlighted in red would be removed once it was adjusted with Mr. Shrivastava’s proposed amendment.

Mr. Steven Van Berkel commented that the amendment changes the recommendation entirely as the positional conflicts being addressed now are those arising from plan dimensions, monuments on the ground or other sources. They are talking about resolving those conflicts in a timely fashion. However, they had been talking about conflicts between Alberta Land Surveyors.

Mr. Alan Main rose on a point of order. He pointed out that just the section in red was up for debate.

Mr. Clealand confirmed that that was the committee’s intent.
President Al Jamieson informed the assembly that they cannot deal with anything other than what is in red.

Mr. Shrivastava responded that his intent for the amendment was to introduce the wording “in a timely fashion.” He was pleased with “in a timely manner” so he withdrew his amendment.

In speaking to the original motion, Mr. Curtis Henrie commented that resolving positional conflicts between Alberta Land Surveyors in a timely manner is completely out of their hands. They can discuss the issues but the resolution is in the hands of the Director of Surveys or a judge. They need to try to do them in a timely manner but to legislate it when it is beyond their control is inappropriate.

Mr. Ken Allred wondered if the committee had considered adding “or to the Director of Surveys under Section 9 of the Surveys Act” to Item 4.

Mr. Cleland replied that it was not considered.

Mr. Allred wondered if they agreed that it is another option. It should be the first option prior to referring it to the court.

Mr. Cleland agreed that it would be an option. However, that portion of 5.5 was not being considered in the recommendation.

Mr. Allred suggested that maybe the committee should consider it next year, even though he agrees that Section 9 seems to be inoperative.

Mr. Bruce Clark spoke against the motion. They are trying to put something into the Manual of Standard Practice that is redundant. They cannot legislate common sense and there is no way they can enforce it. They do not know what is meant by “a timely fashion.” They know they are not supposed to double monument but it still happens.

Mr. Scott Westlund spoke in favour of the motion. About fifty percent of the Boundary Panel cases have involved double monumentation. On three recent Continuing Competency Review files, he noticed that the plan he was checking was actually correct but there were errors on other plans. When he contacted the Alberta Land Surveyor doing the most recent plan and asked if they had contacted the Alberta Land Surveyor who had made an error, all
three of them said they had not. He agrees that it is common sense but it is not being done. They are not discussing double monumentation, they are intentionally double monumenting and they are not resolving conflicts.

Mr. David McArthur spoke against the motion. The motion says to him that it is kind of okay to double monument. He suggested that “needs to be avoided” should be revised to “shall be avoided.” They are causing confusion and boundary ambiguities. If they double monument, it affects the public and fellow Alberta Land Surveyors. It should be avoided and dealt with up front. Sometimes there are timely issues that they have to deal with but they need to avoid it at all costs.

**AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Dave McArthur, seconded by Mr. Scott Partridge, that “Due to potential public confusion double monumentation needs to be avoided.” be removed and replaced with “Due to potential public confusion double monumentation shall be avoided.”**

*Amendment Carried*

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. McArthur reiterated that it must be avoided at all costs to avoid public confusion and boundary uncertainties caused by it. He likes the wording “in a timely manner” and it should be resolved in a reasonable length of time.

In speaking to the main motion as amended, Mr. Steven Van Berkel pointed out that they refer to positional conflicts in the first paragraph but he does not think that it is a positional conflict between Alberta Land Surveyors. It is a disagreement.

**AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Steven Van Berkel, seconded by Mr. Marty Robinson, that “Positional conflicts between Alberta Land Surveyors shall be resolved in a timely manner.” be removed and replaced with “Disagreements between Alberta Land Surveyors shall be resolved in a timely manner.”**

*Amendment Defeated*

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Scott Partridge commented that they are really not talking about disagreements but they are talking about conflicts. He suggested that a friendly amendment should be made that would indicate that the resolution of conflicts between Alberta Land Surveyors shall be initiated in a timely manner. When he was
on the Practice Review Board and tried to write the Interpretive Bulletin, they really struggled with it. If it is changed, as he suggested, it would address everything.

Mr. Van Berkel did not consider it a friendly amendment.

Mr. Irwin Natt wondered what would happen if he found original rust holes and if he would not be allowed to put a double monumentation there, even if it was the original evidence.

Mr. Jamieson responded that he would not consider it double monumentation.

Mr. Natt wondered if someone had already put a post in would he not be allowed to put in a post to preserve the survey evidence.

Mr. Mark Woychuk spoke against the amendment as “disagreements” is too overarching. The section specifically refers to retracement, restoration and re-establishment.

In speaking to the original amended motion, Mr. Hugo Engler commented that the last paragraph in red is not really part of the other five points. It is a summary and it is good the way it is now.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Mark Woychuk seconded by Mr. Jonathan Tingley, that Positional conflicts” be removed and replaced with “Double monumentation.”

Amendment Defeated

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Jacques Dupuis pointed out that the first sentence in the last paragraph says that “double monumentation shall be avoided.” He wondered how they could have a conflict if they have avoided it. The last sentence contradicts the sentence before it.

Mr. Horatiu Caraba commented that for two years in a row now they have tried to include the words “timely manner” in the Manual of Standard Practice and it was defeated last year. As a professional, if you are the last one to respond to something when you compare yourself to all of the other professionals, then you are not doing something right. He spoke against the motion as they should all know that they need to do things in a timely manner and resolve things in a timely manner so it does not need to be added to the Manual of Standard Practice.
MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED
Retracement, Restoration and Re-Establishment
5.5 Conflicting Evidence
Positional conflicts arising from plan dimensions, monuments on the ground, or other sources are not uncommon in conducting retracement surveys. It is the responsibility of the Alberta Land Surveyor to resolve such conflicts objectively by considering the following:

1. Property lines established on a registered Subdivision Plan or original Township Plan cannot be altered by subsequent plans, although re-subdivision can be used to effect new boundaries between consenting owners.

2. Given ambiguity or conflict within a single plan, the “intent” of the original survey should guide the Surveyor in effecting re-establishment.

3. The advice of the Director of Surveys, experienced Surveyors, or the original Surveyor should be sought in difficult cases.

4. If a boundary conflict cannot be resolved by the Surveyor, the Surveyor should consider referring the matter to the ALSA Boundary Panel before resorting to the Provincial Court or the Court of Queen’s Bench. The Surveyor may be treated as an expert witness by each of these bodies.

Due to potential public confusion double monumentation shall be avoided. Positional conflicts between Alberta Land Surveyors shall be resolved in a timely manner.

Main Motion as Amended Defeated

It was MOVED by Mr. Ian Cleland, seconded by Mr. Kris Ritchie, that Part D, Section 5 of the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:
(see Appendix E, Page 142)

Motion Carried

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Cleland informed the assembly that the motion deals with Part D Section 5 on public land dispositions. The main intent is, because of the change in the Alberta Energy Regulator and Environment and Sustainable Resource Development regulators and the different disposition names that came out of that, they were trying to make it more generic when it refers to disposition
names. He reviewed each section that they were proposing to change.

In speaking as a member and not as the Director of Surveys, Mr. Ravi Shrivastava commented that the motion indicates that the lines in Section 5.8 are to be removed but the second paragraph that follows refers to the “above cited document.”

Mr. Cleland responded that it was cited at the beginning of Part D Section 5 as opposed to at the beginning of Section 5.8 so it is cited above and the name is consistent with the name in Part D Section 5.

Mr. Shrivastava responded that he just wanted to point it out but he has no concerns otherwise.

It was MOVED by Mr. Ian Cleland, seconded by Mr. David Hagen, that Part D, Section 5.12 be added to the Manual of Standard Practice as follows:

**Recommendation #5**  
**Statutory Declarations**  
(see Appendix E for rationale document)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wellsites and Public Land Dispositions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.12 Statutory Declaration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This section refers to the Alberta Land Surveyor’s statutory declaration form described in the Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development - Enhanced Approval Process Manual, section 14.0 Final Submission. This form can be found at the link below, under Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) related forms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://esrd.alberta.ca/forms-maps-services/forms/lands-forms/aer-related-forms/default.aspx">http://esrd.alberta.ca/forms-maps-services/forms/lands-forms/aer-related-forms/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before signing a statutory declaration an Alberta Land Surveyor shall confirm in the field that all the facilities were entirely constructed within the survey boundaries as represented on the disposition Plan of Survey on file with ESRD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The verification performed in the field shall be documented in field notes according to Part C, Section 6 of this manual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motion Carried**

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Ian Cleland pointed out that the recommendation is to add a Part D Section 5.12 to the Manual of Standard Practice dealing with the statutory declarations. Council had added it to the Standards Commit-
tee’s terms of reference. The problem is the need to review the application of the statutory declaration. One of the concerns with pipeline access dispositions is the process in the field to confirm that the pipeline has being constructed entirely within the boundaries. It also extends to any statutory declarations submitted under the enhanced approval process. It was thought that adding the proposed section to the Manual of Standard Practice describing the standard of practice would help solve the problem and provide clarity to the members and the industry regarding the standard of practice for the statutory declarations. The Director of Surveys and the manager of the Alberta Energy Regulator for Public Lands were consulted during the creation of the recommendation. The public would benefit by knowing that it is the standard and then members of the Association in discussion with industry would not be providing different answers as to how the statutory declarations would be prepared.

Mr. Jim MacLeod spoke against the recommendation as it is too broad in nature. The initial intent was to have field surveys or as-built plans completed on all pipeline access dispositions that would ensure that the buried pipe was fully within the survey disposition. It also has major safety concerns.

*AMENDMENT MOVED* by Mr. Jim MacLeod, seconded by Mr. David Marquardt, that “Before signing a statutory declaration an Alberta Land Surveyor shall confirm in the field that all the facilities were entirely constructed within the survey boundaries as represented on the disposition Plan of Survey on file with ESRD.” be removed and replaced with “Before signing a statutory declaration for a pipeline disposition an Alberta Land Surveyor shall confirm in the field that all the facilities were entirely constructed within the survey boundaries as represented on the disposition Plan of Survey on file with ESRD.

Amendment Defeated

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Ian Cleland suggested that PLA should be revised to pipeline disposition as the previous recommendation was trying to remove acronyms from the Manual of Standard Practice.

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Reid Egger wondered if the intent of the amendment was to also include pipeline installation leases.
Mr. MacLeod responded that they were just thinking about pipeline dispositions, not pipeline installation leases but they could be included. Their main concern is the dispositions of mineral surface leases and licenses of occupation. In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Michael Thompson expressed concern with including pipeline dispositions. He works on many waterlines and they are DPL plans and often they are bored under rivers. After construction is gone, he has no way of verifying where the pipe is and whether it is within the disposition crossing the river or not. It would create some liability.

Mr. Steven Van Berkel spoke against the proposed amendment as it eliminates mineral surface leases and licenses of occupation. They have to address in some way how they deal with them. It is a significant product that they now prepare and they are relied upon to sign it. There are no standards but it was a start. The document is deficient in ways but it is up to them as Alberta Land Surveyors to indicate the standards. It is not just important for pipelines but also wellsites. They could use aerial photography but he disagrees with that. Everything they do with remote sensing has to be field verified and this should not be any different.

Mr. Joe Longo spoke in favour of the amendment as buried facilities are a major safety concern. To get them as-built plans so they know where the pipes are helps both other surveyors and construction personnel in the field. Since it was given to the Standards Committee, there have been changes it seems to talk about final surveys under the enhanced approval process. In September of last year another document came from government dealing with the renewal process. Under the enhanced approval process they deal with MSLs, PLAs, PILs, LOCs and a few others. Under the 25-year renewal process under the Alberta Energy Regulator they deal with MSLs, LOC, MILs, PILs. PLAs are exempt from it as they are given a blanket indefinite lifespan. Under Environment and Sustainable Resource Development it will also include DMSs, DLOs, DPLs, EZEs, which affect municipal governments, forestry companies, and powerline companies. He is a bit concerned after hearing what Mr. Shrivastava had to say just after lunch and wondered if they were truly meeting with all stakeholders to ensure they are not stepping on others toes and are getting their input before they say that for all statutory declarations, regardless of what it is for, Alberta Land Surveyors need to go to the field. He entirely agrees with PLAs. It is
a must and they should start with that and if future changes are required they can be addressed at future annual general meetings.

Mr. Partridge spoke in favour of the amendment because as an Alberta Land Surveyor it is up to him to judge what tools and results he needs to solve a problem. For some declarations he would be comfortable reviewing the remote sensing data and then making the decision but that is his choice and he would have the option of doing a field survey or not. If it is for a pipeline they have to do it. For other dispositions it should be left to their discretion as professionals. It does not preclude him from doing field surveys on other matters; it just allows him to make the choice.

Mr. Reid Egger spoke against the amendment. He concurred with what Mr. Van Berkel said about it.

Mr. David Marquardt commented that, in 1990, 25 years ago, they had about 4,000 to 6,000 dispositions. Over the next seven years, between 1990 and 1997, things started to get really busy. There may be 10,000 to 15,000 dispositions. It is a huge amount of work that the resource companies will have to swallow if they have to update all of the dispositions to the new standards. They should just take it one step at a time. They know for certain that pipelines are an issue and that is why he seconded the amendment.

Mr. Ken Allred commented that he and the Association have been lobbying for fifteen years to get accurate records of buried facilities. To suggest that they do not need to know where a pipeline is buried before they do a pipeline disposition is entirely contrary to what they have been lobbying for. Part of their argument was that by having accurate surveys of the right-of-way they have a guarantee of where the pipeline is. They have gone further than that to say that they actually have to locate the pipe before it is buried. There has been a strong lobby amongst various associations and he personally introduced a private members motion in the legislature to have buried facilities located. They have to do it and it is their professional responsibility to locate such things.

Mr. Steven Van Berkel commented that they are dealing with 25-year old renewals and are suggesting that they can use remote sensing. The 25-year renewals were never geo-referenced. All they would be doing is rotating the line work to an aerial photo and he does not agree that it is a proper technique to satisfy a professional so they can sign
He agreed that it is hard on the stakeholders but it was not a decision by Alberta Land Surveyors. It came from government and it is not up to Alberta Land Surveyors to say whether the stakeholders should be doing it. It is up to Alberta Land Surveyors to say that if they are doing it this is how they should be doing it to do it right.

Mr. Wayne Savoury spoke in favour of the amendment if it were to include pipeline and powerline dispositions. Powerlines are everywhere and they need to have any that are buried properly accounted for.

**AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT MOVED** by Mr. Wayne Savoury, seconded by Mr. Jim MacLeod, that “Before signing a statutory declaration for a pipeline disposition an Alberta Land Surveyor shall confirm in the field that all the facilities were entirely constructed within the survey boundaries as represented on the disposition Plan of Survey on file with ESRD.” be removed and replaced with “Before signing a statutory declaration for pipeline and power line dispositions an Alberta Land Surveyor shall confirm in the field that all the facilities were entirely constructed within the survey boundaries as represented on the disposition Plan of Survey on file with ESRD.

**Amendment Defeated**

Mr. Joe Longo spoke in favour of the amendment. It would be good to include powerlines as they are above ground but they are also buried. They are professionals and should be able to use their professional opinion and innovative solutions. If he does not feel comfortable with it as a professional he is not going to sign the statutory declaration. The public expects land surveyors to be innovative and there are other ways. They could use LiDAR or a remote sensing tool and they owe it to the public to be innovative. They also have to ask themselves “are we relevant?” They could easily be replaced if it seems too self-serving to the public.

Mr. Hugo Engler wondered if the intent of the amendment was for it to be only underground powerlines. If above ground powerlines are included it would completely change the proposal.

Mr. Savoury replied that it would include above ground powerlines as well. He believes it would be much more difficult to remotely sense with purchased LiDAR or aerial photography whether the powerlines have been constructed or not. He confirmed that it would be for both above ground and underground powerlines.
Mr. Nicholas Madarash spoke against the amendment. Their company uses imagery but often it is from the fall of 2012. He wondered how they would know, if they were going to sign off on something that was three years old, that nothing had changed since then. Unless they have extremely recent aerial photography, he does not see how they could sign the statutory declaration saying nothing has been constructed outside of the boundaries, if they are looking three years into the past.

Mr. Kevin Swabey spoke against the amendment. The reason for the statutory declaration is so that they would have to go and do a field visit. If government was willing to change the requirement, then he would be willing to change what he thinks they need to do. Based on the way they interpret the requirement, they need to leave it open for all dispositions. It seems that there is some confusion and different ways of reading what the government’s requirements are. Unless they lump all of them into one requirement they are going to have this disagreement and they are going to have people feeling like they are living by different rules. He is fine with considering it in the future. However, it needs to include all dispositions for now.

Mr. Mark Sutter pointed out that in the committee’s rationale they refer only to pipeline access right-of-ways and indicated who had been consulted but with what is being proposed it is now more than PLAs. He wondered if those who were consulted were also consulted on all of the other dispositions that the motion is trying to eliminate.

Mr. Ian Cleland responded that in terms of PLAs and their discussions with the Albert Energy Regulator he believes that the main focus was PLAs. The Director of Surveys did provide some feedback on the statutory declarations and it was his understanding that it was applying to all statutory declarations signed under the enhanced approval process.

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava, Director of Surveys commented that the intent of the amendment for the statutory declaration was for it to be a ticket to insurance. It is one document and one piece of insurance. He says that surveyors are required to survey because he can fall back on them and hold them accountable. It gives him, Environment and Sustainable Resource Development and other disposition holders assurances that what they say exists and nothing else. He suggested adding another line that would say that no adjoining disposition is encroaching upon the boundary as that issue
is still not resolved. By making it only for a limited one they are compromising the generality of the statutory declaration. He requested that it be given consideration. The amendment is diluting the purpose. A statutory declaration is a sole undertaking by the surveyor. It is insurance to the crown and disposition holder. Therefore, it should apply to all dispositions.

In speaking to the original motion, Mr. Jim MacLeod spoke against the recommendation. It is too broad in scope and is not just for PLAs, which was the initial intent. Imposing a field visit on all dispositions is not acting in the best interest of the clients. There is an expectation from the clients that as the stewards and gatekeepers of the Alberta survey fabric they will use all processes, mechanisms and facilities available to them. In determining what was constructed, they should not only consider a field survey but also utilize other mechanisms like remote sensing and whatever techniques they feel are appropriate as an Alberta Land Surveyor. The costs, if they have to send a field crew out on all of the dispositions, would be incredibly substantial. The Director of Surveys talked numerous times about costs and timeliness. They have done some generic numbers on the 1990 dispositions and they were about $50,000,000 and that was just to send a truck out on every disposition. If they use a bit of a hybrid, as 25 to 30 percent of the dispositions are quite easily determined, the costs would then be about $30,000,000. The client would also have documentation costs for land companies and it is a big deal. As mentioned, dispositions from 1997 are going to be twice that much, maybe more. They saw the graphs showing the costs for posts in 2004 and it was twice that. The oil and gas companies and clients in general have many good people who know the mechanisms available to Alberta Land Surveyors and they expect Alberta Land Surveyors to use all of those things. There could be push back. He is not just trying to sensationalize it and be alarming. He has heard comments that they are only making buckets of money now, not barrels and it is a concern. He feels that there could be push back and he thinks there will be. It is the first year of 25 years. They should take a year, get a committee together and discuss it with the Alberta Energy Regulator and the Director of Surveys and find out exactly what they need. There was a comment about adjoining dispositions and how, if they redefine some of the dispositions, they need to make sure that they are not creating overlaps and gaps between adjoining dispositions. The committee could bring it back to the membership next year.
Mr. David Marquardt did not think that the resource industry was consulted. He does not want to give the impression to his clients that, through legislation, they are actually creating work for themselves. It would not be a good idea and would not go over well with them. If they just look at 1990 and the $30,000,000 worth of work for new dispositions, by the time they get up to 1997 who knows how much it is going to be. It would create a negative feeling regarding what clients think Alberta Land Surveyors are actually doing. The talks should be between Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers or the resource industry and the government. Alberta Land Surveyors should just be on the sidelines monitoring what they can do to make the government’s recommendations work and make the client’s costs compatible. It should be thought about some more. The numbers are going to be huge. By the time seven years rolls around it could be a whole new business just resurveying dispositions. He suggested that the motion should be tabled so they can come up with a plan involving the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, the government and Alberta Land Surveyors.

Mr. Carl Larsen informed the assembly that he was on the subcommittee that came up with the statutory declaration idea. The whole point of it was to save the clients some money and it is doing that but the whole premise behind the statutory declaration was to do a field inspection.

Mr. Sirt Lin commented that he has many clients who seem to think that the statutory declarations are something that he can just sign. Apparently, they do not understand what they are and what they are meant to be. When he tells them what they are and what needs to be done they want to think about it.

