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Spectra Precision
(repeat)
The last summer of the millennium is coming to an end. Already one can notice shorter days and a bit of a nip in the morning air. I hope that you have all had a reasonably busy summer—I know I have. Hopefully, we can look forward to a long “Indian summer” to finish up our year’s work.

The Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors’ AGM was held in St. John’s on June 10th to 12th, 1999. The President’s Meeting was held on Wednesday, June 10, and was hosted by President Dave Vallis. British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, as well as CIG and CCLS were represented.

The Icebreaker in the evening provided us with a chance to renew our friendship with the other visiting presidents and their wives, as well as make new friends.

On Thursday, the business session opened under the guidance of President Dave Vallis. The first item was a motivational seminar presented by Ms. D. Hanlon. This seminar was very interesting and contained many ideas as “food for thought.”

At the annual luncheon, greetings were brought by the Mayor of St. John’s. The meal consisted of the most scrumptious tasting baked cod fillets. The afternoon was taken up by either golf or a boat trip to view bird life and whales.

The evening function was a trip on the board “The Scadernia” in and around St. John’s harbour. Visiting guests were invited to participate in the “Screeching” ceremony. Those that did participate, including myself and my wife Linda, are now Honourary Newfoundlanders.

On Saturday, the business meeting continued with discussions on raising fees, office downscaling and their budget. At times feelings ran high and became quite emotional. In the end, President Dave Vallis agreed to stay on as President for another term. The evening ended with the President’s Banquet and Ball and a great time was enjoyed by all. On behalf of myself and my wife Linda, thanks to Dave and Patsy Vallis for their gracious invitation and Newfoundland hospitality.

The Association of Prince Edward Island Land Surveyors held its meeting on June 24th and 25th at North River, just outside of Charlottetown. The Icebreaker held on June 24th gave us a chance to once again, renew our newly gained friendships with representatives of our sister associations, as well as make new friends. Represented were Alberta, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick.

The business meeting got underway Friday morning under the supervision of President Dave Morris with a very interesting presentation by Mr. Ivan Ford on the Role of the Land Surveyor in the Proposed Changes to the P.E.I. Land Tenure System.

A few housekeeping items were approved. Mr. Serge Bernard was elected as the new president. Business concluded at noon and then off to the golf course. The evening ended with the annual lobster supper—we even tried the mussels! Thanks to Dave Morris for his gracious invitation and hospitality. We really did enjoy Prince Edward Island, and to Serge Bernard and his wife we extend an invitation to our 2000 AGM in Jasper.

On August 25th and 26th, Executive Committee and Council meetings were held. Digital plan submissions is still a hot item. Council was presented with a demonstration of the Alberta Registries SPIN System by Bill Elliott. We were also informed that Registries is experiencing difficulties converting the TIFF file from the plot file and is looking to the ALSA for some technical expertise to help them solve the problem. The Association’s ad hoc committee on digital plans has been asked to address this issue.

A meeting was held with Public Lands regarding disposition standards, particularly for LOCs. A committee was also struck to work with Public Lands and the Director of Surveys to set some standards that would be acceptable to all.

As summer winds down, our committees are now gearing up and by the time this issue of ALS News is out, they should have all met and set out their objectives.

Friday, August 27th was the ALSA Annual Golf Tournament at the Sylvan Lake Golf and Country Club. It was a huge success; a total of 145 golfers registered. A great day weatherwise, followed by a delicious steak barbecue that night. The winning team in the Texas Scramble was the foursome of Dale Knock, Peter Makarus, David Marquardt, and Scott Westlund. All golfers won a prize and the Jack Holloway Scholarship Foundation was $925 richer through the sale of mulligans. Thanks to all the organizers, supporters, and golfers!
MicroSurvey
(new)
Another summer has come and gone and the weather has been typical “Albertan”. (If you don’t like the weather wait an hour and it will change!)

By the time you read this, I will have attended three Council meetings and several committee meetings. I have found the experience both challenging and rewarding and would like to take this opportunity to thank all the members who voted for me.

Of all the meetings I have attended, the Historical and Biographical Committee meetings are of the greatest interest to me. This committee is comprised of a great many energetic and qualified individuals who are doing a superb job for our Association. Too often when we are asked to do a project for a client we think only of the task at hand. We don’t realize that in some aspect we are retracing history, as we search for evidence left by the surveyors who came before us. Many surveyors have left their names on lakes, rivers, mountains and towns along their journeys. This committee is endeavoring to capture the many untold stories that our members have.