Mr. Art Miller commented that he would speak in favour of the recommendation if it was just for new dispositions. For things that are expiring after 25 years and parallel pipelines, it is more of a concern for the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers and the clients themselves to discuss with government.

Mr. Hector Muniz spoke in favour of the motion and pointed out that the first paragraph indicates that it is limited to dispositions under the enhanced approval process manual so he does not think that dispositions that come up for renewal because they are 25 years old are included in it. It is just for statutory declarations related to the dispositions...
under the enhanced approval process manual. The Director of Surveys should clarify if the dispositions for renewals that are 25 years old would be included. The statutory declarations refer to the dispositions under the enhanced approval process that started in 2011. The short-term dispositions only last four years so they were supposed to start being confirmed in 2015. It is his understanding that that is where all of these started.

Mr. Al Jamieson informed the assembly that if it is in the Manual of Standard Practice it is not up to the Director of Surveys to interpret it for Alberta Land Surveyors as he is strictly the regulatory approving authority.

Mr. Muniz read out the first half of the first paragraph of the proposed Section 5.12. He commented that it does not make sense if it is referring to older dispositions.

Mr. Jamieson asked Mr. Cleland if it would be for all dispositions that they sign a statutory declaration for.

Mr. Ian Cleland responded that the original recommendation only dealt with the short-term to long-term statutory declarations for that renewal process. In that time, the 25-year renewal has become more prevalent. It is being mixed up as it uses the same statutory declaration. He believed the original intent was to deal with the new dispositions that were being converted from short term to long term. It is the same statutory declaration and that is why those renewals are being brought into it.

Mr. Brian Ross commented that as a professional he could not sign a statutory declaration without a field visit. Maybe someone else thinks they can. If they disagree there is the discipline process. The bigger picture is that it is a huge expense on industry. For the long-term dispositions they need to find a way, with government, to do them so they do not require a $50,000 field trip. If they do not do it, industry is going to find a way to do it without Alberta Land Surveyors as it is all about the costs for them. Some of them are just ignoring the renewals because of the costs of the survey and the application process to get the renewal in place.

Mr. Jeff Johnston spoke against the recommendation. As a professional they should have the ability to choose how they perform their surveys, what technology they use and how they go about their work rather than having it described to them in the Manual that they shall do a field
inspection. If they are willing to sign the statutory declaration they are the ones putting their necks on the line. They should be able to use whatever means to gain a comfort level to do it. If they are able to use aerial photos and remote sensing technology for riparian boundaries why could they not use it for something like this. It is a bit limiting the way it currently stands. It should be left up to the discretion of the professional as to whether they choose to do a field visit or not.

The meeting was recessed until 9:00 am on Saturday morning.

After bringing the meeting back to order, President Al Jamieison ask Registrar Rosalind Broderick to come to the podium to conduct the election and asked all the Council members to step down from the head table for the elections.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick appointed new members Rob Cream, Dallas Kuzek, Rudy Ng and Amy Spiers as scrutineers.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick 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 as well as in the AGM committee reports and recommendations package.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick stated that the Nominating Committee put forward the name of Greg Boggs for the position of President of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2015-2016.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick asked if there were any further nominations for the position of president for 2015-2016.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Ken Allred, seconded by Mr. David Hagen, that nominations for the position of president cease.*

*Motion Carried*

The assembly congratulated Mr. Greg Boggs on his election as the 2015-2016 president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the name of John Byrne for the position of vice-president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2015-2016.
Ms. Rosalind Broderick asked if there were any nominations from the floor for the position of vice-president for 2015-2016.

Mr. Ross Woolgar nominated Mr. Fred Cheng for the position of vice-president. The nomination was seconded by Mr. Hugo Engler.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick asked if Mr. Fred Cheng consented to his name being put forward. Mr. Fred Cheng responded that he did.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Ken Allred, seconded by Ms. Ashley Robertson, that nominations for the position of vice-president cease.*

*Motion Carried*

Ms. Rosalind Broderick invited Mr. John Byrne and Mr. Fred Cheng to the podium to address the assembly.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the names of Brian Ball, Carl Larsen, Irwin Natt and Scott Partridge for the three positions of councillor.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick asked if there were any nominations from the floor for the position of councillor for 2015-2016.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Allan Main, seconded by Mr. Kevin Grover, that nominations for the position of councillor cease.*

*Motion Carried*

Ms. Rosalind Broderick reminded the membership of the change to the bylaws last year. The person who receives the most votes in the election will be elected to a three-year term. The land surveyors with the second and third most votes will be elected to a two-year term.

The candidates for councillor were invited to make a short presentation to the membership.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick confirmed that all of the honorary life members and active members had a ballot. The scrutineers were asked to collect the ballots and accompany Ms. Rosalind Broderick to count the ballots.

President Al Jamieson thanked Ms. Rosalind Broderick and congratulated everyone who put their name forward. He also congratulated Past-President Rob Scott and his
Nominating Committee on putting together such a great slate of candidates.

President Al Jamieson informed the assembly that Mr. Les Frederick and the Historical & Biographical Committee had arranged a panel discussion about how land surveying used to be and some of the things that new members may want to watch out for. Mr. Chris Tucker hosted the panel that consisted of Messrs. Ken Allred, Bernie McKenna, Larry Pals and Garry Schirrmacher.

President Al Jamieson asked Registrar Rosalind Broderick to provide the election results.

Ms. Rosalind Broderick announced that Mr. Fred Cheng was the new vice-president. Mr. Carl Larsen was elected to a three-year term as councillor and Messrs. Brian Ball and Scott Partridge had been elected to two-year terms as councillors. She thanked everyone who had put their name forward.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Rob Cream, seconded by Mr. Rudy Ng, that the ballots be destroyed.*

**Motion Carried**

President Al Jamieson introduced the staff of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

President Al Jamieson informed the assembly that last year, Council established the Future Committee to identify key areas where the ALSA needs to lead based on what we think we know about society today and the current state of surveying in the world generally and in Alberta in particular. He asked Future Committee Chair, Ms. Connie Petersen to come forward to present the Future Committee’s report.

Ms. Connie Petersen presented the following report to the assembly:

In March of last year, Council held an off-site meeting and invited the candidates who were running for Council, the Director of Surveys and the Surveyor-General of Canada to attend. A professional facilitator was brought in to help. The purpose of the meeting was to develop a broad understanding of where surveying is going (not just land surveying and not just Alberta) and how we, as an Association, could be more responsive to government and industry in the future. So what came out of that day-long meeting thirteen months ago?
The first thing we did was take a look at what surveying historically has been. Now, for those of us in the profession, there really wasn’t anything new here but it was good to have the discussion and put something in writing. Some of our thoughts included:

- The surveyor is the expert in defining the demarcation of the boundaries.
- Land surveyors see physical evidence; the public sees fences, driveways or road allowances and sidewalks.
- Pins are the old way. We now seem to be moving to something defined by coordinates or some mathematical lines.
- The equipment has changed over time – from chain to transit to GPS to who knows what.
- Land surveyors do not have as much direct dealings with landowners as they once did.
- Educational requirements to become a land surveyor have increased.
- Industry is getting more competitive.
- Field work used to take a lot longer.
- Your work day used to be 8 hours; now the expectation is that you will be available 24/7.
- A cultural shift of homeowners from owning land to owning condos.
- Clients used to appreciate accuracy; now they don’t see the value.
- We live in a do-it-yourself culture today.

So, we took all of these thoughts that we had come up with and asked ourselves the next question, “what do we think we know about the future?” Here are some of our responses:

- Technology will become easier and simpler for the lay person to use.
- The labour force is changing with an aging population and fewer younger workers.
- Government regulations will increase and the requirements for information on products will increase but there will be fewer regulations in terms of process.
- People will have more access to positioning and spatial information. “Open data” is a common phrase used today.
- The land surveyor’s role is changing to focus on the management of data and processes.
- Marking boundaries has moved from land surveyors to technologists to the everyday Joe.
• Fewer “boots on the ground”; more work being done remotely.
• Environmental and safety issues are bigger concerns than they were a few years ago.

This is just a sampling of the comments that were made that day. But, what all of these comments really mean is that land surveyors must strive to be relevant. In many ways, we must reinvent ourselves. We have to realize that, although we are a profession that has been around since ancient times and although we are fortunate enough to have self-governing legislation…there is no guarantee that we will be around for another 100 or 106 years.

There are many examples of industries and professions that either changed or became obsolete. My purpose in saying this is not to scare you. Well, not completely anyways. What I want to emphasize is that we need to embrace the future and try to make things happen as we want to see them happen rather than react and resist to whatever change might come our way.

There we were, sitting in a meeting at the Edmonton Petroleum Club thirteen months ago. We had just spent the better part of the day plastering their walls with bullet points about what surveying historically has been, what are the present challenges to traditional surveying and what do we think we know about the future. What do we do about all of this?

It was late in the day and we needed to find our way forward. Council decided that this was/is a big issue and needed a great deal more discussion and thought. So a committee was formed. We called it the Future Committee and we were given the following single term of reference: “Based on what we think we know about society today and the current state of surveying in the world generally and in Alberta in particular, identify key actions that the ALSA needs to lead in order to get out ahead of clients and government.”

This is what we came up with. This is what the Future Committee has envisioned for the future of this profession and what the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association will be.

The first thing we addressed in our report was not about what we wanted the future to be but what will the public want and expect. If we could get a basic handle on that,
then it would help us drive where surveying and the profession could go in the future.

We believe that landowners will always need to know where their boundaries are and will continue to be concerned about the price of a survey to determine them. They will also continue to want “a one-stop shop” for information. The Future Committee anticipates that the public’s knowledge of concepts such as accuracy and boundary determination will not significantly improve in the future.

There will also be concerns about safety (working in remote areas, placing monuments near buried facilities) and minimizing the surveyor’s environmental footprint. What we have not tried to do here is to say that we need to educate the public or we need to embark on a big public relations campaign. While those things would be nice and it would be great to change the world’s perception of land surveying… there is simply not enough money to turn the land surveying brand into something as recognizable as popular brand names. So we are not going to try to change the public’s view of land surveying but we do want to recognize what their needs and wants are and think about how the profession can deliver that.

This is what we came up with.

The Future Committee expects that all property corners will be governed by coordinates. The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, or its designate, will be the custodians of the data and responsible for collecting, holding, managing and distributing the coordinate information. The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, or its designate, would receive compensation for these services. A coordinate based cadastre will be the foundation to which all other land information will be attached.

A coordinate based cadastre is not a new idea. It was talked about twenty years ago. We had a committee take a look at it and we even tried a pilot project in a couple of urban areas. For one reason or another, the mid-1990s was not the right time. It could be that the early 21st century will be the right time. Our Future Committee does not believe that the public is asking specifically for a coordinate based cadastre. However, the public is not asking for monumented boundaries the way they once were.

Industry, on the other hand, is looking for more data and
information and this has the potential to allow the profession to retain control of that data and provide some form of assuredness about its integrity.

Speaking of data, the Future Committee believes that all registries will be consolidated into one registry. This would make the information easier to access. The public expects to access information more freely and easily. The one registry will be managed by one organization with different entities (including land surveyors, lawyers and others) working collaboratively to manage the receipt, holding and distribution of the data. This would be very similar to British Columbia’s Land Title & Survey Authority model.

Instead of creating a new IT infrastructure for this model, the new authority or the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association (or its designate) will need to work with known experts who can build this structure with existing technologies and platforms. The idea here is that in all walks of life, we are moving away from the physical object, such as the land survey itself, and we as a society are more interested in data and being able to manipulate that data into something else.

If land surveying is changing or going to change – if there is greater reliance on surveying and geomatics and the information derived from that – then perhaps how we are structured as a profession needs to change too.

The Future Committee anticipates a new umbrella act governing six proposed disciplines. Each discipline will have its own regulation. There will be one professional regulatory organization overseeing each of the disciplines. Instead of an act specifically for land surveying, there would be a broader act covering several land related disciplines. There would be a new regulation specifically governing land surveyors and survey technologists.

This harmonized approach to provincial legislation has already been accomplished by the Certified General Accountants, Certified Management Accountants and Certified Accountants here in Alberta under a new act - the Chartered Professional Accountants Act. This is also a model used by health professionals in the province.

Under the new regulation, there would be an updated and modern definition for the “practice of land surveying” to reflect this new umbrella act and regulations and a coordinate based cadastre. There would be a new designation for
professional land surveyors. The new designation could be “professional surveyor (P.Surv.)” or “professional land surveyor (PLS).”

Definitions for “geospatial,” “hydrographic surveys” and the others would be developed in collaboration with the appropriate experts and organizations in those areas.

In the future, with a coordinate based cadastre and a new land information authority in place, there will be opportunities for land surveyors to provide improved and enhanced services and products.

This is perhaps the most contentious part of our report to Council and this idea is certainly not something that would happen right away. This idea of a new act and organization structure, however, recognizes that land surveying and even geomatics is changing and, perhaps, the regulatory structure needs to change as well.

Council has accepted our report. As you can see, our ideas at this point are pretty high-level, broad concepts. Over the next year, Council has asked us to flesh out some of these ideas and work on some of the details.

This could prove to be an interesting and exciting journey and I hope that some of you will be interested enough to join us in taking on this challenge.

I would now like to open up the floor to questions.

Mr. David Hagen applauded the Committee for their work. He commented that the hybrid cadastre is more like Dracula as they can never kill the thing. The coordinate based cadastre basically ignores common law. The whole Surveys Act is based upon and predicated on common law, which goes all the way back to the Magna Carta. For certain applications a coordinate based cadastre is a useful and great tool but for existing boundaries it does not work. Land surveyors are quasi-judicial experts to determine where the boundaries are. Coordinates are on the bottom of the hierarchy of evidence. It sounds like the committee has decided that there is no future in surveying anymore. Anyone can do it so basically land surveyors are obsolete. It is the wrong way to go and he does not think it will work. It was already tried and centuries of common law cannot be overridden. We have the best system in the world right now and are the envy of the world. Yes, we need to prepare for the future but this is suicide.
Mr. Michael Thompson wondered if the committee had looked at the project that was conducted in 2011 and the information pertaining to it.

Ms. Connie Petersen responded that what they had looked at was the report from the previous committee on the coordinate based cadastre from the late nineties. Hal Janes was quite involved in that report. They mentioned that they had done a couple of urban pilot projects. The committee was asked to look forward and have a vision. This may not be the way it ends up but this is what the committee came up with when they started thinking about where things are headed.

Mr. Gord Stark, President of the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors, commented that he thinks what the committee did was quite amazing. We cannot predict the future but he is quite certain that that is how things are going to turn out. Yesterday the discussion included how industry forced the Association’s hand. The public or society imposed that on the survey community. He wondered if the hybrid cadastre is going to be sustainable or if they are going to want a full coordinate based cadastre.

Mr. Hugo Engler commented that he kind of agrees with Mr. David Hagen but not entirely. It is a journey that we are starting on and like the old Chinese saying, every journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step. We have barely taken the first step and there are many more to go. If we do not do it ourselves someone else will force it down our throats and it will not be pretty.

Mr. David Marquardt commented that there is no reason why they cannot live with the present system and embrace the cadastral fabric as well as they deal with different kinds of coordinate systems, including grid coordinates, mapping coordinates, ground coordinates and geographical coordinates. It is stuff they do every day. There is no reason why they cannot live with two different survey systems. British Columbia has several different survey systems. It may be a challenge to deal with the new and the old but it is nothing they cannot handle.

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava complimented and congratulated the Committee for its report. He indicated that he is attending a course and part of his training is what we must want for our clients that they want for themselves. This is what government, the public and industry wants. It is a recipe for success. Congratulations once again and keep it up. He will join in
convincing the government to become partners in the initiative.

Mr. Allan Main wondered if the committee could provide any more insight as to what they were thinking when they say there would be one registry and whether that is simply Land Titles, plus coordinates, plus land registry. He wondered what it would all include.

Ms. Connie Petersen responded that it would include the Land Titles Office, the Metis Lands Settlement Registry, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development and having all of that information available in one source.

Mr. Marty Robinson asked Ms. Petersen to comment more on the umbrella act. He assumes the committee received information from the government on it. He wondered when it may be in place.

Ms. Petersen responded that they did not consult any outside agencies as they were asked to give their vision. With the umbrella act, they looked at what happened with the accountants and health professionals. They predicted that it may be something that the government may be looking at doing as a model. The committee then looked at all of the different disciplines that deal with land. The geospatial, the hydrographic and the engineering surveys do not have anything formal in place at this time. Of course land surveying does. The land agents have regulations and acts. There were six that the committee felt dealt with land pretty much on a daily basis.

Mr. Dave Thomson commended the committee for doing a really good job. They created a vision and we have to buy into that vision. Without a vision we are doomed to run around in circles. With a vision there is direction and if we all buy into it and I hope we do as I really like the picture that was painted.

Mr. Ross Metcalfe pointed out that Ms. Petersen had mentioned the public briefly but it had been brushed over. Our business is to protect the public. He deals with individuals, not oil giants. These people are our next-door neighbours and you have to explain the difference between a descriptive plan and a plan of survey to them. There was no mention in the report of educating the public. The public is one of the primary people we deal with when we are working on the vision. He wondered if we do not work with them, how we are protecting them.
Ms. Connie Petersen responded that it was not the Committee’s intent to gloss over educating the public one on one but they do not want to undertake a big advertising campaign to try to educate the public about what land surveyors do but the one on one education should continue.

Mr. Carl Larsen commented that when he first became a member of the Future Committee he was resistant to the coordinate based cadastre but when you start looking at the trends and some of the international associations you can fight it all you want but that is the way it is going to go. Part of it is due to the technology and part of it is due to the public. We do not know how fast it is going to go but we are not going to lose our jobs and will still have a role. There is still going to be value in the coordinates. The accuracy may be a little lower but if we do it now we can define it, create more jobs for ourselves and have a bigger say.

Mr. Pat Moloney commented that he has had the opportunity to work internationally the last few years and he worked in a jurisdiction that had a hybrid cadastre. It really is not the scary monster they may think, it is a very functional system and it is the way of the future. Darwin said it is not the strongest species that survives but the one that is the most able to adapt.

Ms. Petersen thanked the members of the Future Committee.

President Al Jamieson thanked Ms. Petersen for her presentation. He informed the assembly that if they would like to be a part of the Future Committee, they can sign up by filling out the form in the AGM reports and recommendations package.

President Al Jamieson asked Mr. Darryl Larson, vice-president of ASSMT, to come forward and provide an update on their activities.

Mr. Darryl Larson addressed the assembly as follows:
Good morning. I forgot my name tag today but I did check my driver’s license and that is still who I am.

I am here to talk about ASSMT and the activities we have had to date. As many of you are aware, we have gone through RST and some changes. Listening, it is a tough act to follow this morning with the Future Committee and the fellows who were up here earlier. I started at Stewart Weir, Stewart, Watson, Heinrich & Dixon in 1979. Charlie Weir
brought me in and I worked for pretty much all of them, except for Mr. Stewart of course. A couple of years of public works before that and seen a lot of change personally from the old four door cars and the transit and the chain to what you are talking about here today and the changing of the guard if you will. There is a lot that is to change but at the end of the day it has always been his experience that it is the people who are involved in the survey industry who are the true professionals and the expertise lies there and the licensing of that knowledge to the public is probably perhaps one of the answers that you will face.

Anyways back from the soap box. So ASSMT has been around for a while. It was a pleasure today and yesterday sitting beside Garry Schirrmacher for he was one of the founders back in the seventies. I think it was 1970. The mission statement is effectively to provide the knowledge and skills and proficiencies and I think we can all understand the importance of that.

We are facing an AGM ourselves at the end of May. It is going to be in Canmore. All of you are welcome to attend. One of the primary motions of course will be to take the syllabi that was initially developed back in the AAMIC (ALSA ASSMT MOU Implementation Committee) and then taken and refined under our RST. We are going to be promoting that to the membership this year for adoption. Fundamentally, if you examine the syllabi you will find that it is a conglomeration but effectively what it will do is allow a challenging process that will give you an educational equivalent of what you would come out of an applied degree at NAIT or SAIT, the University of Lethbridge and what not. It is focused on Alberta.