To the members who are interviewed; who submit stories and photographs and those who part with antiques they have collected; I would like to give them a heartfelt thank you. To those who are not interviewed but feel they have a story to tell or photograph to share, please feel free to drop us a line and inform us of your ideas.

Having read all the ALS News magazines and many other associations’ newsletters, it seems there are many articles of a historic nature. Many deal with surveying of international boundaries and others tell a story of individuals and their accomplishments. Many of these seem to be reprinted from American magazines and other publications. The forethought of the Association in supporting the work of the Historical and Biographical Committee...will result in many interesting stories coming from our members. With luck, some of these articles will be picked up and reprinted in other association publications, thus affording us much free public exposure.

In closing, once again, I would like to thank the membership for allowing me the pleasure to serve on Council and I look forward to discussing any concerns or issues the members think should be brought before Council.

Join us at the beautiful Jasper Park Lodge for the 91st ALSA Annual General Meeting and Convention April 13 - 15, 2000
Leica

(new)
Hello! Welcome to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association office. Whether you visit us in person or give us a call, you should know which staff member is responsible for what. So consider this a virtual tour of the north-west corner of the 25th floor of the CN Tower in Edmonton.

The first person you are likely to see is Dawn Phelan. She opens the mail, answers the telephone, and circulates faxes that come into the office to the appropriate person. She processes brochures orders for the members, realtors, and anyone else who requests them, while also providing administrative support for the Public Relations Committee, the RPR Task Force and the Continuing Professional Development Subcommittee. If you have general questions about those committees, post orders or brochure orders, speak to Dawn. As Dawn is on the “front line,” she often receives calls from the general public regarding who they can contact for a Real Property Report. With the development of the new RPR directory, the Association office can now provide the public with a listing of surveyors who have indicated to us that they provide RPRs. We feel this is much better than simply referring them to the yellow pages.

Next to Dawn’s Dilbert-like cubicle, is Sharon Stecyk’s office. Everyone knows Sharon; she has been with the Association for almost twenty years and has seen administrative assistants (and executive directors) come and go. While everyone has either spoken to Sharon on the telephone or has met her at an annual meeting, many of you may be surprised by all the other things that she does. Sharon provides administrative support for the Convention & Social Committee, Legislation Committee, Registration Committee, Executive Committee and Council. Give Sharon a call if you have any questions regarding any of these committees or the golf tournament or the annual meeting as she does much of the administrative legwork for these events every year.

Sharon receives a number of calls every year from articling students who are fretting over their exams or technical reports, students who want to article, and even surveyors from other provinces and countries who want to know how to become an Alberta Land Surveyor.

If that wasn’t enough, Sharon prepares ALS News for typesetting and does much of the artwork; she takes on the same responsibility for the annual report each year. I also insist that she ensure that the’re ar know misteaks or tipos in the Kawpy. (She also allows me a joke at her expense every now and then.)

On the other side of my office is Brighid McGarry. Many of you will know Brighid (she uses the Gaelic pronunciation, “BrRÍ”) for providing administrative support for the Systematic Practice Review Program and the Practice Review Board. While this still takes up the bulk of her time, Brighid also provides administrative support for the Historical and Biographical Committee and the Professional Development Committee.

As Brighid now provides support for the Professional Development Committee, she is the one you should talk with when you want to register for one of our seminars.

Lyall Pratt’s office is a little bit further down the hall. Lyall is the Director of Systematic Practice Review. By now, all of you are familiar with the Systematic Practice Review Program and the work that Lyall has done for the past two years or Al Nelson did previously.

Oftentimes, members will call the office to ask Lyall a question about a particularly difficult situation. Lyall is usually pleased to help but is always careful to point out that any opinion he provides is his own personal one and not that of the Practice Review Board. He is also quick to point out that it is the practitioner’s responsibility to exercise his own professional judgement. Sometimes, a practitioner wants to speak to the Director of Practice Review about situations where they feel another practitioner has done something improper or negligent. Such situations are not the responsibility of the Director of Practice Review and Lyall will automatically refer them to either Jerry Rasmuson or myself.

Don George is second in seniority at the ALSA office. He began his employment with the Association on January 1, 1994. Don oversees the external audit portion of the Practice Review Program, organizes the field inspections and prepares the reports arising from them. Don oversees Survey Technologist Wade Heck’s work and provides a sounding board for Lyall when survey questions arise. Don does not receive a great number of calls but will occasionally handle calls from practitioners or questions from the general public (if neither Lyall nor myself is around).