We have about 250 members. It has gone up and down over the years. It offers certification in four primary areas today and that is the technician, the senior, the technologist and the senior technologist. Various disciplines, cadastral certainly is the prominent one. We received applications for 26 applicants. They go through a certification process. The Panel of Examiners takes a look at their educational requirements or achievements as well as a Certification Board that looks at affidavits and character references and experiences and things of that nature. We also have a technician-in-training program and student categories. This year we took in 11 students and they typically come from NAIT, SAIT and what not.
We have a couple of advisory positions. One is always appointed by the ALSA Council and this year it was Lesley Sick. Thank you Lesley. There is another one that our bylaws allow ASSMT to nominate. Typically the last handful of years Tim Harding has been the volunteer on that and we appreciate the role that he served and the mentor that he has provided. We are probably going to be talking about the formation of a joint subcommittee with the land surveyors to address the evolving context and to recruit volunteers onto critical endeavors and Connie has raised a few today. This is intended as a means to encourage evolution and to change practices and be flexible and nimble enough to adapt to industry needs. I guess I did not come up with anything new from what we have heard here this morning.

The Education Committee is certainly one of the committees that is going to be going there. It is a challenging position to be in. I sat as a dean a lifetime ago. It has evolved now, particularly with the panel of examination and the syllabi and the RST thrust. We certainly need to have a strong committee there for the review and maintenance and enhancement of the syllabi because it is a living document as we know.

And of course the Getting it Right seminar. That was handed off to ASSMT a couple of years ago, if I am correct. It has spun its wheels. I was fortunate yesterday to sit with Ross at the Eclipse table. It is something that we need to re-initiate. There is some thought around the table that perhaps some of the context is perhaps outdated. My experience is that good practices probably do not get outdated but maybe the tools that we do use change over time. Nonetheless, we need to develop some context here and get a seminar back underway, probably along the lines of an online or blended course that will allow flexibility for staff, no matter where they may be or where they may be housed in order to learn those practices, probably as many of you here have learned. And that was short and sweet. I was told I had five minutes. Maybe I overran. Thank you. And if you have any questions?

President Al Jamieson thanked Mr. Darryl Larson for speaking to the membership today and commented that the ALSA has always enjoyed a close relationship with ASSMT and we certainly look forward to that continuing as work on the RST regulation continues.
President Al Jamieson informed the assembly that there is time on the agenda for open forum. It is their chance to speak on any subject or issue that concerns them and provides the opportunity to report on something, ask a question, get feedback from the membership or encourage people to join their committee. He noted that open forum is still being recorded.

Mr. Bob Wallace commented that he would like to put on his Registration Committee hat and make a couple of comments regarding the process and the way the articling pupils are handling the process right now. He would like to give a bit of advice to those who have articling students and to the articling students themselves. He sits on qualifying exams and marks reports. He requested that articling students and principals look at the reports before submitting them. There should be no acronyms unless they are established in the report. If the report says four pages, do not send eight. It is simple. The land surveyor should read the report for the student and make sure it makes sense and looks professional. The reports should come in much better shape than they do. It seems that the articulated pupils can get through the exams and to the qualifying exams without doing much surveying but it is evident by the way that they handle some of the surveying specific questions, students need to get their field work done and principals need to ensure their students have the ability to get out and do some re-establishment work so they understand the notation and process. It is really easy to fill in the report at the end of the year but when it comes to the qualifying exam and the student is asked to do a re-establishment they have a blank look on their face. What is the Committee supposed to do when the student has not been out in the field and has not done a re-establishment. Principals need to take more care to ensure their pupils are more prepared and have the experience when they move towards the qualifying exam.

Mr. Greg Illchuk responded that he had his articled student present a project report, which he believes met the requirements. It was four pages. The comments from the Registration Committee floored him. There were questions being asked that were to be added to the report on stuff that was not in the project. The report that went back was eight pages. The standards seem to have changed and the articling students were not informed of them.

Mr. Vince Ziegler commented that he is one of the directors of the JH Holloway Scholarship Foundation. He thanked
everyone who had contributed to the silent auction and live auction the night before. The Foundation awards over $10,000 in scholarships each year and $6,000 to $8,000 was raised.

Mr. Jason Deschamps introduced his articling pupil Drew Stodalka.

Mr. John Byrne commented that he gets the feeling that the Registration Committee sees many people who are great surveyors but not necessarily great land surveyors. The Future Committee may want to think about what other brains the profession might need to have. There is no need for lots of staff to be professional land surveyors. There are great construction people and control people and there is a place for them in the profession. They do not all need to be land surveyors and it really needs to be considered going forward.

Mr. David Marquardt indicated that he had a comment regarding natural boundaries and Ravi Shrivastava may want to speak to it. Having done a number of these very unique types of surveys on a number of rivers, it seems that he is always coming up against a brick wall when they are put before government. Government seems to be very enamored with Section 3 of the Public Lands Act stating that when the terrain takes on the characteristics of bed and shore, then that particular land reverts to the crown. Often times it is a distinct difference from what they understand to be the legal boundary of the bank. In terms of flood times, they were always taught that floods do not change the position of the legal boundary. Yet the Public Lands Act states that if a flood comes through and the characteristics of the terrain are changed for the bed and shore then that land is destined for the crown. There is a bit of a disconnect and he is always having trouble with the water boundaries branch in determining it. To the point that for a recent project, someone acting on behalf of the government told the land owners in Bragg Creek that they had lost land due to the floods of 2013. As a senior advisor on the project to one of their junior land surveyors he had an issue with it and had to inform them that they cannot really lose land as a result of the flood as the legal boundary does not change. Yet, they approached landowners in this particular area with regards to Section 3 of the Public Lands Act and said that if it takes on the characteristics of the bed and shore it belongs to the crown.

President Al Jamieson responded that it sounds like a good topic for a seminar.

Mr. Ryan Pals indicated that he had a question for the Direc-
tor of Surveys. He wondered what the plan was for control as ASCMs are being lost like crazy and nothing is going back in. It is a big problem and he wondered what the plans were for it in the future.

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava responded that the does not have a tailor-made answer ready for the question but he does know that it is one of the issues he has identified. Where it falls in priority he does not know as of yet but he will pass it on and try to explore what must be done in this case.

President Al Jamieson thanked the sponsors who supported the AGM.

Mr. Shrivastava informed the assembly that he was responding to the earlier question about Section 3. He indicated that he knows it is a long topic but he will not take too much time. It is important to realize that as surveyors they know riparian rights and riparian rights are an outcome of the common law decisions of the court decisions. On top of riparian rights, there are also statutory laws. Surveyors often understand riparian rights very well but they tend to not understand the other rights. For example, these rights are subject to many other acts, starting with the Northwest Irrigation Act and federal, provincial and other statutes. Section 3 is also subject to another set of laws called the Water Act. Riparian rights say that if flooding takes place, the boundary gets fixed. So the boundary gets fixed under riparian rights but if the water continues to flow for a period of time causing natural banks, under the Water Act the Crown can make a claim for that land and such situations do occur. The Director of Surveys said that his recommendation is that surveyors need to understand these laws. He recommended a one-day workshop to try to understand and maybe empower themselves to become experts in the boundary laws.

Paddy Marshall, Chair of the Registration Committee thanked the assembly for their comments in the morning. The Registration Committee always appreciates feedback.

Mr. Wallace said exactly what the Committee looks for. If you get comments back that you do not think are appropriate, please let the committee know. The best thing is communication with the committee. The committee has 39 members so it is hard to keep track of all of the comments that are going back from the markers. If there is a problem, definitely let the committee know and let Michelle Woywitka at the office know and the comments will be passed onto the chair.
The chair will then decide if the comments were appropriate or not. It has happened this year and it is reviewed and taken seriously.

Mr. Marshall provided a quick indication of a few of the changes regarding the Registration Committee. Next year, the number of written exams will be changing from three to two. The March Council Report essentially informed everyone of what the transition plan is for those who are currently in the system. The project reports will likely be changing as of June 1. As of May 1, articling pupils will start having to pay a fee for the project reports but the transition from three project reports to two will most likely occur on June 1. Qualifying examinations have not yet been changed but they will be in either the summer or fall. The project report portion will be removed from the qualifying exam and it will be a bit different format. As everyone knows, the legislative changes were passed by the membership last year and passed onto government. Government is looking at it but with the election call it will not be happening this spring. The changes will be going to the legislature hopefully sometime this year. The Professional Governance Unit is still working on them even with the election call so it is progressing and they are hoping to see the changes coming soon. He thanked Rosalind Broderick and indicated that with Registrar now helping with the Registration Committee things are improving. She is addressing all of the exams and doing all of the questions, which are then reviewed by the committee. She is reducing the workload and is doing a tremendous job. Although Michelle Woywitka, who is the committee’s administrative assistant, does an extremely good job with an articling process that has 105 students. It is hard to keep on top of things and she does a great job. The 39 volunteers also do an extraordinary job with the project reports, qualifying exams, marking of exams and he thanked them. The committee is looking for more volunteers from Edmonton to help with the qualifying exams and they would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Ross Woolgar indicated that, as the representative for Eclipse College, he wanted to thank the Alberta Land Surveyors and other professionals who graciously gave of their time to make a difference to the profession and its future. The articling students at Eclipse College greatly appreciate the dedication and effort in contributing to their future and success. Thirty-four presenters gave of their time last year. They gave of their experience and knowledge for the betterment of the articling students and the profession. He also thanked the Association for their commitment to Eclipse College.
College and Brian Munday, who also makes presentations at Eclipse College. Eclipse College is greatly appreciative of the opportunity given to them by the Association to present the report to the assembly.

Eclipse College will continue next fall, starting in mid-September until April 2016. They are again looking for guest presenters to volunteer their time for the betterment of both the students and the profession. He encouraged everyone to review the topics in the lobby and sign up as they would like to have at least two presenters for each topic. There are two mock orals and he would like to see at least three volunteers for each of them. He will help the volunteers through the rest of the process. Open discussion and questions from all of the attendees are welcome and expected.

Eclipse College is also available online to those unable to physically attend. Most of the attendance now is online but they do get a few who attend in the classroom. They are slowly moving towards online. The attendance for the online classroom last year was 852 students, so about 37 students per class as there were about 22 classes last year. In some cases there would have been more than one student that was online in a boardroom. They use David Hagen’s office as the Edmonton location and they would like to set it up the same as the Calgary location, including lapel microphones, video cameras and large screens.

They greatly appreciate the financial contributors and they still need additional funding to keep the program going. He asked everyone to please give generously to Eclipse College. They are a non-profit registered with the province of Alberta so they would greatly appreciate some additional funding to help provide professional quality for the students and profession. The Wednesday topics are e-mailed out every Monday at 8:00 a.m. and the information goes to all of the articulated students as well as the Alberta Land Surveyors so they can inform their students. He personally thanked Bruce Gudim, David Hagen, Fred Cheng, Glendon Chen and Kevin Nemrava for their time spent on this worthwhile and rewarding project and the program would not be possible without their constant efforts. He once again thanked everyone who has volunteered and presented. He reiterated his request that everyone sign up and be a volunteer and present at Eclipse College. Those who have already presented found it a worthwhile opportunity.
President Al Jamieson responded that it has been a great success for both students and land surveyors.

Mr. Adam Pluim thanked Mr. Woolgar and everyone else at Eclipse College for helping them as students get through the process. He suggested that with the Registration Committee going to a two-test system, those who have not been in the system as long will not want to be the guinea pigs for the first test and they may want to wait for others to write it first. He suggested that the Registration Committee may want to consider providing a one-day workshop about what the new test will be like as it may help settle the fears about the new test system.

Ms. Lesley Ewoniak thanked everyone for the wonderful success of the silent auction the night before. $6,460.00 was raised for the scholarship foundation. The ALSA will be contacting anyone who has not yet paid.

President Al Jamieson indicated that if the financial statements are examined they will notice that a number is missing. The missing number is the value of all of the hours and effort put into the running of the Association by the volunteers. Imagine for a moment what the balance sheet would look like if they tried to put a dollar value on all of the time the membership put into serving on committees and helping the Association in so many ways. The balance sheet would be even healthier than it already is. Yet, at the same time there is not a committee member that he has ever met who did not say that being on a committee was also a valuable and rewarding experience. He asked the assembly to join him in thanking all of the committee members for the sacrifices they make. He encouraged everyone to volunteer for an Association committee. The Committee chairs were also thanked and presented with a gift of appreciation.

President Al Jamieson thanked Council for its support and hard work in making the year a successful and enjoyable one for him and he presented gifts of appreciation to those who would no longer be on Council. Gifts of appreciation were also presented to those remaining on Council.

President Al Jamieson was pleased to call Greg Boggs to the podium to take the oath of office as the 2015-2016 president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

Incoming president Greg Boggs took the oath of office in front of the assembly.
President Greg Boggs presented Al Jamieson with a plaque and pin signifying that he has faithfully served as president of the Association.

President Greg Boggs asked the retiring Council members to step down and asked returning the newly elected Council members to take their place on stage. President Greg Boggs led Council in taking the oath of office.

President Greg Boggs addressed the assembly as follows: Good afternoon honoured guests, ladies and gentlemen

It is indeed an honour and a pleasure to be elected as president of the ALSA. Following in President Al Jamieson’s footsteps will be difficult to do but we have a great group of Council members up front here willing to make this year a success.

When I was asked recently if I had an “agenda” should I be nominated and elected for president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, I was a little surprised. My contributions to the ALSA in my past committee work, two years on Council and one year as VP were, what I thought, my personal contributions to a professional association which I hold dear.

I had not, up until that point thought about what I would like to promote or see happen within the Association. So, I decided that rather than “just be of service” to the Association, I should attempt to contemplate some sort of mandate I should fulfill in my year as president.

So I took the time to review the documentation available on the last few years of operation of the ALSA. What I discovered is between our executive director, his staff, our councils and our many volunteer committee members, the ALSA is extraordinarily efficient and on top of virtually every issue we face today.

We, as an association, are able to fund and operate an association that is the “gold star” model for survey associations across Canada and perhaps around our globe. So, rather than have an “agenda,” what I as president would like to see is the Association stay on top of two particular issues. The first must be the Association’s revenue model and secondly, where and how we as an association will be positioned moving into the future.
With respect to our funding model, changes are coming that will impact how we fund our association.

Change is coming to our Ministerial Order early in 2016. This is one of our Director of Surveys’ priorities and could significantly impact how the ALSA does its business. We rely on iron post and marker post sales to a great extent to manage all our professional functions of registration, practice review and discipline.

If this order changes to our detriment, the ALSA will have to have planned a different source of revenue to carry on. The director is working closely with the ALSA to make sure that should a coordinate-based cadastre come into play that a different source of revenue may be generated to compensate for the loss of post sales.

We, as Albertans and fellow land surveyors, are well into what could be one of the most difficult financial periods for our province and our professional services industry in many decades.

Our most recent Council approved budgeted revenue from iron posts and marker posts at the lowest point it has been in over 20 years. Should the price of oil and gas stay low into the fall, as some analysts are predicting our Council will need to quickly look at a contingency plan to deal with the financial shortfall.

These two issues, our ministerial order and our post sales must stay in the forefront of Council and all members of our Association - as its potential impact cannot be understated. As president, I will encourage input from members and communicate from Council all items relating to our funding model.

I received my commission twenty years ago this fall. In many ways, not much has changed, but yet a tremendous amount has changed!

The digital and information age has changed a great deal in how we undertake our work. Twenty years ago the ALSA began strategic planning, moving towards our Vision 2000 document.

The land surveyors of the mid-90s identified many of the same issues the Future Committee, an entirely different group of surveyors this year identified.
Themes summarized in 1995 were privatization and cut-backs, deregulation and consolidation of professions, technology and competition. A different time period but similar concerns.

Many of these same themes were identified when creating the position paper that Connie Petersen presented earlier today and the Future Committee prepared this year. Collectively we know that change for the Association is coming!

Whether that change is as a result of government action similar to the chartered accountants recent consolidation of their accounting professionals or as a result of our own efforts remains to be seen.

What I as President want is that we as an Association make every effort to research and study what is presently taking place in surveying and other similar professions around the world. We are then in a better position to understand what might be coming. Being proactive and at the front of discussions places us in a far better position than being reactive.

Thus, we as an association need to look at North America, look at the world stage and study what is happening to professions as a whole. With the information change that has taken place in the last twenty years, finding out information and studying change is far easier than possibly imagined back then.

The ALSA needs to be proactive and stay in touch with all levels of government in order to create a two-way form of communication. While our provincial government does not appear to change very often, we find that Ministers and their deputies change quite regularly thus ending lines of communication. We need to keep them open!

I would like to thank all my partners at Universal Geomatics. As all companies that have afforded their members the opportunity to act as president of the ALSA understand there is a tremendous time commitment for that company. This brings me to the last of my two points. Volunteer. No matter where you are in your career you certainly have something to offer and I guarantee you will not regret the experience you will receive. To our sister provinces and associations, my wife and I look forward to our travels and getting to know you all a bit better. Thank you.
President Greg Boggs informed the assembly that new business recommendations must be in writing and signed by the mover and seconder. New business resolutions are not binding on Council but Council is obliged to consider the matter, if they are passed by the membership.

It was MOVED by Mr. Gerald Whaley, seconded by Mr. Wayne Wesolowsky, that the Council consider the creation of guidelines for the Discipline Committee that include the following:

1) All expenses, costs, fees or other disbursements related to a discipline investigation and decision where the Alberta Land Surveyor has been found guilty of (1) unprofessional conduct and/or (2) unskilled practice of surveying or has been found guilty of any conduct as specified in Land Surveyors Act section 35 (1 & 2) shall be paid by the guilty party.

2) The expenses, costs, fees, or other disbursements shall not affect any fine imposed by the Discipline Committee as a deterrent for the actions of the practitioner.

Motion Defeated

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Whaley commented that all of the disbursements and costs related to a discipline hearing and investigation should be borne by the Alberta Land Surveyor if they are found guilty of either unprofessional conduct or conduct unbecoming (sic). It should also include any time that the Registrar spends trying to implement an easier process rather than an expensive Discipline hearing.

Mr. Bruce Winton spoke against the motion as it indicates that most decisions of the Discipline Committee are black and white. He has been on a couple of panels and realizes that they are not always black and white. The way it is structured right now gives the Discipline Committee some leeway in the grey areas.

Mr. Wesolowsky spoke in support of the motion. Discipline is not a very pleasant process for any member and the members have much leeway to resolve the issues before they get to Discipline. If a member gets to Discipline, it is very serious and that member has caused it by an action that they themselves have created, not the membership. The costs should be borne by the member that is found guilty. He agreed with Mr. Winton that the issues are not always black
and white and they are looking for guidelines. They are not looking for specific things where there may be extenuating circumstances. For the Association to bear the costs of the guilty party is a bit much. It should be the guilty party as they have created the situation and had the opportunity to resolve it through mediation or whatever avenue they could take with the other practitioner or the public or whoever they are dealing with so they should bear a large portion.

Mr. Ron Hall spoke against the motion. There is a whole process of due diligence and due process. Knowing what the penalty outcome of the hearing is going to be before they decide if the defendant is guilty or innocent gets in the way of the due process. The process is set up so they go through the Discipline process, including the hearing findings and orders. Then there is a second process regarding the penalties, fines and findings. It seems out of order to know what the end is going to be before going through the due process. It should be left with the Discipline Committee.

Mr. Whaley stated that he does not think that it is up to every member of the Association to contribute to the penalty the land surveyor is given for unprofessional conduct or unskilled practice. To penalize other members of the Association for the attitude and actions of a member who has broken the rules is not right and that is the reason for his motion.

Mr. Hugo Engler spoke against the motion as it can easily be seen as grossly unfair from the outside. The panel has the power to drag the hearing out, thereby increasing the penalty. He is not suggesting that they would do such a thing but appearances are often more important than the actual facts. He agreed with the others that these people brought it onto themselves. He wondered what would happen to society if we did the same to people who had broken the law and they had to pay the costs for the courts themselves. Society has to pay for it and they are a society and have to pay for part of it. He agreed that the member would have to pay a substantial portion but they as a society have to pay for it as well.

Mr. Dave Thomson spoke against the motion. He indicated that, with the complexity of the cases and the panel having to have counsel there because they are under such scrutiny on their decisions, the process has become very expensive. It may not be black and white and it is not the entire burden of the accused. The panel has the understanding and it is in the act that the member should pay the cost but the panel has the latitude to say it is not right. If you made a mistake
should you go bankrupt? The penalty might be the intent of the act, $10,000 but a hearing could easily reach $100,000. Maybe even several if it stretched to a week. He wondered if that would be an appropriate penalty for the crime. If the committee’s hands are tied it could end up in the appeals court and be reversed on that principal.