Wade Heck is the Survey Technologist for the SPR Program. His office is squeezed between Lyall and Don’s. He is a graduate of the NAIT Geomatics Program and has been under contract with the Association since May 1998 for a term of two years. His primary duties are to set up job files, examine and compute survey plans and field notes and to assist Don with field inspections. Some of you may have spoken to Wade or met him at one of the Association’s functions.

Marjorie Picard is the Association’s bookkeeper. She deposits your cheques and prepares the cheques for me to sign. If you receive an invoice...
or statement from the Association office, it has come from her printer. As she is only in the office on Tuesdays, you can call me about your account or wait until the following Tuesday.

Jerry Rasmuson is the Association’s Registrar. He is based in Calgary but does travel to Edmonton approximately twice a month — or more often if the Discipline Committee has a heavy agenda. (Fortunately, their agenda has been quite light recently.) Jerry will also handle calls from the general public. He also occasionally receives general public calls directly to his office in Calgary.

My office is in the corner next to Sharon’s. It is conveniently within shouting distance. The tenant who had the corner office before the ALSA moved in 1995 had an absurd sense of self-importance—the carpet in the corner office has extra padding. My responsibilities are varied and it is impossible to predict what may happen from one day to the next. I might be handling a call from someone who is upset about a surveyor who has caused damage to property and has not yet repaired it, or taking a call from someone who thinks their handheld GPS receiver is better than the surveyor’s professional opinion. As I look through my calendar, I can see that I have fielded calls from government ministers’ offices, Russel Metals, our investment manager, our accountant and a really interesting call from a TV researcher in Quebec. He was looking for information on Dominion Lands Surveyors who worked on the railroad. I tried to give him a few leads and he told me that they expect to run a series on Canada’s railroads (of which surveyors will be one of the segments) which will air on the History Channel in September 2000.

As you can see, ours is a busy office. It is a terrific group of people to be working with. Thanks for joining me on this virtual tour. Please come back again soon.
Weighting of GPS Position Difference Observations

I was wondering if a member of the Standards Committee could give me a brief description of the following. I don’t understand what it means.

"Network adjustments shall include only (n-1) position differences or, if trivial position differences are included, the mathematical correlations should be properly accounted for.”

RON EICHEL, ARTICLED STUDENT

In the above, “n” refers to the number of GPS receivers simultaneously observing during a measurement session. It is possible when processing GPS data to compute as many as \[\frac{n(n-1)}{2}\] position differences. However, only (n-1) position differences are mathematically independent. For example, consider a measurement session with 3 receivers deployed in a triangular configuration and observing simultaneously. It is possible to observe all three sides of the triangle \[\frac{n(n-1)}{2}\] position differences. However, the third side is fully mathematically correlated or trivial. The three sides would close perfectly due to the mathematical correlations. If you subsequently used a least squares adjustment process to adjust the data, the residuals would be zero and the subsequent error analysis from the adjustment would be incorrect, i.e. much better than it really is. The proper method of processing the data is to process 2 sides of the triangle \[(n-1)\] position differences from one session. A second session would then be required to measure the third side of the triangle. All the data from both sessions and the correspondind covariance information would then be entered into an adjustment resulting in a more accurate error analysis. It should be noted that there are mathematical methods available which do allow for the input of all \[\frac{n(n-1)}{2}\] position differences into an adjust-

Plan Corrections

Dear Sirs:

I reviewed the Council Report (dated May 20, 1999) and came across the following motion made by Mr. Grosz and seconded by Mr. Winton:

WHEREAS Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association recognizes the importance of plan corrections being of public record, and Alberta Registries’ cost of administering plan corrections appears to be excessive,

BE IT RESOLVED that the ALSA explore the possibility of maintaining a database identifying the registered plan number and surveyor for any plan requiring a correction. This information will be made available to Alberta Land Surveyors at no cost.

Motion Carried
best interest of the public and may have the potential of creating liability for the surveyor.

I understand that this motion may have been the result of frustration, but a motion made in haste is not befitting our Association nor is it in the best interest of the membership. I believe that Council should reconsider this motion at the next Council meeting.

DON R. GEORGE, A.L.S.

Response to Don George, A.L.S.

In response to your letter of June 12, 1999, it was Council’s intent in passing motion 99.05.005 to send a clear message to all parties concerned that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association considers the implementation of a digital integration fee for plan corrections to be fundamentally wrong and unacceptable.

Council recognizes the importance of plan corrections being of public record. We therefore encourage the membership to continue making plan corrections at Land Titles.