It was MOVED by Mr. Gerald Whaley, seconded by Mr. Wayne Wesolowsky, that the Council consider the creation of guidelines for the Discipline Committee that the swearing of a false affidavit by an Alberta Land Surveyor shall result in an automatic decision of unprofessional conduct. Motion Defeated

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Whaley commented that when a person swears a false affidavit it is deemed in a court of law to be a perjury and perjury is a criminal code offense. He did not think that the Association should be condoning land surveyors for swearing a false affidavit. If they agree that it was a false affidavit that they signed, where is the justification for finding them not guilty? Members who are swearing false affidavits should be facing substantial discipline from the Discipline Committee.

Mr. Mark Woychuk commented that he is not sure if he is for or against the motion. He wondered what would happen if he was under the honest belief that he was swearing a true affidavit and something came up after the fact that says that the information they had was mistaken. He wondered where it would fall as technically he would have sworn a false affidavit, not necessarily through a fault of his own but under a genuine belief that he was in fact swearing something that was the truth.

Mr. Brian Ball spoke against the motion. He did not want an automatic decision taking it out of the hands of the Discipline Committee when there may be grey areas and he does not appreciate the thought of an automatic decision.

Mr. Wayne Wesolowsky commented that there has been a very strong theme of ethics and swearing a false affidavit is a very serious ethical problem. He wondered how, if the membership does not put forward a face of doing things ethically and doing things in accordance with the laws and regulations, they as members providing a public service could stand before the public and show that they are ethical and controlling themselves and providing services to the public in a manner that the public expects them to.
Mr. David Jardine commented that the motion raises a couple of legal issues that he would like to provide a perspective on. One of them is that this is not something that has not arisen historically in a number of cases. There have been different decisions. They say false affidavit but he wondered what that really means. Does it mean that something that was in it was incorrect or does it mean that they deliberately and consciously swore an affidavit that they knew was inaccurate? There is a big difference between the two. Perjury has been talked about and perjury is a criminal offense, which means that the criminal must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the person had intent. He wondered if every time someone signs an affidavit that someone else disagrees with, if it would mean that if a panel decides differently they may have sworn a false affidavit. They may have sworn an incorrect affidavit but the facts of each case and context are going to determine some of the other things and that is what has happened in the past. People have been significantly sanctioned for recklessly swearing something they should not have or for swearing something that was clearly wrong. On the other hand there have been ones where there was a difference of opinion and the panel did not perhaps agree with the person or what they had done but they did not see it as something that was conscious. He informed the assembly that he has worked with many panels over the years and he has a great deal of respect for the people who sit on those panels and volunteer to do it and it is one of the strengths of the system. There is a group of surveyors who hear all of the evidence and then they make decisions on three things: 1) Were the facts proven? 2) Does it constitute unprofessional or unskilled practice? 3) What should the penalty be? He is very uncomfortable with trying to legislate ahead of time what the panel will determine before it has seen the evidence or the circumstances. As a lawyer, he looks at words like false affidavit as it is a tough one to define in many circumstances. If two surveyors disagree as to whether the practices were good or not he would say that it was not intent. He does not think that those determinations can be made in advance and he would be concerned about it. The act is structured now that, if a decision of unprofessional conduct or unskilled practice is made by the panel, he does not think that a decision by Council or the Association would have the ability to bind a panel. It does not mean that the Association could not change the regulation, set out certain things or change the definition of unprofessional conduct but it would take more than a resolution. The act is very clear about it and the regulation right now gives the panel the ability to
impose full costs. Historically, that is what has been done in probably over eighty percent of the cases. There are cases where it does not happen for various reasons and sometimes he agrees with them and sometimes he does not. That is why there is a panel of people appointed who are respected.

It was MOVED by Mr. Gerald Whaley, seconded by Mr. Wayne Wesolowsky, that Council consider implementing operating procedures for the Discipline Committee that include the following:

1) A minimum of five (5) members of the Discipline Committee be present for all discipline hearings and the same five (5) members be present for any penalty proceedings.

2) That the practitioner involved in the hearings be notified of the proposed Discipline Committee members and provided the opportunity to request the Discipline Committee Chairman to consider replacing Discipline Committee members with whom the practitioner may have a conflict. This request from the practitioner must include an explanation as to the basis for the perceived conflict.

Motion Defeated

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Whaley commented that his motion was as a result of the two Discipline cases that were in the last two editions of the ALS News. The letter he had written for the ALS News was a little rough on the Discipline Committee and he apologized to them for it. The weight of being on the Discipline Committee and deciding whether or not a land surveyor is guilty of unprofessional conduct or unskilled practice would be a little easier if they had a minimum of five members to hear the evidence and make the decision on the evidence. For three people to participate in a full day hearing and then consider the evidence is a stressful situation for the three members. It likely would also be even for five. The motion is to ask Council to consider that the Discipline Committee have a minimum of five members present for a hearing.

It is MOVED by Mr. Hugo Engler, seconded by Mr. Chris Beaugrand, that the Association investigate the process of adding new nominations in a more acceptable manner such that the deadline for additional nominations be extended to some reasonable time before the AGM but not at the AGM.

Motion Defeated

New Business #3: Discipline Committee Membership

New Business #4: Council Nominations
In speaking to the motion, Mr. Hugo Engler pointed out that he had earlier seconded the nomination adding the eventual winner to the ballot for vice-president. He did it, not because he felt uncomfortable with the one candidate but because he did feel uncomfortable with the lack of choice. It is a very important position and he felt that the last minute nomination process is very unfair to both the candidate who let their name stand for nomination and the new nominee and also the entire Association.

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava indicated that he was speaking in his personal capacity and not as the Director of Surveys. It is a democratic process and nominations from the floor for elections are very common practice in every jurisdiction in Canada. He was not sure about the laws in Alberta but he believes that it is fine in most of the self-governing professions. He wondered why they would want to create a new set of rules, which a) is ceasing the democratic process and b) is trying to run the Association entirely differently than most other associations. Government is constantly looking for commonalities. Therefore, the standards that every other association is following should be adhered to. He indicated that he was opposed to the motion.

It is MOVED by Mr. Brian Ross, seconded by Mr. Steve Yanish, that Council consider striking a committee to work with the Director of Surveys, ESRD, AER and CAPP to find efficient and cost effective solutions to deal with long-term crown disposition renewals.

Motion Carried

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Brian Ross pointed out that there was much discussion the previous day regarding statutory declarations. He did not think there was anything they could do about it but government has to figure out a way to cheaply renew long-term crown dispositions. It might be too late now as government and the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers have probably already talked about it. 1990 was the start of 25-year leases and long-term dispositions. The renewals are now due and the oil and gas operators do not want any costs associated with the renewals. Perhaps there is something that can be done to reduce the costs. In many cases they are going from a crayon drawing to a full blown survey. Maybe there could be something in-between that does not requiring a huge amount of field work. Perhaps the disposition mappers need to get involved in it and the Association should consider it. Mr. Al Jamieson indicated that he had had the privilege
of being on the Geomatics Committee for the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers and they have major concerns about the renewals and trying to use some kind of imagery to upgrade their long-term dispositions and the sketch plans that are on file. There is a large degree of frustration at that table and being able to sit down at that table with AESRD and form a meaningful conversation with someone who can actually either change policy or make some decisions in that regard on the government side. He agreed that it would be worthwhile to try to play a part in it and it would be good to try to do it.

In speaking in favour of the motion, Mr. Rob Cream commented that he realizes that the Association cannot really lead it as it is something from government but earlier they talked about how important optics are and if they can show that they are doing everything they can to make it work for the industry, then if the decision is something that industry does not like at least they would know that it is not coming from the Alberta Land Surveyors as they will have shown that they have tried to address it.

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava, the Director of Surveys, informed the assembly that he would generally support the motion as it is an opportunity to maintain a dialogue to create the best way of doing it. They should also understand that the disposition may have been issued on a piece of paper or on the back of a cigarette package. The technology can be used and they can come up with something different. The way that they understand it is that they are not creating legal boundaries and if they are not, any subsequent disposition is asking the person to bear the costs of the renewal of that portion of common boundaries. This is not the best management practices as far as land resource development is concerned. He continues to support the motion for the reason that it gives them the opportunity to work together to find the best method in view of the entire technology available.

Mr. Matthew Chandler informed the assembly that, as a member of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers Geomatics Committee, he will be pushing it through the committee for further review. One of the issues that he has with it is having to go and do field checks and/or new as-built plans on plans that were surveyed as per the directions and regulations of the time, without trespass by the forest officers or the land use officers being proven. However, for sketch plans he is leaning towards going back and redoing as-built plans as they tend to have more issues. He reiter-
ated that he will definitely work towards it from the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers perspective also.

President Greg Boggs invited Mr. Ryan Maloney, president of the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association to make a few final remarks.

Mr. Maloney addressed the assembly as follows:
I don’t know if you are brave or foolish giving the mic to a guy from Saskatchewan after that lunch. I have made some additional notes but thank you very much for the opportunity to come up here and address your Association and Greg and Al. As per the tradition, the next outgoing president or the most senior member in tenure is given the opportunity to say a few words about Al. Al has been an outstanding representative for your Association and a true ambassador of the profession. His ability to clearly present and advance discussions on all important issues will certainly be missed at our presidential forums. His advice commentary on his Association’s operations in our forums and at various business meetings provides evidence of his knowledge, experience and passion for the profession, both in Alberta and across Canada. It has been a very educational experience for myself and as well I am sure for Al. It is a serious commitment in time and your effort and thank you all for doing your part to improve yourself, your association and all of those who got to tour with you. Given the similarities between Alberta and Saskatchewan throughout the entire tour I found myself that I mirrored and echoed many of Al’s positions. However, we have agreed to disagree on two serious ongoing issues, whose beef is superior Alberta or Saskatchewan and who has the better football team, Stamps or Riders. We will let you be the judges of that. We have all been very fortunate to have the opportunity to tour with Al and Barb. We have developed a deep respect and a great friendship with them both. Al’s insight, his approach to presidential business, his generosity, his great sense of humour will definitely be missed on the presidential tour. Thank you Al for everything you have done for your membership, the rest of the presidents and best of luck in your past presidency. Thank you very much.

President Greg Boggs declared the 105th 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, 2014 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 accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations.

Edmonton, Alberta
September 30, 2014

CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Statement of Financial Position

Year Ended April 30, 2014
(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash (Note 3)</td>
<td>$828,333</td>
<td>$807,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities (Note 3)</td>
<td>2,786,128</td>
<td>2,460,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable (Note 4)</td>
<td>506,558</td>
<td>292,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses (Note 5)</td>
<td>14,597</td>
<td>31,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,135,616</td>
<td>3,591,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUIPMENT (Note 6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,983</td>
<td>15,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,144,599</td>
<td>$3,606,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>$500,556</td>
<td>$350,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>16,466</td>
<td>33,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions (Note 8)</td>
<td>655,685</td>
<td>693,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,172,707</td>
<td>1,077,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT (Note 9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>755</td>
<td>5,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in equipment</td>
<td>8,983</td>
<td>15,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally restricted (Note 10)</td>
<td>2,962,154</td>
<td>2,508,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,971,137</td>
<td>2,523,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,144,599</td>
<td>$3,606,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEASE COMMITMENTS (Note 11)**

**APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL**
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## UNRESTRICTED--GENERAL FUND

### REVENUE
- Operating revenue (Schedule 1) $2,064,640
- Fees 631,177
- Investment income (Schedule 2) 362,208
- Indirect Boundary Panel 124,232

**Total Operating Revenue:** 3,182,257

### EXPENSES
- Council and Committees (Schedule 3) 189,948
- Continuing Competency review (Schedule 4) 285,226
- Administration expenses (Schedule 5) 794,984
- Operating expenses (Schedule 6) 1,364,247

**Total Operating Expenses:** 2,634,405

**Operating Variance:** 423,136

**Operating Excess:** 2,790,251

### INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS

#### REVENUE (EXPENSES)
- Discipline Revolving Fund (113,178)
- Technology Transfer and Education Fund 0
- Communications and Public Relations Development Fund 0
- Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors Levy Fund:
  - Revenue 8,937
  - Expenses (8,832)
- Professional Surveyors Canada Fund:
  - Revenue 24,274
  - Expenses (26,096)
- Making Their Mark Fund:
  - Expenses 0
- Leasehold Allowance Fund (1,015)
- Financial Stabilization Fund (17,447)

**Total Internally Restricted Revenue:** (133,157)

**Total Internally Restricted Expenses:** (825)

**Revenue over Expenses:** $447,531

### Boundary Panel Fund:
- Revenue 455,775
- Expenses (422,559)

**Total Boundary Panel Fund:** 32,816

## REVENUE OVER EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Budget 2014</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRESTRICTED--GENERAL FUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue (Schedule 1)</td>
<td>$2,064,640</td>
<td>$1,940,395</td>
<td>$124,245</td>
<td>$1,917,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>631,177</td>
<td>622,000</td>
<td>9,177</td>
<td>609,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income (Schedule 2)</td>
<td>362,208</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>270,208</td>
<td>207,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Boundary Panel</td>
<td>124,232</td>
<td>104,726</td>
<td>19,506</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>3,182,257</td>
<td>2,759,121</td>
<td>423,136</td>
<td>2,790,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and Committees (Schedule 3)</td>
<td>189,948</td>
<td>235,730</td>
<td>(45,782)</td>
<td>249,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Competency review (Schedule 4)</td>
<td>285,226</td>
<td>306,515</td>
<td>(21,289)</td>
<td>256,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses (Schedule 5)</td>
<td>794,984</td>
<td>818,945</td>
<td>(23,961)</td>
<td>777,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses (Schedule 6)</td>
<td>1,364,247</td>
<td>1,305,557</td>
<td>58,690</td>
<td>1,317,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>2,634,405</td>
<td>2,666,747</td>
<td>(32,342)</td>
<td>2,600,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Variance</strong></td>
<td>423,136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Excess</strong></td>
<td>2,790,251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciplines Revolving Fund</td>
<td>(113,178)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(83,178)</td>
<td>(103,340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52,978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors Levy Fund:
  - Revenue | 8,937 | 0 | 8,937 | 8,496 |
  - Expenses (8,832) | 0 | 0 | (8,832) | (9,113) |
| Professional Surveyors Canada Fund:
  - Revenue | 24,274 | 0 | 24,274 | 29,750 |
  - Expenses (26,096) | 0 | 0 | (26,096) | (25,022) |
| Making Their Mark Fund:
  - Expenses 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 825 |
| Leasehold Allowance Fund (1,015) | 0 | (1,015) | 0 | 0 |
| Financial Stabilization Fund (17,447) | 0 | (17,447) | 0 | (1,800) |
| **Total Internally Restricted Revenue** | (133,157) | (30,000) | (103,157) | (153,832) |
| **Total Internally Restricted Expenses** | (825) | | | |
| **Revenue over Expenses** | $447,531 | $29,571 | $417,960 | $10,304 |
## Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association

### Statement of Changes in Net Assets

**Year Ended April 30, 2014**

*(Unaudited)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Balance at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Revenue (Under) Expenses</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted--General Fund</strong></td>
<td>15,369</td>
<td>(6,386)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invested in Equipment</strong></td>
<td>15,369</td>
<td>547,852</td>
<td>(554,238)</td>
<td>8,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internally Restricted</strong> <em>(Note 10)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>2,269,174</td>
<td>(17,447)</td>
<td>441,060</td>
<td>2,692,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(113,178)</td>
<td>113,178</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Presenter Revolving Fund</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>127,575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel Fund</td>
<td>(25,444)</td>
<td>32,839</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining and Enhancing Professional Practice Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Their Mark Fund</td>
<td>4,997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Allowance Fund</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>(1,015)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors Levy Fund</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral Research Fund</td>
<td>29,964</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Surveyors Canada Fund</td>
<td>7,306</td>
<td>(1,822)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                              | $2,508,237                  | (100,321)                | 554,238   | 2,962,154              |

| Total                              | $2,523,606                  | $447,531                 | $0        | $2,971,137             |
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Statement of Cash Flows

Year Ended April 30, 2014

(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue over expenses</td>
<td>$447,531</td>
<td>$10,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges (credits) not affecting cash:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>6,386</td>
<td>10,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>(4,527)</td>
<td>(4,528)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net changes in non-cash working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital items <em>(Note 12)</em></td>
<td>(428,177)</td>
<td>82,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,213</td>
<td>98,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH INCREASE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,213</td>
<td>98,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at beginning of year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>807,120</td>
<td>708,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$828,333</td>
<td>$807,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH FLOWS SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received</td>
<td>$59,196</td>
<td>$64,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements

April 30, 2014

(Unaudited)

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 accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations.

Cash
Cash is defined as cash on hand and cash on deposit, net of cheques issued and outstanding at the reporting date.

Marketable Securities
Marketable securities recorded at fair market value. Unrealized gains or losses 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 straight-line 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.

(continues)
NOTE 2--SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (continued)

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 of that later period.

Deferred contributions are comprised of membership dues collected in advance, special levies for programs to be completed in the subsequent year and amounts received with respect to discipline matters still unresolved at year end.

Administration fees, professional development, registration and communication revenue are recognized as the services are provided.

Sales of documents, forms and publications are recognized once the item has been delivered.

Financial Instruments
Financial instruments are recorded at fair value when acquired or issued. In subsequent periods, financial assets with actively traded markets are reported at fair value, with any unrealized gains and losses reported in income. All other financial instruments are reported at amortized cost and tested for impairment at each reporting date.

Use of Estimates
The preparation of financial statements, in conformity with Canadian accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations, requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the amounts reported in the financial statements. Significant estimates include amortization, allowance for doubtful accounts, accrued liabilities and deferred contributions. By their nature, these estimates are subject to measurement uncertainty and actual results could differ.

NOTE 3--RESTRICTED CASH AND MARKETABLE SECURITIES

Cash and marketable securities include $2,962,154 (2013--$2,508,237) which have been designated for specific programs that are described in Note 10.

NOTE 4--ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE

Accounts receivable consists of the following:

\[
\begin{array}{lcc}
\text{Accounts receivable} & 2014 & 2013 \\
& $511,338 & $301,441 \\
\text{Allowance for doubtful accounts} & (4,780) & (9,316) \\
\hline
$506,558 & $292,125 \\
\end{array}
\]

During the year, the Association recorded bad debts of $79 (2013--$9,313) which is included in administration expenses.
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements

April 30, 2014

(Unaudited)

NOTE 5--PREPAID EXPENSES

Prepaid expenses are comprised of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3,597</td>
<td>3,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent deposit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 14,597</td>
<td>$ 31,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 6--EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Accumulated Amortization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>$ 50,082</td>
<td>$ 46,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>41,851</td>
<td>35,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>32,147</td>
<td>32,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>124,080</td>
<td>115,097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuing Competency Equipment:

|                                |            |            |              |              |
| Furniture and fixtures         | 3,101      | 3,101      | 0            | 0            |
| Survey equipment               | 6,315      | 6,315      | 0            | 0            |
| Computer equipment             | 17,786     | 17,786     | 0            | 0            |
| **Total**                      | 27,202     | 27,202     | 0            | 0            |

**Total**                      | **$151,282**| **$142,299**| **$ 8,983**   | **$15,369**  |

NOTE 7--BANK INDEBTEDNESS

The Association has a line-of-credit at prime, to a maximum of $200,000, secured by a general security agreement. During the year, the Association did not draw on the line-of-credit.
NOTE 8--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>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at beginning of year</td>
<td>$ 693,331</td>
<td>$ 598,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions received during the year</td>
<td>655,685</td>
<td>693,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts recognized as revenue</td>
<td>(693,331)</td>
<td>(598,742)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$ 655,685</td>
<td>$ 693,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 9--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 (2013--$4,528) was credited to rent expense.

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 are 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 year, Council sets the fund at $30,000.

Public Relations and Communications
This fund is used for special initiatives that promote the profession to the public. At the start of each year, Council sets the fund at $25,000.

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. At the start of each year, Council sets the fund at $10,000.
(continues)
NOTE 10--INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS

Ambassadors' Reserve Fund
This fund is used to reimburse members who are acknowledged delegates of international organizations, invited speakers or participants at conferences or meetings outside of Alberta. At the start of each year, Council sets the fund at $10,000.

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. At the start of each year, Council sets the fund at $15,000.

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.

Boundary Panel Fund
This fund was established by Ministerial Order for the purpose of funding investigations of boundary uncertainties or alleged errors in surveys.

Maintaining and Enhancing Professional Practice Fund
This fund was established for the purpose of tracking the mark-up approved by the Ministerial Order for the purpose of maintenance and enhancing professional practice, education, public awareness and quality and the technical capability of land surveyors in Alberta.

Making Their Mark Fund
This fund was established to be used to manage the costs and expenses associated with the Made to Measure travelling museum exhibit.

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.

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

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.