At present, an integration fee for plan corrections is not being levied but one for monument plans is. As stated in the motion, Council recognizes the importance of plan corrections being of public record. We therefore encourage the membership to continue making plan corrections at Land Titles.

If, however, the Government of Alberta does propose extending the fee to include plan corrections, then it is Council’s belief that this would actively discourage surveyors from filing plan corrections. It is Council’s role to consider all options should this eventuality occur.

DON JAQUES, A.L.S.
PRESIDENT, ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION ON BEHALF OF COUNCIL

Forced Destruction of Alberta Survey Control Markers on Private Property

This letter was originally published in the December 1998 issue of ALS News. Unfortunately this issue is still a problem as the Director of Surveys Office recently received a phone call from a gentlemen from Hythe. Apparentely, he is running into problems with “surveyors” digging up a control marker on his property and not filling the hole back in (it is buried about 50cm). Unfortunately, the landowner does not know who the surveyors are and the Director of Surveys Office has indicated that they would probably destroy marker #44883 by the middle of September.

Over the last year the Geodetic Control Section has been asked to destroyed three Alberta Survey Control Markers (ASCMs) on private property at the request of the landowners. In all three situations, the landowners expressed great concern for safety of livestock potentially tripping in holes left by “surveyors” for markers below ground level as well as a constant annoyance of having “surveyors” accessing the control marker without the consent of the landowner. There is also concern over liability related to the open hole if an animal or person were injured while walking in a field as well as potential injury from survey stakes left behind.

Unfortunately, none of the landowners could provide information on which surveying companies had been doing work at the markers. The Geodetic Control Section investigated and complied with two of the landowner requests and subsequently removed the markers. The third landowner has agreed to wait and see if the situation can be rectified by other means such as a notice on the ASCM ID card telling users to contact the landowner before accessing the marker.

The Section recognizes that Alberta Land Surveyors (or their assistants) may enter onto private property in order to access a control marker. However, they do have the obligation to use the utmost care and attention including cleaning up their site and filling in any holes that may have been dug to access a control marker.

As the government organization responsible for the provincial spatial referencing system, we are requesting that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association reiterate to their members their responsibility to landowners when entering onto private property to access an ASCM.

Your cooperation in helping to rectify this situation is greatly appreciated.

In Alberta there are approximately 29,500 usable and accessible ASCMs with over 3,000 on private property. The potential loss of these markers on private property is very significant and will have a detrimental effect on the continuity of the network. Additionally, there may be increased costs for Alberta Land Surveyors due to the lack of control markers because they have been destroyed for no other reasons than those outlined above. Your cooperation in helping to rectify this situation is greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions or comments related to the information contained within this letter, please don’t hesitate to contact me at Tel: 780/422-1291 or Fax: 780/427-1493.

GEOFF BANHAM, P.ENG. — PROJECT LEADER, GEOEDTIC CONTROL SECTION, DIRECTOR OF SURVEYS BRANCH, ALBERTA ENVIRONMENT

Judgement

On July 23, 1999 Harland & Higgins Land Surveyors received a Certificate of Judgement after filing a claim in the Civil Division of the Provincial Court of Alberta against Carrington Holdings Ltd. and Carrington Properties Ltd. in the amount of $748.01.

DAVE HIGGINS, A.L.S.
New Members

#659

MacDONALD, Gordon R.

Gordon was born at Senneterre, Quebec on August 18, 1965. He moved to Alberta and graduated from Innisfail High School in 1983 and then went on to receive a diploma in Survey Technology (honours) from SAIT. In 1993, he graduated with a B.Sc. in Surveying Engineering from the University of Calgary.

Articles were served under Alberta Land Surveyors W.J. Mintz and N.R. Woolgar. The topic of the technical report submitted as part of the qualifying examination was “Treaties and Indian Land Claims in Alberta.”

#660

GAUTHIER, Richard

Richard Gauthier was born in Montreal, Quebec on August 25, 1962. Upon graduation from Richelieu Valley Regional high School in 1979 he attended Dawson College of Montreal and received a diploma in Civil Engineering Technology in 1982. A B.Sc. in Surveying Engineering was received from the University of New Brunswick in 1988.

As an Ontario Land Surveyor and a Professional Engineer in Ontario, he was involved in committee work with both the AOLS and APEO.

Leo E. Raessler, A.L.S. served as Rick’s principal. “Calibration Baselines” was the topic of the technical report submitted as part of the qualifying examination.