Professional Surveyors Canada Fund
This fund was established to accumulate surplus funds collected on behalf of Professional Surveyors Canada. The surplus may be applied, at the discretion of the Council, to reduce future levies to members.
NOTE 11--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 August 30, 2018.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 10,400</td>
<td>3,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 14,219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequent to year end, the Association renewed its lease to June 30, 2024.

NOTE 12--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></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities</td>
<td>(325,861)</td>
<td>75,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>(214,433)</td>
<td>81,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>17,353</td>
<td>3,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>149,786</td>
<td>(183,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>(17,376)</td>
<td>10,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions</td>
<td>(37,646)</td>
<td>94,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(428,177)</td>
<td>82,330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements

April 30, 2014

(Unaudited)

NOTE 13—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.

NOTE 14—FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

The Association's financial instruments consist of cash, marketable securities, accounts receivable and accounts payable and accrued liabilities.

The Association is exposed to the following risks through its financial instruments:

Credit Risk
Credit risk is the risk that one party to a financial instrument will cause a financial loss for the other party by failing to discharge an obligation, or there is a concentration of transactions carried out with the same party. The Association is subject to credit risk through its accounts receivable.

The Association's accounts receivable are generally the result of services to its members. The Association has a large number of members which reduces the concentration of credit risk.

It is management's opinion that there is no significant credit risk as of April 30, 2014.

Liquidity Risk
Liquidity risk arises from the possibility that the Association might encounter difficulty in settling its debts or in meeting its obligations related to financial liabilities.

In management's opinion, this risk has been reduced due to the large cash and short-term investment reserves kept on hand at April 30, 2014.

Market Risk
Market risk is the risk that the fair value or future cash flows of a financial instrument will fluctuate because of changes in market prices. Market risk is composed of currency risk, interest rate risk and other price risk.

Currency Risk
Currency risk is the risk that the fair value or future cash flows of a financial instrument will fluctuate because of changes in foreign exchange rates.

The Association is exposed to currency risk on its marketable securities invested in foreign currency. The Association mitigates its risk by having a diversified portfolio.
NOTE 14—FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (continued)

Interest Rate Risk
Interest rate risk is the risk that the fair value or future cash flows of a financial instrument will fluctuate because of changes in market interest rates.

The Association is exposed to interest rate risk arising from its interest bearing assets.

The Association's cash and short-term investments include amounts held by financial institutions that earn interest at market rates.

The Association manages its risk by monitoring interest being earned on excess funds.

Other Price Risk
Other price risk is the risk that fair value or future cash flows of a financial instrument will fluctuate because of changes in market prices.

The Association is exposed to other price risk through their investments in marketable securities.

The Association mitigates its risk by having a diversified portfolio.
NOTE 15—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. The mark-up allowed has two components. The first component is for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing professional practice, education, public awareness and quality, and the technical capability of land surveyors in Alberta. The second component is for 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:

Component 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post sales</td>
<td>$1,712,911</td>
<td>$1,564,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post sale administration</td>
<td>1,027,745</td>
<td>967,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Competency</td>
<td>225,825</td>
<td>238,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>155,555</td>
<td>178,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing professional practice</td>
<td>107,020</td>
<td>88,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness</td>
<td>98,658</td>
<td>201,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 47 plan monitoring</td>
<td>6,371</td>
<td>6,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field note / dormant plan repository</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE OVER (UNDER) EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>91,483</td>
<td>(117,689)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>(117,689)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$ (26,206)</td>
<td>$ (117,689)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements

April 30, 2014

(Unaudited)

NOTE 16—INFORMATION REQUIRED BY MINISTERIAL ORDER (continued)

Component 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post sales</td>
<td>$ 455,775</td>
<td>$ 426,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Boundary Panel</td>
<td>124,232</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Boundary Panel</td>
<td>298,707</td>
<td>397,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>422,939</td>
<td>452,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE OVER (UNDER) EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>32,839</td>
<td>(25,444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>(25,444)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$ 7,392</td>
<td>$ (25,444)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Operating Revenue

#### Year Ended April 30, 2014

*(Unaudited)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Budget 2014</th>
<th>Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts, net of Boundary Panel transfers</td>
<td>$1,237,038</td>
<td>$1,116,245</td>
<td>$120,793</td>
<td>$1,118,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts, net of Boundary Panel transfers</td>
<td>475,873</td>
<td>463,750</td>
<td>12,123</td>
<td>446,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>164,382</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>4,382</td>
<td>165,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention levy</td>
<td>63,368</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>53,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>38,628</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>36,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
<td>26,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>25,116</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>(9,884)</td>
<td>29,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>18,150</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>13,050</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(6,950)</td>
<td>17,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(1,510)</td>
<td>2,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>8,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                            **$2,064,640** | **$1,940,395** | **$124,245**          | **$1,917,855**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Budget 2014</th>
<th>Budget Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gains</td>
<td>$273,645</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$228,645</td>
<td>$113,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>59,196</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>33,196</td>
<td>64,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend income</td>
<td>43,974</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>28,974</td>
<td>53,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gains (losses)</td>
<td>(14,607)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(20,607)</td>
<td>(23,779)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$362,208</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$270,208</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,578</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year Ended April 30, 2014

* (Unaudited) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Budget 2014</th>
<th>Budget Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External relations</td>
<td>$ 64,182</td>
<td>$ 82,750</td>
<td>$(18,568)</td>
<td>$ 36,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>34,374</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>(1,626)</td>
<td>39,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and examination</td>
<td>30,275</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>30,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s travel</td>
<td>21,947</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(8,053)</td>
<td>23,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Board</td>
<td>11,756</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>(4,744)</td>
<td>14,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>10,261</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>(6,739)</td>
<td>84,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>4,586</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>2,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3,581</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>(1,919)</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>(1,158)</td>
<td>4,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and biographical</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(667)</td>
<td>1,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>(2,219)</td>
<td>6,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>(1,982)</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>(2,068)</td>
<td>1,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>(2,300)</td>
<td>1,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention and social</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                                                                     **$189,948**

$235,730 **($45,782)**  **$249,896**
Continuing Competency Review

Year Ended April 30, 2014
(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Budget 2014</th>
<th>Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>$218,899</td>
<td>$221,710</td>
<td>$(2,811)</td>
<td>$209,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fee</td>
<td>55,095</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>(4,905)</td>
<td>30,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and transportation</td>
<td>9,035</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>(6,965)</td>
<td>13,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(218)</td>
<td>1,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(779)</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(2,806)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and dues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>(1,555)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>(750)</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and plans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$285,226</strong></td>
<td><strong>$306,515</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(21,289)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$256,321</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Administration Expenses

**Year Ended April 30, 2014**

*(Unaudited)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Budget 2014</th>
<th>Budget Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, benefits and contract staff</td>
<td>$510,273</td>
<td>$508,758</td>
<td>$ 1,515</td>
<td>$484,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building operations</td>
<td>160,255</td>
<td>167,405</td>
<td>(7,150)</td>
<td>144,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>25,595</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,595</td>
<td>20,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies and photocopying</td>
<td>15,861</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>(10,139)</td>
<td>28,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>(8,849)</td>
<td>18,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>12,149</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>7,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and donations</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>(2,750)</td>
<td>14,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, Internet and database</td>
<td>8,469</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>12,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>6,571</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>6,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>6,386</td>
<td>9,732</td>
<td>(3,346)</td>
<td>9,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6,161</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>6,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and courier</td>
<td>5,323</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>(1,677)</td>
<td>6,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence and travel</td>
<td>3,402</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>2,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and subscriptions</td>
<td>2,943</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training and library</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical file management</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(759)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(2,017)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debts</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>9,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 47 monitoring</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(140)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$794,984 $818,945 $ (23,961) $777,028
Operating Expenses

Year Ended April 30, 2014

(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2014</th>
<th>Budget 2014</th>
<th>Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts</td>
<td>$ 646,986</td>
<td>$ 587,845</td>
<td>$ 59,141</td>
<td>$ 597,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts</td>
<td>331,573</td>
<td>323,750</td>
<td>7,823</td>
<td>323,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>217,559</td>
<td>221,600</td>
<td>(4,041)</td>
<td>225,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges and management fees</td>
<td>64,490</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>12,490</td>
<td>56,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>30,993</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>(7,007)</td>
<td>37,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>20,677</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>(14,323)</td>
<td>23,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>19,610</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>20,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>14,394</td>
<td>10,862</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>13,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>14,091</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(5,909)</td>
<td>19,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$1,364,247 $1,305,557 $ 58,690 $1,317,426
I am pleased to provide the membership with a short report outlining some of these activities that I and my staff have undertaken over the last year.

Since my last annual report to the membership, the Association started a new ten-year lease at our current space. As part of the lease renewal, we were able to have the office re-painted and re-carpeted as part of the tenant improvement allowance we were provided. In addition to the painting and carpeting, we were able to renovate the boardroom and bring in a SmartBoard system that has been used by Council, the Practice Review Board, the Registration Committee and others.

Rosalind Broderick is now Registrar of the Association. She is taking on that role on a full-time basis. David McWilliam is still acting registrar on a couple of matters that were holdovers from his time as Registrar. We hate to see Dave go but we are pleased to have Rosalind on board. In addition to the registrar duties that David McWilliam performed, she is also assisting the Registration Committee with the transition to a new articling process and helping the committee set exams and review other procedures.

The most challenging part of the Association office in the last year was dealing with the bookkeeping side of things. I will not go into details as to what happened but things went sideways at our busiest time of the year and it took some time to find the right person and identify all of the issues to get things righted again. Once again, I would like to apologize to the membership for what happened. We currently have a professional accountant working for the Association on contract to help us prepare written procedures and processes so that we are able to more easily pick up the pieces if someone unexpectedly leaves.

With having a full-time Registrar and another staff person who mostly does the Association’s books, we are short two administrative people from where we were just two years ago. This means that I have taken on providing administrative support to two Association committees and all of us are not able to get to all of the tasks and projects that we want to as quickly as we want to. Having said that, the staff and I are committed to addressing any concerns from the public as they arise and then providing the level of service to the membership that they have come to expect.
I focus as much of my time as possible on those key critical areas that Council has established. For example, over the last year, the President and I have had a number of meetings with government ministers and government staffers on a number of topics and these meetings are usually reported in Council Report. Most of the discussions, though, relate to work that Council and committees have done with respect to regulation changes and other matters of interest to the membership.

Like everyone else in the land surveying profession, and in fact all of Alberta, we will be watching our dollars and cents especially carefully this year. We have tried to be quite conservative with respect to projected post sales and realistic as far as expenses are concerned. The challenge that we have as the Association is that our workload does not vary as the economy changes. In some ways, we can actually get busier as the economy slows down. Therefore, as we set about to tighten our belts as everyone else is doing, we must really identify what tasks are the priorities and what tasks, if any, could we possibly forego.

I continue to enjoy working for the Association and working with the membership. I would also like to thank all of my staff for all of the hard work and effort that they put in to everything. I would like to thank and congratulate Dawn Phelan for her 20 years here with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

Brian Munday
In 2014, the average number of years of experience of an active Alberta Land Surveyor was 15.7 years. Alberta Land Surveyors who received their commission in 2014 had articulated for an average of 41.0 months.

### Educational Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Commission</th>
<th>Univ./ College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Calgary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNB</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Toronto</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Alberta</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAIT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAIT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIT</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This only reflects the data available on actively practicing Alberta Land Surveyors.*

---

**Registrar’s Report**

### Practicing Alberta Land Surveyor Information

#### Increases/Decreases to Number of Practicing Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Started During Year</th>
<th>Added During Year</th>
<th>Subtracted During Year</th>
<th>Remaining At Year End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Male/Female Ratio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Received Commission</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-Present*</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1994</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1989</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Up to February, 2015

---

**Industry Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year*</th>
<th>Head Offices</th>
<th>Branch Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In operation for a portion or all of the calendar year.*
ASSMT

ASSMT has a mission to promote the knowledge, skill and proficiency of technicians and technologists involved in the field of surveying and mapping. Over the years, ASSMT and ALSA have developed and maintained a strong relationship sharing educational information, public relations ideas and professional development concepts. ASSMT and ALSA have had another successful year working together on issues that affect the surveying profession as a whole.

The RST Implementation Ad Hoc Committee has been working at establishing a framework to manage the RST designation working towards bringing it under the Land Surveyors Act. Key topics include the ASSMT syllabus and RST experience requirements, development of and RST Code of Ethics, discipline policies and registration requirements and policies.

ASSMT is currently working on the syllabus for the Getting It Right (GIR) seminars in which they hope to implement in the near future. The intent of the GIR seminars is to teach and enforce good survey principles important to all survey practices. ASSMT is currently looking to the ALS members for volunteer assistance to help with the development of the GIR syllabus. I would like to invite all interested parties to contact ASSMT.

Many of the topics of concern to ASSMT are similar to those discussed by the ALSA Council including member registration, examination and educational requirements, professional development, financials and public relations. The ASSMT Membership Committee is currently investigating the possibility of mandatory volunteer hours for ASSMT members.

In conclusion, I would like to acknowledge the hard work and dedication shown by each member of the ASSMT Council members.

Lesley Anne Sick, ALS

Boundary Panel

The Boundary Panel continues as a very active committee which has achieved good results in the past year. This past year, we completely resolved several cases by using judges’ orders, registration of monument plans, letters to municipalities and plan corrections on behalf of deceased members. The statistics for 2014 are as follows:

• 13 cases were opened.
• 8 initial investigations were completed.
5 initial investigations are underway.
7 meetings were held on investigated cases.
6 final reports were issued and 2 are in the finalization stages.

We were also, because of a favorable year end fund balance, able to complete one more of the Director of Surveys’ baseline projects.

Although there were many positives, we are still struggling with the timing of the investigative reports and the final panel reports. If we are to improve our credibility and prove to the public that this is the most viable solution to certain boundary uncertainties, we must step up and resolve these in a timely fashion.

The Panel held an information meeting with the Calgary urban surveyors regarding a number of inquiries from infill building owners who say that differences in governing evidence used by surveyors was causing issues with compliance or encroachments on their properties.

My sincere thanks to Boundary Panel Manager Scott Westlund for his immense contributions to the Panel’s success. I also want to thank all of the Boundary Panel members for their time and dedicated service to this very important committee and would encourage all members to say thank-you to them all.

Jerry Rasmuson, ALS

**Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors**

CBEPS board duties include the following: assess candidates, evaluate Institutions for exemptions, manage the national examination system of 15 writing centres across Canada, and manage the university program accreditation process. In addition, CBEPS has endeavoured to provide candidate support through the use of study guides, comprehensive learning outcomes documents, online candidate forum, previous exams and webinars.

**Exam Statistics:**

- March 2014 - 158 candidates wrote 208 exams
- October 2014 - 130 candidates wrote 165 exams
- Number of Certificates of Completion issued in 2014 = 56
- For the March 2015 sitting, 195 Candidates are scheduled to write 273 exams
Candidate Distribution (# exams written in each province, spring/fall) 2014

- AB (71/75)
- NWT (5/3)
- BC (74/47)
- ON (2/0)
- MB (17/17)
- PE (0/0)
- NB (1/0)
- YT (0/0)
- NL (10/6)
- SK (9/3)
- NS (19/14)

**C3 – Advanced Surveying**

In March, 6 students wrote C3, 1 passed (61%) and 5 failed. The average mark was 36%.

In October 4 students wrote C3, 0 passed, the average mark was 28%.

The issue of the low passing rate for C3 – Advanced Surveying, remains.

The Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors has a proposal to make C3 – Advanced Surveying an elective exam with two components: survey calculations and advanced surveying; increase the number of elective exams to two and to decrease the number of core exams by one.

In the past the member associations were split on splitting the exam into two, therefore the exam remained the same. To help the candidates prepare, webinars were prepared and hosted by Dr James Secord. The C3 webinars are available on YouTube and should be viewed by any candidate writing the C3 examination. Additional study material for this examination is also available on the CBEPS website. Students are directed to utilize the BCIT online course, which, if passed with a minimum of 60%, receives an exemption.

Dr. John Ogundare from BCIT is working on a textbook specifically for the C3 exam which he would like to make available to CBEPS students to purchase through BCIT.

**C12 - Hydrography**

ACLS developed the Hydrography Online exam when it was to be a CBEPS elective. CBEPS is in discussion with ACLS to use this on-line exam for CBEPS. The on-line exam is time limited and questions are randomly selected by the system from a database of approved questions.

David Dodd, the special examiner for the hydrography exam is proposing a change to the current syllabus for C12 as well as developing a new “Advanced Hydrography” elective. This is as a result of a submission to the International Board on Standards of Competence for Hydrographic Surveyors (IBSC) to have the exam meet the certification requirements of IBSC. IBSC found that the current syllabus does not meet the requirements for accreditation.
This would mean that the current C12 syllabus and requirements would have to be revised and that the ACLS online exam would also have to be revised and therefore could not be used at this time.

Accreditations/Exemptions:
BCIT – Currently has exemptions for:
• C1- Mathematics
• C2- Least-Squares Estimation and Data Analysis
• C3- Advanced Surveying
• C4- Coordinate Systems and Map Projections
• C6- Geodetic Positioning
• C7- Remote Sensing and Photogrammetry
• C10- Land Use Planning and Economics of Land Development
• C11- Business Practices and the Profession
• C12- Hydrographic Surveying

BCIT has applied for exemptions for:
• C5- Geospatial Information Systems
• E1- Spatial Database & Land Information Systems

NAIT – Currently has exemptions for:
• C1- Mathematics
• C2- Least-Squares Estimation and Data Analysis
• C5- Geospatial Information Systems
• C6- Geodetic Positioning
• C10- Land Use Planning and Economics of Land Development
• C12- Hydrographic Surveying

NAIT has applied for an exemption for:
• C8 – Cadastral Studies

SAIT – Currently has exemptions for:
• C2- Least-Squares Estimation and Data Analysis
• C4- Coordinate Systems and Map Projections
• C7- Remote Sensing and Photogrammetry

Lethbridge College – Currently has an exemption for:
• C4- Coordinate Systems and Map Projections

U of C continues with full accreditation.

UNB - continues with full accreditation.

Red River College, College of Geographic Sciences, and College of the North Atlantic, all have individual exemptions.

CBEPS Exemptions and Accreditation Committee
CBEPS combined the Exemption Committee with the Accreditation Committee in order to prevent discrepancies between the two as happened with BCIT’s failed bid for accreditation, which resulted in lost exemptions granted by the Exemption Committee.
The new committee has received funding to hire some of the special examiners (they write and mark the CBEPS exams) to help with decisions on granting exemptions. The committee will also write a procedure manual for the accreditation and exemption processes.

They are also looking for new members.

**Entry Requirements for CBEPS**

There has been some discussion about the entry requirements for CBEPS. Some members felt the current approach of being flexible with admissions and considering survey experience in lieu of formal education on a case-by-case basis is appropriate for admitting candidates. As the CBEPS exams are challenging, it was felt that if a candidate had good experience and a desire to become a professional surveyor, they should be permitted to write the exams.

However, not all agree and there are candidates with degrees or diplomas in other fields not related to surveying, who apply. Some questions arise: “would someone with a bachelor’s degree in Geography be a better candidate than one with no formal education but with ten years of experience as an instrument man?” CBEPS will look at clarifying the entry requirements and the process for evaluating candidates.

**Pathways Project at AOLS**

CBEPS provided information about this topic at the last meeting of 2014.

Competency-based assessment of foreign-trained professionals was funded by the Ontario provincial government and administered by York University. After six years, the project is ending. 260 knowledge elements (some based on the national syllabus) were developed. A process following prior learning assessment principles was developed but it looks like the AOLS did not adopt it. Prior Learning Assessment is based on a tool called a portfolio that the candidate must fill out and document. The portfolio method was abandoned by the AOLS because candidates did not want to use it. They would rather the AOLS just review documents provided by candidates.

York University wants to apply for funding with HRSDC to continue the program but for this to be accepted, they need support from national organizations such as CBEPS and ACLS. There is currently no CBEPS accreditation for York University. CBEPS will continue to explore this option with York University.
Alberta Reps:
• U of C Rep for CBEPS: Dr. Andrew Hunter, PhD, PEng, PRSurv
• CBEPS Board of Directors: John Haggerty, ALS, CLS, PEng.
• CBEPS Committee Member: Lana Bily, ALS, SLS

CBEPS Financials:
For the 2014 year, CBEPS ran a balanced budget. A transfer of nearly $20,000 was required from the Survey Law Book Reserve Fund in order to achieve balance. This amount equals, almost exactly, the cost to complete the book this year. A final auditors’ report is to be presented at the CBEPS AGM in March.

The 2015 budget will also be presented at the CBEPS AGM. It was recognized that a significant payment in kind is made by the ACLS, in the form of staff and other resources. The new budget recognizes this.

This does, however create a revenue shortfall for CBEPS. The intention is to remedy this through increases to both the CBEPS levy to the member associations and with increases to the various fees for candidates. The ALSA will be receiving a formal request after the budget has been approved at the 2015 CBEPS AGM. The intention/request is to increase the CBEPS levy to the ALSA from $9,000 to $10,400 or roughly 15%.

The Council of the ALSA will need to evaluate this request.

Survey Law Book Project – (Completed!)
Available for sale on the CBEPS website for students, professionals and professional students
• Guide to Aboriginal Law
• Water boundaries issues – Marine Boundary Delimitation
• Water Boundary Issues – Eastern Canada
• Water Boundary Issues – Québec
• Water Boundary Issues – Prairies
• Water Boundary Issues – BC
• Registration Systems
• The Canadian Legal System
• Land Surveyor as Expert Bornage: Determining boundaries of the immovable in Québec
Study Notes Project
The Taskforce was to look at the feasibility for online course development from existing institutions such as Athabasca University which is an online school. The Study Guide Task Force has identified 4-5 courses that are trouble-spots. Work is ongoing.
• Study Material available for sale
• Subject C7 (Remote Sensing and Photogrammetry)
• Subject C8 (Cadastral Studies)
• Subject C12 (Hydrographic Surveying)

Help tool available for free on Internet
• Subject C1 (Mathematics)

John Haggerty, ALS

Convention & Social
The Convention & Social Group is chaired by the executive director with the president and vice-president and others working to plan the AGM. Michelle Woywitka provides administrative support.

The Convention & Social Group worked on the following tasks this year:
1. Golfers enjoyed the sunny skies for the 50th annual golf tournament. Thanks to the generosity of the participants, the J.H. Holloway Scholarship Foundation raised $2,000 through the sale of mulligans and draw tickets. Congratulations to both teams (Mark Grocholski, Jeremy Rakai, Dana Sands, Jeri Smith and Catherine Boggs, Greg Boggs, George Rogers and Andrew Roop) on winning the tournament! Attendance was down in 2013 but picked up again in 2014. There were two changes to the tournament format in 2014. First, the tournament was held on a Thursday instead of the traditional Friday and, second, it was also decided to not offer a different prize to every golfer but to have one “give-away” for everyone. The committee is investigating holding the tournament at a different location to try to ensure that interest and enthusiasm for the tournament remains strong.
2. The 106th annual general meeting will be held at the Chateau Lake Louise from April 23-25, 2015.
3. The dates for future AGMs are:
   2016 – Fairmont Banff Springs - April 14-16
   2017 – Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge – April 20-22
   2018 – Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge - April 19-21
   2019 – Fairmont Banff Springs Hotel – April 25-27

Brian Munday

Chair:
Brian Munday
Members:
Greg Boggs
Catherine Boggs
Garth Hartung
Al Jamieson
Barb Jamieson
Discipline

Between January 28, 2014 and the date of this report being written, February 18, 2015, there were three complaints lodged with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

The three complaints were submitted by Alberta Land Surveyors against another practitioner. The complaint dated February 18, 2014 was withdrawn by the complainant. The complaint dated February 12, 2014 was referred to the Discipline Committee and a hearing was held February 9, 2015. The complaint dated January 16, 2015 was reviewed by the Registrar and, as mediation was not possible, has been referred to the Chairman of the Discipline Committee.

Of the complaints referenced in the 2013/2014 Discipline Committee report, one complaint, dated June 25, 2012, was withdrawn by the complainant. The complaint dated June 12, 2013 was dismissed by the Chairman of the Discipline Committee. On April 6, 2014 a hearing was held for the complaint dated December 16, 2013. The decision for the complaint dated December 20, 2012 was published in the December 2014 issue of ALS News. The decision for the complaint dated June 15, 2012 will be published in the March 2015 issue of ALS News.

Rob Scott, ALS

External Relations

The Association’s External Relations Committee (ERC) held seven meetings via GoToMeeting this year. The committee’s purpose is to create greater awareness within the general public, government and industry about professional land surveyors and the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. The committee is structured where members are assigned responsibility for each of the external groups categorized as: government, education, geomatics associations, Alberta professional associations, oil & gas, real estate and development, general public relations, and other stakeholders.

The key messages we relay are:

Professional land surveyors ensure orderly development of the province and the public interest

1. Alberta has a land boundary system to be proud of. The continued required use of professional land surveyors will protect our system into the future.

2. Professional land surveyors are university educated or equivalent; have articling experience; are reviewed and assessed every four years to ensure continued competency, and; adhere to a professional code of ethics that ensures boundaries are established in an unbiased manner, protecting the public interest at large.
GPS is a tool, and tools evolve over time. Measuring between two points is easy; knowing where to measure from and where to measure to is the difficult part.

The art of land surveying is more than a technical task; it requires judgment, analysis and the application of professional standards.

3. Private property owners’ rights are protected through the unbiased assessment of boundaries thereby limiting disputes and uncertainty.

4. Land surveyors have contributed to Alberta’s economic success through the efficient and orderly development of the province. Industry, municipalities and investors have confidence in the fact professional measurements are accurate and backed with professional accountability mechanisms.

Government
The ERC coordinates communication with the government using the services of a consultant that continues to be useful in assisting with government relations. Throughout the year meetings were coordinated with the Minister of Environment and Sustainable Resource Development (ESRD), Minister of Service Alberta, Minister of Jobs, Skills, Training and Labour, the Director of Surveys and attendance at the Premier’s Dinner. With the potential of a spring Provincial election the committee should continue to promote meetings with various Alberta Ministers and select government administrators.

Educational Institutions
The ERC continues to be proactive with educational institutions. This is achieved by meeting with the deans and serving on program advisory committees for University of Calgary, NAIT, SAIT, Lethbridge College, BCIT and Saskatchewan Polytechnic. With the University of Calgary, we successfully ran the popular Beef and Bun, along with setting up a booth at the U of C Geomatics Exposition.

Geomatics Associations
The ALSA administration has been proactive in meeting with other geomatics associations. There have been various discussions with Professional Surveyors Canada (PSC), provincial land surveyors associations, Alberta Society of Surveying and Mapping Technologists (ASSMT), Spatial Data Warehouse (now called Alberta Data Partnerships (ADP)), Alberta Geomatics Group (AGG), the National Cadastral Roundtable and the Canadian Geomatics Community Roundtable meetings.
Alberta Professional Associations
This year the Association was asked to comment on the amalgamation of the accountants under one piece of legislation. The committee continues to encourage contact and the development of relationships with other professional associations.

Oil & Gas
The committee reviews concerns and changes relating to the Oil & Gas industry. There was a meeting with the Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) and continual dialogue with Indian Oil and Gas Canada (IOGC).

Real Estate and Development
The committee has continued to approach realtors, development officers and planners to offer presentations and distribution of Subdivision and RPR brochures. A presentation by an ALS was made to the Canadian Real Estate Board (CREB) rural conference in November.

General Public Relations
This year the ERC Committee made a recommendation to Council to stop producing the Boundaries newsletter which was adopted. The committee continues to monitor the content and supply of all Association brochures.

Other (Stakeholders)
The committee subscribes and reviews news items from various stakeholder organizations that may have relevance to the Associations activities. These groups are monitored by the committee members throughout the year.

In the upcoming year the ERC will investigate into the involvement and sponsorship of the Geomatics Education Symposium (GES) put on by AGG in 2014. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee members for their hard work and willingness to participate on the ERC this year.

Paul Dixon, ALS

Future
At a strategic planning session held on March 7, 2014, Council struck a Future Committee and asked the Committee to provide Council with a report addressing the following:

“Based on what we think we know about society today and the current state of surveying in the world generally and in Alberta in particular, identify key actions that the ALSA needs to lead in order to get out ahead of clients and government.”

Chair:
Connie Petersen
Vice Chair:
Carl Larsen
Council Liaison:
Kevin Grover
Members:
Andrew Clark
Gord Linnell
Rob Scott
Predicting the future is not an easy task. The committee discussed the potential advances in technology, the current trend of governments with regards to self-regulating professions and looked at what other professional survey associations around the globe were doing to stay viable.

After much discussion, we arrived at a consensus and prepared a report for Council that addressed such things as public perception in the future, the basis for land surveys, information systems, professionals who deal with land, and how this might all interrelate.

The report was submitted to Council for review at their January 26th meeting. Council accepted the report as an information item.

I would like to thank all the committee members for their insight and input and for allowing themselves to take a trip into the future.

Connie Petersen, ALS

Historical & Biographical

This past year, the “Making Their Mark” travelling museum exhibit was displayed at the Millet & District Museum and the High River - Museum of the Highwood. From the attendance figures sent to us after each museum booking, the exhibit has been seen by almost 50,000 people over its six-year run and thirteen-museum tour. During the next year, it will be at the St. Paul People’s Museum and the Strathcona County Museum and Archives. From the negotiations we are having with several other museums, this exhibit will be available for several more years.

The Committee has conducted some personal interviews over the past year and is planning on more in the future. The purpose of these interviews is to capture the biographies and stories of retired and former association members to ensure that those biographies, survey and other stories that are out there will be preserved. This year, we have performed on-camera interviews with several newly commissioned land surveyors together with our senior land surveyors to get different perspectives to similar questions. If you would like to be part of this process, please contact any member of our committee.

The Committee prepares a display for the annual AGM with a theme related to a particular member who has had an influential impact on Association members. This display this year honours Mr. George Walker, who during his illustrious career, still found the time to article 14 students, several of who are still practicing today.

In collaboration with the Mr. Scott Westlund, the Director of Practice Review, the Committee is organizing a Q &
A forum with several senior Alberta Land Surveyors for the 2015 AGM.

The Collections Sub-Committee has completed the cataloguing of the Associations’ many artifacts. They are now in the process of sorting and cataloguing the many photographs in the collection. We would like to thank all the practitioners and companies that have donated equipment and memorabilia to the Association over the years. Please contact any member of the Committee or the ALSA if you’re considering donating any survey equipment to the Association.

I would like to personally thank all the members of this committee and the Collections Sub-committee for their dedication and commitment during the past year.

Les Frederick, ALS

Legislation

The Legislation Committee was tasked with the following terms of reference for 2014-2015:

1. Conduct a comprehensive review of the Land Surveyors Act and make recommendations to Council on the expectation of the act going forward to the 2016 spring sitting of the Alberta Legislature.

2. Investigate amending the bylaws to allow for electronic voting of Council members and make recommendations to Council.

The committee began its work with enthusiasm, dividing the terms of reference and delegating sub-committees to their different components. The Land Surveyors Act was reviewed by its different parts, namely Parts 1, 4 and 5 to begin. Sub-committees returned research to the committee meeting, reviewing the wording and intent of many of the different sections within. Debate over wording and meaning provided some further questions and possible recommendations for changes. Additional research of other acts and historical amendments would be required. On October 16, 2014 three committee members and ALSA staff met with Mr. Adrian Pritchard, Director of Professional Regulatory Renewal for the Government of Alberta. Mr. Pritchard provided a thorough review of the background of professional associations in Alberta and how he envisioned the associations of the future. He encouraged the committee members to use this time as an opportunity to look at the “big-picture scenario” for our Association and our act. Rather than focus on the content of the existing act he asked the group to look twenty years into the future and determine what changes would be required to expand our membership, solidify our
position in the province and sustain our future as a professional association. It was a change in direction and the committee moved to adapt and add this direction to its focus. In the coming meetings, debate ensued over how to tackle this new view, as wide-ranging as it is. As the committee began to refocus it learned of similar research/work being completed by the Future Committee and the decision was made to postpone its work until further direction from Council.

Research investigating electronic voting had commenced but was also postponed with news of potential overlap between the committees. Although the terms of reference were not completed this year, much initial effort to direct the research has been done and this will position the committee to continue its work in the upcoming year. I would like to thank all committee members for their participation and work this past year, and I encourage each one to continue with this project next year.

Andrew Christian, 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: G.A. (Greg) Boggs
For Vice President: J.M. (John) Byrne

Additional nominations may be made by two Alberta Land Surveyors, with the consent of the nominee in each case, up to February 27, 2015 and at the floor of the Annual General Meeting being held between the dates of April 24th to 25th, 2015 at The Fairmont Chateau Lake Louise.

The following offices are to be filled:
• President, one-year term
• Vice President, one-year term
• One member of Council, three-year term
• Two members of Council, two-year term

Rob Scott, ALS
The Practice Review Board (PRB) is a statutory committee established under the *Land Surveyors Act*. Its mandate, responsibilities, and authorities are outlined in Part 2 and Part 5 of the act. The Board’s goals and objectives are set in the terms of reference approved by Council, within which the Continuing Competency Review (CCR) program framework document is to be followed.

One formal hearing was conducted last year (to the date this report is submitted on February 23, 2015), where in the practitioner was requested to clarify some concerns with his Phase One review before the Board.

Phase One of the CCR Program commenced in May 2010. Phase Two of the CCR program commenced in May of 2014.

Since May 2014, the PRB has reviewed 120 Phase Two files and recommended ten files for follow-up comprehensive reviews to date. One complaint from Phase One was directed to the Registrar. A comprehensive review may not necessarily be an indication of a poor review or deficiency in a practice, but rather to clarify perceived practice deficiencies or concerns. In most cases, most of the concerns are sorted out and the files get closed.

A comprehensive review generally is a detailed follow-up review of the initial review which may involve a field inspection. The Director of Practice Review (DPR) may employ a seasoned Alberta Land Surveyor as an independent contractor to conduct the practitioner’s field inspection. Upon receiving the inspector’s field returns and checklists, the Board will then render a recommendation, to either close the file, require additional clarification from the practitioner, assign a certain undertakings for the practitioner, or call the practitioner to a formal hearing.

Anonymity of the practitioner is of utmost importance within the CCR process. The Association staff members (the DPR, and Kerry Barrett, Administrative Assistant) go through a great deal of effort in sanitizing products submitted to the Board for discussion. The identity of the practitioner is unknown even to the Board’s chairman signing the final recommendation letter to the practitioner.

The Board is meeting its goals as specified in the terms of reference, thanks to Mr. Westlund’s excellent work in reviewing files and reporting to the Board in a timely manner. Special thanks are also owed to Ms. Kerry Barrett in conducting the Board’s day-to-day business in a prompt, accurate, and professional fashion. The introduction of the File Synopsis (Control Sheet) has been extremely helpful to track each file at-a-glance.
Status
As of February 23, 2015 there are two files remaining open for completion of the Phase One program, which require follow-up comprehensive reviews. Between the last AGM in 2014 and February 2015, the Board held three on-line meetings, four face-to-face meetings and one hearing. All practitioners are welcome to attend the Board meeting at the time their file is discussed.

The following table reflects the current status of CCR Phase One and Phase Two:

Phase One CCR program
- Files opened: 454
- Files closed: 452
- Comprehensive Reviews: 35
- Second Comprehensive Reviews: 7
- Field inspections: 48
- Formal hearings (May 2010 - Feb 23, 2015): 4

Phase Two CCR program
- Files opened: 120
- Files opened and reviewed: 88
- Files opened yet to be reviewed: 32
- Files closed: 78
- Comprehensive Reviews: 10
- Field inspections conducted: 3
- Formal hearings held to date: 0

Phase Two CCR program is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2017.

General Observations
Since commencing Phase Two of the CCR program in 2014, the process itself has not changed substantially, other than minor tweaks with the Phase Two CCR questionnaire. There is an expectation that Phase Two reviewed practitioners will have registered a number of their dormant plans since Phase One, and that they have implemented remedial measures to prevent deficiencies identified in their Phase One reviews.

Areas identified for improvements in Phase Two are drafting errors on plans, substandard field notes, lack of redundant measurements, and more importantly, deficiencies in evidence assessment.

Practitioners are reminded that boundary determination and evidence assessment is the expertise of a professional Land Surveyor this is the one area we should shine during practice review. Be mindful that the public’s interest can only be protected when field staff and office staff are well-
trained, coached and mentored in these areas. It is through our own continuing education and continual coaching and mentoring of our staff that we can move towards eliminating plan and field work deficiencies.

Lastly, I sincerely thank all Board members for their diligence, integrity and hard work. They made my volunteer term as the PRB Chair educational and rewarding.

Fred Cheng, ALS

Professional Development

This year the Professional Development Committee (PDC) started its term with another half-day face-to-face focus group session, facilitated by the Director of Education, Scott Westlund. The purpose of this focus group session was to set the educational priorities and learning outcomes for seminars for the following twelve to eighteen months. It was attended by eight land surveyors from the Calgary area. Many good ideas were discussed and the professional development priorities identified were:

- SRD/AER training session,
- QA/QC of LiDAR data,
- business practices and leadership,
- the future of land surveying, and
- an evidence crawl in Calgary/Edmonton

In 2014-2015, the ALSA presented the following seminars: Calgary Evidence Crawl, Using LiDAR to Support Land Surveying Projects (Edmonton and Calgary), the November and March regional meetings as well as the seminars at the 2015 AGM.

Work has been done to organize an evidence crawl in Edmonton; however, we are still looking for suitable monuments and a tour guide. If you know the location of interesting monuments in the Edmonton area and/or have an interest in guiding a tour, please contact Scott Westlund.

Thank you to all members of the focus group for their ideas and suggestions. I would also like to thank Kerry Barrett and Brian Munday for their support and assistance with preparing and organizing the regional meetings and professional development courses.

Scott Westlund, ALS
Registration

The Registration Committee is a statutory committee as set out in the *Land Surveyors Act*. The purpose of the committee is to ensure that incoming land surveyors have the skills and knowledge necessary to act as a professional consistent with the demands and expectations of the public. This is done by assessing and examining articling pupils prior to receiving their commissions. It is the responsibility of the articling pupil and principal to ensure the articling pupil receives the necessary education, training and experience to be a competent Alberta Land Surveyor.

With 106 pupils currently in the articling process it takes a considerable amount of volunteer time to have this process run successfully. This year’s Registration Committee consisted of 39 Alberta Land Surveyors, all of whom volunteered a considerable amount of their time to ensure the registration process ran smoothly.

The following is a list of some of the duties these volunteers carry out during the year:

- approve articles, transfers, prior field service credit and affidavits of service;
- conduct annual, initial, transfer and other interviews, as required;
- mark the written professional examinations;
- attend the qualifying examinations; and
- review and mark project reports.

As of the end of February the committee has:
- conducted 27 qualifying examinations;
- reviewed and marked 42 project reports; and
- marked 47 written examinations.

This year was the start of the transition towards the new articling process as passed by Council in November of 2013. One of the major changes was the addition of the Registrar Rosalind Broderick, ALS to the committee. I would like to thank Rosalind for the great job she has done thus far - especially with preparing the written examinations and reviewing the yearly affidavits of service.

The committee has been busy working on the transition plans for the written examinations and the project reports. The proposed transition plans have been sent to Council for their review and approval. The committee is hoping to implement the new project report requirements in May 2015 and begin the new written examinations in the spring of 2016.

Council had asked the committee to investigate the concept of articling pupils paying a fee for the submission of each project report. The Registration Committee viewed this as an opportunity to review all the fees within the articling...
process. The committee examined what other land surveying associations were charging within their articling process and also reviewed other professions in the province. After this research was done, the committee provided Council with a proposed increase to all the fees within the registration process. Council approved the proposal and the new fees will come into effect on May 1st, 2015.

The committee and the Registrar were forced to terminate five pupils this year because they did not provide their affidavit of service before the January 15th deadline. The January 15th deadline is set out in the Examination and Training Regulation and therefore the committee must terminate articles if the affidavits have not been submitted.

The committee had to deal with two pupils being laid off in February due to the downturn in the economy. All pupils were made aware of the committee’s policy on unemployed articling pupils during the group annual meetings that were held in Calgary, Edmonton and Grand Prairie in February. If a pupil finds themselves being laid off, then they must notify the Registration Committee as soon as it happens.

The committee is struggling with the quality of the project reports. This topic will be subject of the March ALS News article. This concern was one of the topics at the group annual interviews. The committee has stressed to both the pupils and principals that the reports are to be at a professional level before they are submitted to the committee for review.

I would like to thank all of the volunteers on the committee for their dedication and hard work throughout this year. Without you, the committee could not effectively carry out the duties Council has requested of us. I would also like to give a special thanks to Michelle Woywitka who looks after all the day-to-day work of the committee. She has done an excellent job keeping the committee informed of all aspects of the registration process.

Finally, I would like to congratulate all the newly commissioned Alberta Land Surveyors and I look forward to seeing each of you at the AGM in Lake Louise.