Commission as an Alberta Land Surveyor was received on June 21, 1999. Rick is presently serving on the ALSA Public Relations Committee. Rick is also on the Municipal Planning Commission for the Town of Slave Lake.

Rick has been involved in engineering and legal surveys for Canadian National Railways, Ministry of Transportation of Ontario, and various legal firms.

Hiking and cross country skiing are leisure activities that Rick enjoys. He is employed by The Cadastral Group Inc. and resides in Slave Lake with his wife Anne.

#661

MAIN, Allan R.

Allan was born in Ontario on February 19, 1956. He graduated from Simcoe Composite School in 1975, attended Georgian College, and went on to receive a B.Sc., from the University of Calgary in 1986.

A.L. (Tony) Melton, A.L.S. served as Allan’s principal until he received his commission on August 23, 1999. The topic of the technical report submitted as part of the qualifying examination was “Survey of Additional Lands For Stoney Reserve No. 142B and Dual Registration of Plans.” Allan is also a member of the Executive of the Calgary Section of the Alpine Club of Canada.

Hobbies including hiking, and rock and alpine climbing. Allan is employed with All West Surveys Ltd. and resides in Calgary with his wife Deanna.

R. WEBER CONSULTING INC.
Quality Drafting & Calculating
133 Douglas Ridge Pl. S.E.
Calgary, Alberta T2Z 2T2

Robert M. Weber
robweber1@home.com
Office (403) 720-4801
Cell (403) 708-1737
Fax (403) 720-4166
How To Get Through The Articling Process
In Five Years Or Less

The Registration Committee receives several suggestions and critiques throughout the year from pupils and principals who are involved in the articling process. Especially as of late, with 25 people completing the articling process last year and 57 currently articulated. One can imagine, we get lots of feedback. Whether it is serious criticism, idle whining, or suggestions of the Committee members themselves, we collectively review all such concerns and try to see what can be done to help the pupils. That is, without diminishing those professional standards that we expect and consider paramount in maintaining the confidences of the public and our peers.

There are two things that continue to be a stumbling block for the majority of articling land surveyors—acquiring the minimum amount of field and office time and completing the technical report. This is out of five basic requirements (the written professional exams, the prescribed field time, office time, the technical report, and the qualifying oral exam). The Registration Committee finds any inability to comply with these minimum requirements to be a significant issue.

As far as the technical report goes, it is largely up to the pupil and there is not much the Registration Committee can do. All we can offer is some encouragement and an annual, “is it done yet?”

As for the office and field time, we have sympathy for some of those individuals who are in a position of “critical value” for their employer—making their absence from their field or office role, a considerable void to their employer. Having the pupil work in the opposite function for a 6 or 18 month period can be too heavy a price for smaller, remote, or even highly specialized practices.

It is with these thoughts in mind that the Registration Committee has been making note of those individuals who are interested in arranging a “swap” of some sort with other articling pupils, in an effort to gain experience outside the areas of practice in which they presently work. As the logistics of such an undertaking will vary from pupil to pupil, as well as from principal to principal, we propose to simply act as a posting board for those who are interested (not to be confused with personal ads, although they could end up sounding similar…). We’ll leave it up to the respective pupils and principals to work out the specific details.

By making use of such a “swap” the respective articulated pupils would be gaining more varied experience, and therefore should be better prepared for the written and oral exams. They should end up being in a better position to complete the prescribed office/field time in a more timely fashion. They will also be more competent as a future ALS by having a broader perspective of the land surveying profession.

The principal land surveyor ends up gaining a more rounded employee and/or future colleague. Having an individual with experience outside the company’s regular area of expertise may create more opportunities for the company to diversify. As well, insights into other areas of practice and surveying processes may help streamline their own survey practices.

Acquiring varied experience gives individuals greater perspective in looking at projects, possibilities, and processes. They are better able to notice and make those changes that will enhance the profession of land surveying. This greater perspective gives the individual a broader outlook on the pros and cons of different types of survey methodologies. With a broader outlook on the scope of what it is we do as professional surveyors, we end up being more cognizant of how we really impact the public at large.

It ends up being a terrific opportunity for those people in the system to network a bit more and actually touch on the wealth of knowledge that currently exists throughout this association. Generating better and more qualified Alberta Land Surveyors simply strengthens our profession, our image, and the service we provide to the public.

Interested persons are encouraged to contact Sharon at the Association office to inquire further, or check out the ALSA web site for more information.

VICTOR HUT, A.L.S.