Patrick Marshall, ALS
RST Implementation
The RST Implementation Ad Hoc Committee met seven times in 2014-2015 and was charged with the following terms of reference:

Finalize the ASSMT syllabus and experience requirements to become an RST
A finalized syllabus for Level 1 and Level 2 was achieved.

ASSMT is anticipating that the syllabi will be submitted for consideration by the membership at the 2015 ASSMT annual general meeting to be held in May 2015.

Level 1 is based on the requirements of a diploma program in geomatics. Minor updates were made due to changes in the SAIT curriculum while, based on research by Lee Morden, no significant changes occurred at other post-secondary institutions for the current academic year. NAIT may be in the process of restructuring their program however his belief is that the program content will remain much the same, however the course material will be consolidated into five “super courses” per term.

Level 2 remains unchanged.

In addition, Mr. Morden received notice that the Canadian Technology Accreditation Board (CTAB) is in the process of releasing a new set of benchmarks labeled 2014. ASSMT has created the syllabus based on the 2012 benchmark document.

It is not expected that these changes will have a significant impact on the ASSMT syllabus. Regardless, it will require periodic maintenance to keep it current with the national benchmarks and the curriculum at the post-secondary schools in Alberta.

Review the ASSMT bylaws associated with the RST designation and recommend any changes required.
It was acknowledged that this work cannot be finalized until the amended act and new regulation is in place. The consensus best case scenario for the government bringing the amendment to the Land Surveyors Act forward is now thought to be in the fall of 2015 or 2016.

ASSMT retained Mr. Norm Bishop of the legal firm of Bishop & MacKenzie in Edmonton to investigate whether there needs to be changes to ASSMT’s organizational structure and bylaws as a result of bringing in the RST designation. The intent of the review to date is to have something ready to provide responses to government in the event that questions arise.
Review the RST Code of Ethics

It was agreed that an RST must follow the ASSMT code of ethics plus something extra specifically for an RST. An RST will not be included in the ALSA Code of Ethics Regulation. An RST would not be subject to two codes of ethics. RSTs must be aware that land surveying is an exclusive scope of practice.

A number of concerns were expressed when preparing a draft code of ethics including situations when a RST is working under the supervision direction and control of an Alberta Land Surveyor and where a RST is independently engaged in the practice of surveying only.

Additional work based on the existing ASSMT code of ethics document will be needed for consideration going forward.

Develop a policy for both the ALSA and ASSMT on the discipline for RSTs

The committee agreed a framework for discipline based on what the ALSA and ASSMT wants to have happen is required, regardless of whether the framework goes into bylaws or some other form. It was clarified that the ALSA does not and would not have the authority to discipline an RST except by means of participation on a joint ALSA-ASSMT committee. The underlying principle behind the proposed legislation is that there is a firewall between the ALSA and ASSMT.

The only penalty that could be applied to a RST would be loss of membership and loss of the RST title. If the penalty is the same, then a more robust and formal discipline process may not be necessary. Questions arose on how disciplinary powers are going to be enforced if it is not a statutory committee. Concern was expressed that if discipline is mentioned in the legislation, the processes and procedures will also need to be referenced in the legislation therefore the existing ASSMT bylaws will not be sufficient.

After extensive discussion, it was agreed that the committee needs to write out a process or flowchart outlining what happens from application to removal. As the flowchart is developed, questions will arise that the committee will be able to identify and for which answers and procedures can be created.

This has been tabled for further discussion.
Develop a policy for both the ALSA and ASSMT on the registration for RSTs including who will review the education and experience of candidates?
ASSMT already has a panel of examiners and a certification panel (a joint member panel) to administer the registration process.

It was agreed that there should be a mechanism in the ALSA policy manual that the ALSA officially appoints Alberta Land Surveyors to the various ASSMT committees.

Develop a policy for both the ALSA and ASSMT on the registration for RSTs including what testing will be required?
An ad hoc committee will need to prepare a written guideline/framework for the ethics examination but it was agreed that it is too soon to start preparing sample examination questions. It was felt that the existing ASSMT Panel of Examiners could administer the examination. If the workload for the Panel of Examiners increases, then more people can be added to the Panel of Examiners.

Darryl Larson

Standards
The Standards Committee was fortunate to have 39 members this year from the Association, Director of Surveys Office, Land Titles Office, and ASSMT. A total of seven terms of reference were assigned by Council, resulting in three recommendations being forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM, two recommendations being forwarded to Council, and two being carried over to next year. The Committee met seven times via GoToMeeting during the year. I would like to thank all committee members for their hard work and input this year. I would also like to mention the efforts by our subgroup leads to tackle the terms of reference.

Investigate how integration is being handled by other provincial associations
A recommendation was made to Council on a proposed integration policy based on how integration is being completed in other jurisdictions. This will be retained for future discussions on integration.

Review the statutory declaration for as-built plans for long-term dispositions
A recommendation was made to add a section to the Manual of Standard Practice on statutory declarations for public lands dispositions.
Develop a standard or guideline outlining the issues that practitioners should address when an Alberta Land Surveyor leaves the employ of a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership and their collective professional responsibilities

The subgroup worked to develop a guideline dealing with this term of reference but were unable to have all details in the document completed. This will be carried over to the following year.

Review what digital information (i.e.: metadata) should be provided to clients

This term of reference will be continued in the following year.

Review and recommend amendments to make references to dispositions in the Manual of Standard Practice more generic as a result of the changes to public land disposition names

A recommendation was made for changes to portions of Part D, Section 5 of the Manual of Standard Practice dealing with public lands disposition names.

Investigate whether the Association should ask Alberta Land Titles to implement a SPOC+ solution

The SPOC+ system was reviewed by the subgroup with the assistance of the Land Titles Office liaison. The committee felt that this system would be best developed in conjunction with the upcoming modernization of the Land Titles system and made a recommendation to Council accordingly.

Consider adding a similar item to the Manual of Standard Practice regarding double monumentation as in the Manitoba Manual of Instruction Section 26 which states, “All boundary conflicts between land surveyors shall be resolved to avoid double monumentation.”

A recommendation was made for changes to the Manual of Standard Practice to address this item.

Ian Cleland, ALS
Rationale Documents

RATIONAL DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the revision of Section 40(1) of the Association’s bylaws.

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)
   
   Council felt that the existing bylaw needed clarification during a review of all of the Association’s financial policies.

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
   
   The bylaw limits withdrawals from the Association’s account to be done by cheque only. In a modern banking system, the electronic withdrawal of funds may make more sense in certain specific circumstances.

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   
   The intent of the recommendation is to allow for pre-authorized withdrawals from the Association’s bank account for certain regular expenditures when approved by Council. For example, payroll and rent are amounts that do not change from month to month and could, with Council’s approval, the Executive Director could set up an electronic transfer to withdraw the funds from the Association’s account.

4. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
   
   None.

5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
   
   The public interest is not affected. The membership is still protected because payments other than by cheque must be authorized by Council. Payments over $5,000 must be signed by two people if by cheque or authorized by a majority of Council. If something improper were to occur, the Association does have an insurance policy in place specifically to cover such dishonest acts.

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?
   
   None.

Appendix “E”

Recommendation #1
Signing Authority
Recommendation #2

Affidavit of Service

It was MOVED by Mr. Paddy Marshall, seconded by Mr. Hugo Engler, that Form D of the bylaws (Affidavit of Service of an Articled Pupil) be amended as follows:

Form D
Affidavit of Service of an Articled Pupil

The Land Surveyors Act (RSA 2000 c L-3)
Affidavit of Service of an Articled Pupil

I_______________________________Alberta Land Surveyor of the__________________
of____________________in the Province of Alberta MAKE OATH AND SAY:

(1) THAT ______________________has regularly and faithfully served as my articled pupil under articles of agreement dated___________________.

(2) THAT the pupil has been engaged in actual surveying operations in the field and in the office on the following surveys and for the periods of time set down opposite them, that is to say for the period _______________ to _________________.

SWORN before me at_____________________
in the Province of Alberta this_______________
day of _______________________, ________

______________________________
(Alberta Land Surveyor)

Commissioner for Oaths in and for the Province of Alberta
(sign, print name and provide expiry date)

Application for Service Time for the year Field Time:______(months) Office Time:_____ (months)

_____________________________________
(signature of applicant)

FOR REGISTRATION COMMITTEE USE ONLY

Service Time Approved for the year_______ Field Time:____(months) Office Time:____(months)

Date:___________ Initial: __________

__ months of prior field service granted on ____________, _____ Approved by:

__ months of approved field time served to:_________________

_________________ (print name and initial)

__ months of approved office time served to:_________________

Date:_________________

Approved by the Registration Committee on:_____________________

COMMENTS:

See attached form for recording details, only 12 months of service shall be granted per calendar year.
RATIONAL DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the revision of Form D of the bylaws (Affidavit of Service of an Articled Pupil).

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)**
   
   This recommendation arose from the Articling Pupil Process Ad Hoc Committee Report (Approved by Council on November 7, 2013).

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
   
   The review of the annual affidavit of service submissions takes a considerable amount of time to evaluate. By developing a new submission form with categories (to be determined by the Registration Committee), the affidavits become standardized.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
   
   To streamline the form, make it more user-friendly and easier to evaluate. This will benefit the articling pupil and principal by making the form easier to fill out and easier to evaluate by the Registration Committee.

---

**NOTE:** Record all experience in the reporting period. Please identify any work done outside of Alberta. For field service, please identify level of responsibility: [i.e., supervision (S), party chief (PC) or field assistant (FA)].
4. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
No one was consulted outside of the Association.

5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
This recommendation does not affect 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?
There are no financial costs associated with this recommendation.

It was MOVED by Mr. Ian Cleland seconded by Mr. Nitin Bansal, that Part C, Section 5.5 of the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

Retracement, Restoration and Re-Establishment

5.5 Conflicting Evidence
Positional conflicts arising from plan dimensions, monuments on the ground, or other sources are not uncommon in conducting retracement surveys. It is the responsibility of the Alberta Land Surveyor to resolve such conflicts objectively by considering the following:

1. Property lines established on a registered Subdivision Plan or original Township Plan cannot be altered by subsequent plans, although re-subdivision can be used to effect new boundaries between consenting owners.
2. Given ambiguity or conflict within a single plan, the “intent” of the original survey should guide the Surveyor in effecting re-establishment.
3. The advice of the Director of Surveys, experienced Surveyors, or the original Surveyor should be sought in difficult cases.
4. If a boundary conflict cannot be resolved by the Surveyor, the Surveyor should consider referring the matter to the ALSA Boundary Panel before resorting to the Provincial Court or the Court of Queen’s Bench. The Surveyor may be treated as an expert witness by each of these bodies.

Due to potential public confusion double monumentation needs to be avoided. Positional conflicts between Alberta Land Surveyors shall be resolved in a timely manner.
RATIONAL DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the revision of Part C, Section 5.5 of the Manual of Standard Practice.

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)
   The Practice Review Board in the past has tried to develop an interpretive bulletin regarding double monumentation but found that there were too many circumstances to cover. The PRB were informed that the Manitoba Manual of Good Practice had a clause that seemed to address what the PRB would like to see done. On February 29 2014 Council sent the item to the Standards committee to see if wording similar to those used in the Manitoba Manual of Good Practice could be added to the Manual of Standard Practice.

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
   The recommendation is addressing the issues of boundary uncertainties, double monumentation and lack of communication between surveyors. The recommendation requires practitioners to solve boundary uncertainties in a timely manner.

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   The intent of this recommendation is to help reduce the number of incidents in which positional conflicts between surveyors create boundary uncertainties.

4. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
   Representatives of the Director of Surveys Office and the Land Titles Office are members of the Standards Committee. Their input was provided when the Committee reviewed the subgroup’s proposed recommendation.

5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
   Pro: The recommendation will help reduce the number of boundary uncertainties to land owners caused by land surveyors who register positional conflict in property boundaries.
   Con: None at this time.
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 Manual of Standard (MSP) will have to be updated to reflect the changes. There will be an administrative cost associated with updating the MSP.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Ian Cleland, seconded by Mr. Kris Ritchie, that Part D, Section 5 of the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:*

**Section 5: Wellsite and Public Land Dispositions**

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

An Alberta Land Surveyor should be familiar with public land disposition types and the approving authority’s plan requirements before carrying out surveys involving public lands.


**5.1 Environmental Conditions Affecting Well Licensing**

Alberta requires operators of upstream oil and gas facilities in environmentally sensitive areas to conserve and reclaim land and to mitigate the effects of their activities. For specifications and guidelines, consult the Alberta Environment Fact Sheet entitled *Siting an Upstream Oil and Gas Site in an Environmentally Sensitive Area on Private Land*: [http://environment.gov.ab.ca/info/library/5940.pdf](http://environment.gov.ab.ca/info/library/5940.pdf)
5.2 Reference Boundary

1. An Alberta Land Surveyor performing a survey for the location of wellsites and related facilities in surveyed territory shall locate and confirm sufficient monuments within, on, or defining the section in which the facilities are located to determine the position of the wellsite and related facilities in relation to the section boundaries. The word “monuments” here refers to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act.

2. An Alberta Land Surveyor performing a survey for the location of wellsites and related facilities in Unsurveyed Territory shall locate and confirm sufficient monuments to determine the position of the wellsite and related facilities in relation to the theoretical section boundaries. The word “monuments” here refers to:
   - monuments placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act;
   - monuments shown on a Wellsite Control Plan on file with the Director of Surveys Office;
   - monuments shown on an Establishment of Monuments for Wellsite Control Plan registered at the Land Titles Office;
   - monuments shown on a plan of survey signed by an Alberta Land Surveyor and registered at Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development on or after August 1, 2009; or
   - Alberta Survey Control Markers directly connected to Part 2 or Part 3 monuments that define the theoretical section boundaries.

Theoretical section boundaries shall be determined using the Supplement to the Manual of Instructions for the Survey of Canada Lands.

5.3 Surveys Act

Where the boundaries of a wellsite or related facility purport to define a property boundary, the said boundary shall be defined in accordance with the Surveys Act, excepting thereout the provisions of Sections 44(3) and 46(3), to define the boundaries of the parcel.

However, when a related linear facility (access road) crosses or terminates on a property boundary, the intersection may be calculated, in which
case the plan shall clearly indicate that the intersection is calculated.

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 that does not meet the requirements outlined in Part D, Section 5.7.3 (Wellsite Plan Requirements) on page 52 and in Part D, Section 6 (Other Surveys in Unsurveyed Territory) on page 58, 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*.

When performing this survey, the Surveyor shall:
1. Make ties to existing surveys as required to determine the relationship between the survey being performed and the theoretical section boundaries in accordance with the accuracies specified in Part C, Section 1.6 (Wellsite Surveys) on page 14.
2. Place monuments not further than 1,000 metres from the well location.
3. Place a monument at each survey point established.
4. Show this information on a Wellsite Control Plan and submit it to the Land Titles Office for registration as an Establishment of Monuments for Wellsite Control Plan within 180 days of completing the survey.

If the survey for a well location in Unsurveyed Territory meets the requirements outlined in Part D, Section 5.7.3 (Wellsite Plan Requirements) on page 52 and Part D, Section 6 (Other Surveys in Unsurveyed Territory) on page 58, the Surveyor is not required to register an Establishment of Monuments for Wellsite Control Plan at the Land Titles Office.

5.5 **Monumentation**

Refer to Part C, Section 3.10 (Wellsites and Related Facilities) on page 20.
5.6 Accuracies
Refer to Part C, Section 1.6 (Wellsite Surveys) on page 14.

5.7 Wellsite Plan Requirements
1. A Wellsite Survey Plan shall include, at minimum, the following administrative information:
   - name of licensee (applicant);
   - name of survey corporation and/or Alberta Land Surveyor;
   - dates of survey and any revisions; and
   - ALS Certification for Wellsites on Private Land (Part E, Section 1, page 72) or ALS Statutory Declaration for Public Land Dispositions:

2. For technical requirements and guidelines, consult Energy Resources Conservation Board Directive 056 – Energy Development Applications and Schedules:

3. A Wellsite Survey Plan in Unsurveyed Territory shall clearly identify the survey evidence used as the datum and show the coordinates of the datum point or points relative to the northeast corner of Section 33 on the Base Line that governs the positions of the theoretical ATS boundaries in the vicinity of the wellsite.

4. Surveys performed under Part D, Section 5.7 (Wellsite Plan Requirements) shall also meet the requirements in Part D, Section 6 (Other Surveys in Unsurveyed Territory) on page 58.

5.8 Public Land Dispositions Except Access Roads Licence of Occupation (LOC)

This sub-section refers to the requirements for surveys of public land dispositions. If disposition plans are registered at the Land Titles Office, the Surveyor should refer to the appropriate section of the Manual.

An Alberta Land Surveyor should be familiar with public land disposition types and the approving authority’s plan requirements before carrying out surveys involving
A list of various disposition types and plan preparation guidelines is available in the Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development document entitled *Disposition Plan Types/Formats*:


It is necessary to accurately define the location of activities and dispositions on public lands so that the approving authority does not grant conflicting authorizations on the same land. This is accomplished by requiring applicants to provide a detailed plan showing the location of the land for which the applicant is applying in relation to known survey evidence.

The above-cited document entitled *Disposition Plan Types/Formats* specifies:

- when a survey is required and when a proposed plan or sketch plan, without a survey, is allowed;
- the content requirements for a proposed plan or sketch plan at the application stage; and
- the content requirements for survey plans at the final stage after construction.

When determining the boundaries of public land dispositions, Surveyors should be guided by the following criteria:

- Where the disposition boundaries are surveyed and monumented, the boundaries shall be defined by the monuments placed for that purpose.
- Where the disposition boundaries are surveyed and not monumented, the boundaries shall be defined by the best evidence governing those boundaries.
- Where the disposition boundaries are not surveyed, the boundaries shall be defined by the best physical evidence governing those boundaries.

When conducting a survey and preparing a plan for a public land disposition, an Alberta Land Surveyor shall:

1. Mark the positions of the boundary lines to be established by placing monuments at every change in direction and at the beginning and end of ev-
any curve. The type of monument to be placed is stipulated in the Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development document entitled *Disposition Plan Types/Formats*:


2. Intersect and monument all surveyed section boundaries crossed.

3. When surveying public land dispositions that require monumentation to be statutory iron posts, intersect and monument existing public land disposition boundaries that are defined by statutory iron posts and crossed by the new disposition.

4. In surveyed territory, locate and confirm sufficient monuments within, on, or defining the section in which the disposition is located to determine the position of the disposition in relation to the section boundaries. The word “monuments” here refers to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the *Surveys Act*.

5. In Unsurveyed Territory, locate and confirm sufficient monuments to define the theoretical section in which the disposition is located in order to determine the position of the disposition in relation to the theoretical section boundaries.

The word “monuments” here refers to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the *Surveys Act*, those shown on a Wellsite Control Plan on file with the Director of Surveys Office, monuments shown on a plan of survey signed by an Alberta Land Surveyor and registered at Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development on or after August 1, 2009, or Alberta Survey Control Markers integrated with the Alberta Survey Control System.

6. Derive and reference the bearings of all surveyed lines in accordance with Part D, Section 1.2 (Datum or Origin for Bearings and Coordinates) on pages 36 to 37.

7. Verify all bearings and distances to the level of accuracy specified in Part C, Section 1.6 (Wellsite Surveys) on page 14 except ties identified in Sec-
tion 5.8.8 below.

8. Make sufficient field measurements to ensure that there are no errors of layout or measurement, and show these measurements on the plan.

9. Tie in and show on the plan all visible public land dispositions crossed or adjacent to the survey.

10. Prepare the plan in accordance with Part D, Section 1 (General Requirements for Plans) on pages 35 to 37 and the approving authority’s plan requirements.

11. Certify the plan in accordance with the ALS Statutory Declaration for Public Land Dispositions:

5.9 Remote Sensing for Public Land Dispositions and Wellsites on Private Land

An Alberta Land Surveyor preparing a disposition plan on public lands or wellsites on private land based on remotely sensed survey data such as LiDAR shall:

1. Use remotely sensed data only if it can be demonstrated that it meets accuracies of 0.5 m vertically and 2.0 m horizontally with respect to Alberta Survey Control Markers or other published benchmarks in the area at the 95% confidence level. Verifying this may include obtaining the calibration data and testing the collection method for quality assurance, comparing the data to data for a sample of areas surveyed using proven techniques, and comparison with points that have published horizontal and vertical positions.

2. Visit the subject area to confirm that all relevant topography has been identified and shown on the plan. For example, the Surveyor may find small creeks that were not discernible in the data.

3. Locate and confirm monuments in accordance with Part D, Section 5.2 (Reference Boundary) on page 50.

4. Identify the data collection technique prominently in the plan heading (e.g., LiDAR Survey).

5. Identify positions to be monumented (corners, changes in direction, and beginnings and ends of curves) with a symbol that is represented in the legend as a “remotely sensed position.”
6. Note on the plan when the remotely sensed data was collected.
7. Prepare the plan in accordance with Part D, Section 1 (General Requirements for Plans) on pages 35 to 37 and, if the survey includes public land, the approving authority’s plan requirements.
8. Certify the plan in accordance with the ALS Certification for Wellsites on Private Land (Part E, Section 1, page 72) or the ALS Statutory Declaration for Public Land Dispositions: http://esrd.alberta.ca/lands-forests/director-of-surveys/documents/DOS-DirectorofSurveysAct-Policy-Feb1-2011_final.pdf
9. If the survey includes public land, prepare a monumented as-built plan of survey within the time period specified by the approving authority in accordance with Part D, Section 5.8 (Public Land Dispositions Except Licence of Occupation) on pages 52 to 54, Section 5.10 (Licence of Occupation Linear Public Land Dispositions) on page 56, and the approving authority’s plan requirements.
10. If the wells site survey includes private land, prepare a monumented as-built plan of survey based on non-remotely sensed techniques within the time period specified by the approving authority (ERCB) in accordance with the provisions of Part D, Section 5.2 (Reference Boundary), Section 5.3 (Survey Act), and Section 5.7 (Wellsite Plan Requirements) on pages 50 to 52.

5.10 Survey of As-Built Access Roads  Licence of Occupation (LOC) Linear Public Land Dispositions

This section does not apply to access roads included in a surface lease disposition with monumented boundaries.

An Alberta Land Surveyor performing a public land disposition survey for an as-built LOC-access road shall:

1. Survey the location of the as-built access road. The disposition boundaries shall be determined from the centreline of the as-built road. The relationship of the centreline of the as-built road to the disposition boundaries shall be shown on the plan. The placement of monuments, marker posts, and bearing trees is not required.
2. Make ties to existing surveys as required to deter-
mine the relationship between the survey being performed and the Alberta Township System to the level of accuracy specified in Part C, Section 1.6 (Wellsite Surveys) on page 14. Tie the beginning and end points of the survey to existing surveys, which include the Alberta Survey Control System, surveyed section boundaries, plans of survey registered at the Land Titles Office, Wellsite Control Plans, and monumented disposition surveys.

3. Derive and reference the bearings of all surveyed lines in accordance with Part D, Section 1.2 (Datum or Origin for Bearings and Coordinates) on pages 36 to 37.

4. Verify all bearings and distances to the level of accuracy specified in Part C, Section 1.6 (Wellsite Surveys) on page 14 except ties made under Section 5.10.5 below.

5. Tie in and show on the plan all visible linear public land dispositions crossed or adjacent to the survey.

6. Prepare the plan in accordance with Part D, Section 1 (General Requirements for Plans) on pages 35 to 37 and the approving authority’s plan requirements.


5.11 Wellsite Disposition Plan Amendments for Mineral Surface Leases (MSLs)
An Alberta Land Surveyor performing a wellsites (maximum 10 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.
For information on public land disposition amendments, refer to Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development’s *Survey Manual – Public Land Surveys*:

**RATIONAL DOCUMENT** for the motion pertaining to the revision of Part D, Section 5 of the Manual of Standard Practice.

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)**
   During the January 30, 2014 Council meeting, a motion was put forward proposing that the Manual of Standard Practice should be more generic as a result of the changes to public land disposition names.
   The activities relating to upstream oil and gas, oil sands, coal mines and geophysical exploration have transitioned to the Alberta Energy Regulator (AER). As a result of this transition, there has been a series of changes to PLA dispositions that have been affected.
   Effective December 1, 2013 ESRD has made changes to disposition activities to separate similar activities between ESRD and the AER. The Standards Committee created a subgroup to investigate the how changes to public land disposition names would impact the Manual of Standard Practice.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
   The current 2014 version of the Manual of Standard Practice references public land dispositions and their abbreviations. The revisions remove disposition abbreviations, update the links, and add a document that clarifies the disposition ownership between energy and non-energy activities.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
   The overall intent is to make the Manual of Standard Practice more generic in regards to public land dispositions.
4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**
Representatives of the Director of Surveys Office and the Land Titles Office are members of the Standards Committee. Their input was provided when the Committee reviewed the subgroup’s proposed recommendation.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**
Pros: The recommendation will update URL links and remove specific references to dispositions making it more generic. Cons: none at this time.

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 Manual of Standard (MSP) will have to be updated to reflect the changes. There will be an administrative cost associated with updating the MSP.

**RATIONAL DOCUMENT** for the motion pertaining to the revision of Part D, Section 5.12 be added to the Manual of Standard Practice.

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)**
The origin of this item dates back to a Council Meeting from August 29, 2013. The term was added to the Standards Committee’s 2013-2014 terms of reference and then carried forward to 2014-2015 for further research and discussion.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
The problem presented was the need to review the application of the statutory declaration and especially for PLA dispositions where the pipeline is not totally built within the PLA right-of-way boundaries.
Adding a section to the MSP describing the standard of practice related to the statutory declaration will help to solve the problem.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
The overall intent of the recommendation is to set the standard of practice with regard to statutory declarations to avoid misinterpretations.
4. *Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?*
   Yes, the Director of Surveys; the Manager of PLA Geomatics-Public Lands-AER and other government officers were consulted. They agreed in general with the committee’s opinion and provided feedback.

5. *How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?*
   Pro: The public interest will benefit by knowing that the statutory declaration may reduce application costs in many cases, but may not be applicable for PLA dispositions. It is in the best public interest to link the position of buried pipelines to their related PLA dispositions.
   Con: None at this time.

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 will be a cost associated with updating the MSP.
Valerie Lethbridge, ALS and Jonathan Lunn, ALS were not able to attend the annual general meeting.
New Members Address

President Al Jamieson asked Mr. Horatiu Caraba to come forward to say a few words on behalf of the new members about what receiving their commission means to them and all of the hard work they have put into this moment.

Mr. Horatiu Caraba addressed the luncheon as follows:

To put it in Al’s term, this scares the sugar out of me. It is not something that I would usually volunteer for. It is not something that I would even agree to but I will tell you what happened. Being a new land surveyor, I am still at work. It is late, six o’clock. I am the only one there. Al comes into my office and he says, I’ve got an idea and he talks for about fifteen minutes and then he leaves the room. You know what happened in that fifteen minutes. He planted a seed. He plants a seed. That is how he does it. That is how all presidents do it. They plant a seed. Greg, you should be taking notes. Write this down, inception. I have been told by Bob Wallace that I am under strict instruction to wrap this up by the time he falls asleep. So given the fact that we only have about five minutes left here, I have already cut this speech. I took out about two-thirds of it and now I have three minutes left so I am going to cut that last third into a quarter and skip right to the end and tell people what a qualifying exam feels like because I know that the articling students that have been through it know what it is like and the land surveyors know what it is like but there are a lot of articling students in here that are going to find out and you know what, their spouses are never going to know. Maybe some of the more seasoned land surveyors have already blocked it out as it is a pretty horrific time. They just block it out of their memory. Traumatic right, so don’t worry I will bring it back for you. I will remind you what it was like and you can thank me later. The qualifying exam is pretty much the equivalent of jumping out of an airplane and I am not talking about the fun part of jumping out of an airplane where you are flying through the air with your cheeks going and wondering why you did not do this sooner. This is great. That is not the part that I am talking about. I am talking about when you are sitting in the airplane and it starts to climb and it is climbing and climbing and you know that when it gets to ten thousand feet, you have to jump. During that time you are sitting there and some people get cold. They get nervous. Their hands get cold but they are sweaty for some reason and it does not even make sense and then there are other people that start overheating, like Matt over here. He starts overheating and turns all tomato red and
gets lakes under his armpits. Then there are people like me. I get hot. I get cold. I don’t know what is going on. So anyway you are sitting there, waiting to walk into the qualifying exam room and you are freaking out. Then the door opens and that is like the door to the airplane opening. You know you are about to jump. When you get to that door you really just want to grab it and stick your feet on the door frame so that no one can push you through. That is pretty much how it goes. That would be pretty embarrassing. What are the examiners supposed to do? They let you cry it out? I don’t think so. So like all of the other articling students before you, you are going to walk through the door into the room and wipe the sweat off your hands so that when you shake the examiners hand, they do not know that you are scared. They have no idea, right. Then it starts from there but when it was all said and done I remember saying to Bob, I don’t even know what just happened. I can’t remember. That was so hard I can’t believe I passed. They must have felt bad for me. Now, I have had my commission for about ten months and I will tell you this. They did not feel bad for me. They had to do the exact same thing that I had to do but just because they did not feel bad for me doesn’t mean that they did not want me to succeed. I don’t remember a time when I was articling that I ran into a problem or that I ran into a situation where I did not know what to do and there wasn’t a land surveyor there to give me a hand and give me some advice. With that in mind, I would ask that the new land surveyors take a good look around this room because the people in this room, the family, the friends, the colleagues, the other land surveyors, your principals, without them, without their help, without the opportunities that they have provided for us I don’t think we would have much to celebrate at all. So please take the time this weekend to thank them and tell them what it means to you. Thanks.

President Al Jamieson thanked Mr. Caraba and told him that he knew that he could count on him.
President Al Jamieson asked his business partner and colleague, Mr. Bob Wallace, to come to the stage to say a few words to the new members. He also asked that the new members all line up in front of the stage.

Mr. Bob Wallace addressed the luncheon as follows:

You know that Horatiu was my articled student and this was a big move for him. It was about one year into his articles and we did not know that the guy could talk. I am another volunteer for Mr. Jamieson to come up and salute the new land surveyors that we are lucky to have in our fold this year. I would really like to start off by congratulating all you young land surveyors. It is quite a process from the time you start university or your CBEPS exams or your jurisdictional exams till the time you receive your commission. I do know about that qualifying exam because I am on the Registration Committee. Ha-ha. You may think that you have reached your pinnacle here but this is simply just a milestone in your career journey. You know just as much now as you did when you were an articled student so it is important that you continue on with your learning process. This might take the form of more diversified experience, personal growth, management and geomatics courses, seminars but last but not least volunteering in your community or our Association. Part of your future growth should be to tap into the great minds within our Association. There are people with years of knowledge and experience that can pass that on to you to make you a better land surveyor. There are also amazing business minds within our Association. They would be more than happy to mentor you to that aspect of our business. If you are lucky enough to work with a company that has a number of land surveyors, they will be more than willing to help you develop your skills as a land surveyor. For those of you who don’t have access to other land surveyors, don’t be afraid to give any land surveyor in a company a call should you have any questions at all. One unique aspect of our Association of land surveyors is we can put business competition aside and work together to solve problems, mentor articled pupils or new land surveyors as well as promoting our field of practice.

For the last number of years, we have been battling to preserve our land surveyor ranks in our profession in Canada. Our ranks are dwindling across the country. In Alberta,
ever, we have been lucky to have a strong number of new land surveyors every year to replenish our ranks in order to replace those who are retiring or leaving our profession, where other associations are battling to preserve their existence. When I became a land surveyor in 1981, us whipper-snappers were viewed as a threat to the existing competition and it sure took a long time to feel included. It’s not true today. Us practicing land surveyors welcome your new minds, your technical knowledge, your passion towards our profession. We want to leverage this talent to expand our profession instead of just worrying about survival. So we pass the torch to you to not only preserve what we have but to make it better. Use your education, your knowledge to create new opportunity for our profession. Lastly, I hope you have read President Al’s most recent article in *ALS News*. Ethics, you must realize the support that your company gave you in order to obtain your commission. I believe you must respect that and start to give back to those that not only helped and invested in you but also participating in our Association to keep it at the forefront of all professions. Congratulations.
### 25-Year Pin Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lorraine Hortness</th>
<th>Peter Sullivan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 50-Year Pin Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barry Bishop, ALS (Retired)</th>
<th>Hugo Engler, ALS</th>
<th>Alex Hittel, ALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barry Bishop, ALS (Retired) was not able to attend the Past-Presidents’ Breakfast to receive his 50-year pin.
In May 1995, a spunky little gal from Bon Accord walked into the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association office. Twenty years later she has turned into one of the most valuable assets this Association has.

It is my absolute pleasure to honour Dawn Phelan with the President’s Award in 2015.

I have personally worked countless years with Dawn through the Standards Committee and spent the last two years on Council appreciating Dawn’s wit, commitment and sense of humour. Dawn has worked with just about every committee in the Association from public relations, professional development, standards, legislation, executive to discipline, Council and the Practice Review Board. For someone who is not a land surveyor, Dawn has an incredible understanding of the professions, standards, and practices and knows as well as anyone how the Association works and how things get done!

Dawn has a great knack of being able to discern a bunch of table talk into an intelligible statement or motion.

Trying to keep this President’s Award presentation a secret in the small ALSA office proved quite a challenge, especially with someone as inquisitive as Dawn. Thanks to Brian and Michelle for keeping this a secret (I hope!).

Figuring out the appropriate gift of appreciation for Dawn proved a challenge. Her biography in the June 1995 ALS News when she was hired listed her hobbies as reading and cross-stitching. So, for someone who likes to snuggle up on the home front, what better gift than this beautiful quilt made with love by none other than our own Kathy Wallace. We discussed, but opted out of Dawn’s likely preference of material, a Winnie the Pooh design, thinking it just wasn’t right for the occasion.

The very last sentence of the bio in ALS News from twenty years ago states “we are looking forward to a long association with her,” this became very visionary. Dawn, I would like to thank you on behalf of myself, and also the entire membership for your twenty years serving our Association.

Dawn, would you please come forward and accept the 2015 President’s Award.

Ray, would you come forward as well.

Al Jamieson, ALS
Dawn Phelan provided the following for the June 2015 issue of ALS News.

Thanks to the skilful deception of Michelle Woywitka, Brian Munday and Al Jamieson I was completely caught off guard when then-President Al started speaking, after Clayton Bruce accepted his well-deserved honorary life membership at the 2015 Past President’s Breakfast, about someone starting at the Association in May of 1995. Having been told that Al was not giving out a President’s Award I thought that he may just be making a few nice comments about my tenure at the Association, as he had in his president’s address earlier that week. Clearly, I was mistaken. Shockingly, surprisingly, happily wrong.

In April of 1995, an employment agency I was registered with asked if I’d be interested in interviewing for a receptionist position. Since I was trying to survive on part-time retail work and intermittent short-term contract positions, I was more than willing to try for a full-time position. Obviously it worked out in my favour and twenty years later I’m the last one left that worked in the ALSA office on the day I started.

I may have started at the front desk answering phones and doing mail-outs but over the years my responsibilities have changed and grown. I’ve worked with most of the standing and statutory committees and have learned things that I can honestly say I never thought I’d ever know. RPR, stat dec, co-ordinates, N ¼ on the blindline. Not common phrases to most people but ones that now have meaning to me. Working with the Standards Committee and the Practice Review Board I learned a lot about the practice of surveying and, thankfully, I worked with people like Don George, Al Nelson, Lyall Pratt and Brian Munday who could explain it all to me so I could not only capture the conversations at meetings but understand, at least at a basic level, what was being discussed. Working with Jerry Rasumson, Dick Bassil, David McWilliam and now Rosalind Broderick in their role as Registrar has also given me a breadth of knowledge and means of interpreting legislation that I definitely did not foresee back during my interview when Sharon Armstrong (then Stecyk) asked me if I had any familiarity with government legislation. For those who are curious, my only legislation knowledge would have revolved around the Landlord and Tenants Act at that time but I was willing to learn. And learn I did...and still do.

People don’t stay in relationships for twenty years, or more, if there isn’t good reason to. I’ve been privileged to work with a number of those good reasons over the years. I have enjoyed working with a number of the members and am
pleased that there are some I can count as friends. It’s the staff at the office though that has really made it easy to stay with ALSA this long. I’ve had the chance to work with and become friends with a number of staff over the years and have learned something from each and every one of them.

When I first started at the Association, I would tease Sharon that she started with ALSA at the same time I started school. In a sweet karmic turn of events, I may one day have someone saying the same thing to me. I can only hope that I’ll take with as good a sense of humour as Sharon did.

Thank you Al. Thank you for the recognition. That Saturday morning was truly one of the most special in my life and means more than I can express.

Thank you to Michelle and Brian for being able to lie with a straight face. I’m never going to play poker with either of you but I really do appreciate the efforts you went through to make sure it was a surprise. And a special thanks to Kathy Wallace for making an absolutely wonderful quilt to accompany my award. Everyone who has seen the quilt has made moves to “borrow” it but it is and will always be treasured.

Dawn Phelan, Executive Assistant
President Al Jamieson informed the attendees that two years ago, Clayton Bruce was on the stage receiving his fifty-year pin – having just retired from active practice but this time is being recognized as an honorary life member within the Association.

Clayton was raised on a farm near Forestburg Alberta and graduated from Heiseler High School before heading off to SAIT.

He received his ALS commission in 1963. He was also a Canada Lands Surveyor. Clayton was employed by Alberta Transportation for 34 years conducting road boundary surveys in Southern Alberta. In 1992, he became a sole practitioner located in Strathmore until his retirement not long ago. Clayton Bruce has served on numerous Association committees over his career including, more recently, the RPR Task Force, the Practice Review Board and a two-year stint on Council in the mid-2000s.

Clayton articled a number of students over the course of his career – who themselves have become well respected members of the Association. Those former articling students include Robin Arthurs, Andrew Cammaert, Iain Douglas, Lorraine Hortness, Wayne Hucik, Craig Hughes and Bernard Lamarche.

Everyone welcomed and congratulated Mr. Clayton Bruce and Dianna.

Mr. Clayton Bruce addressed the luncheon as follows:

I guess I should say a few words. Thank you for those kind words Al. There is only one page here. That is good news for us all. It is a great honour to be accepted among the group that has gone before me and I sure want to thank everybody who had something to do with nominating me for this position. Among the honorary members I want to mention is Jim Clark, ALS - the first Alberta Land Surveyor I ever met. He was an instructor at the provincial institute of technology and art in Calgary at that time and inspired and encouraged us all to continue with our profession. I also want to mention Peter B. Bapte, ALS who I served my articles with and I will always be grateful for his help. My memories include the ALS examinations, the good news and the bad, the fellows I studied with and the help they gave me, my eight articulated students and the friendship I enjoyed with them throughout.
the years, my fellow land surveyors, the good times we had at the annual meetings. I will always remember the years I spent on the Practice Review Board and on Council and all the good people I met including the ALSA staff and I count them all as friends. To the new members, congratulations! It is a tough road to hoe but you made it and that is good. Always remember there are things to learn from those you meet and the survey plans that you study. Ask for advice when needed, consider carefully what you hear and see and remember you have to make up your own mind for your actions because you are responsible for them all. The time required for the profession is consuming. I wish to thank my wife and family for putting up with me and those times I was away from home and the times I was at home and my mind was on my work. Thank you all and go Flames go.

President Al Jamieson thanked all of the past presidents in attendance and congratulated the 25 and 50 year members of the Association and especially congratulate Clayton Bruce as honorary life member.
List of Exhibitors and Sponsors

EXHIBITORS
Abacu Datagraphics Ltd.
Altus Positioning Systems
Bench-Mark.ca GNSS Equipment
Brandt Tractor Ltd
Canon Canada Inc., PPSG
Cansel
Carlson Software
Choice Survey & Construction Supplies
Coordinate Control Inc.

D W Technologies Ltd.
DGE Group Inc.
Hilti (Canada) Corporation
Jones Brown Inc.
MicroSurvey Software Solutions Inc.
Pioneer Offroad Rentals
Pirbright Professions
Spatial Technologies Inc.
The CG&B Group Inc.

SPONSORS

Platinum—$1,500+
Can-Am Geomatics Corp.
Challenger Geomatics Ltd.
Choice Survey & Construction Supplies
Measurement Sciences Inc.
MMM Geomatics Alberta Limited
Russel Metals
The CG&B Group Inc.
Universal Geomatics Solutions Corp.
Valard Geomatics Ltd.

Gold—$1,000+
All-Can Engineering & Surveys (1976) Ltd.
Quest Geomatics Inc.
Vista Geomatics Ltd.

Silver—$500+
Baseline Geomatics Group Ltd.
Fairmont Chateau Lake Louise
Ivo Nedev Surveying Ltd./RPRdepot.ca
Jag Printing Ltd.
Longhorn Geomatics Limited
Millennium Geomatics Ltd.
Precision Geomatics Inc.
Urban Systems Survey Inc.