Corrections/Changes to the Register

Ram Achal, A.L.S. tel: (403) 239-5602; fax: (403) 239-0586.
Jim Berry, A.L.S. has moved from Medicine Hat to the Calgary office of Midwest Surveys Inc. His e-mail and Linden address remains the same.
Rick Gauthier, A.L.S. rgauthier@cadastral.org.
Jones Geomatics Ltd. kjones@telusplanet.net.
Jovan Misic Land Surveyors Ltd. fax is the same as the phone number (780) 448-1689.
Midwest Surveys Inc. area code for Lloydminster should be (780).
Morrison Surveys Ltd. (P201) registered as a new surveyor’s corporation effective September 7, 1999 under the direct supervision of Robert Morrison, A.L.S.
Pals Surveys Cold Lake palscl@jetnet.ab.ca.
Pals Surveys Calgary tel: (403) 319-1291 or (877) 319-1291; fax: (403) 319-2394; palscal@telusplanet.net.
Precision Geomatics Inc. (P202) is a new surveyor’s corporation effective September 13, 1999 under the direct supervision of Roy Devlin, A.L.S.
Gerry Smyth, A.L.S. has moved from Calgary to the Medicine Hat office of Midwest Surveys Inc.
Swenson Morrison Land Surveys Ltd. (P200) is a new surveyor’s partnership effective September 7, 1999.

New Associate/Affiliate Members

Juliana Wafula ..................... AS021
Gary Deren ........................ AS022
Daniel Joerissen ................. AS023
Analysis of 1999 Professional Exams

Practical Surveying

Since the Association holds a workshop each year to review the past Practical Exam, this report will not offer detailed answers to each question, but will only identify the components other than simple coordinate geometry which had to be addressed in order to complete each question.

Question #1
This question was that of a wellsite surveyed by GPS in unsurveyed territory utilizing Alberta Survey Control Monuments, one of which had a cadastral tie to the baseline. The question contained coordinate computations in unsurveyed territory, convergence and scale computations, computing closures to ASCMs and reduction of GPS observed heights.

Possible Mark: 24.0
High Mark: 20.5
Low Mark: 0.0
Average Mark: 6.8 (28%)

Question #2
(no computations required)
This question was a three lot rural subdivision. It dealt with plan requirements, understanding of certificates of title and planning requirements.

Possible Mark: 20.0
High Mark: 18.5
Low Mark: 6.0
Average Mark: 12.6 (63%)

Question #3
(no computations required)
This question was a 10 acre rural subdivision, first parcel out which required a plan of survey. The question dealt with the interpretation of descriptions (i.e.: N 1/2 vs. northerly 1320'), the understanding of a township plat and posting requirements.

Possible Mark: 16.0
High Mark: 16.0
Low Mark: 5.0
Average Mark: 12.6 (79%)

Question #4
(no computations required)
This question dealt with the understanding and ability to decipher original township “split line” notes and to transfer this information to a township plat. The question also tested understanding of Bulletin 38 and iron post marking requirements.

Possible Mark: 16.0
High Mark: 15.0
Low Mark: 0.0
Average Mark: 11.8 (74%)

Note: Candidates were required to answer question #5 or question #6, but not both.

Question #5
This question was a short rural right of way. The question required computations for bearings, distances, postings, a curve intersection, and closures. Plan requirements and appropriate reference to the Surveys Act was tested.

Possible Mark: 24.0
High Mark: 23.0
Low Mark: 6.5
Average Mark: 15.4 (64%)

Question #6
The question was that of computing a building pre-construction stake-out and subsequent real property report.

Possible Mark: 24.0
High Mark: 24.0
Low Mark: 11.5
Average Mark: 17.3 (72%)

Statute Law

The following is a summary of the results of the Statute Law Examination.

Questions that everyone knew the answers to.....

Condominium Property Act

1. (a) Is it possible to subdivide a condominium unit?
4. (c) Prior to 1979, what where the default boundaries?

The Land Titles Act

7. What effect does the registration or filing of the following plans have on the title of the subject lands:
(a) A right of way plan.
11. Define the following as they apply to the Land Titles Act.
(f) Transfer.

Land Surveyors Act

2. Describe the main functions of the following bodies.
(a) The ALSA Council.

Questions that got less than 75%........................

Condominium Property Act

2. How does a barelands condominium differ from:
(b) a traditional subdivision.
· ‘Parks’ are common property.
· ‘Roads’ are common property.
· No land dedications as such.
· ‘ Lots’ are units with a ‘unit factor.’
(2 marks) (66.7%)
3. A developer shall not sell or agree to sell a residential unit or a proposed residential unit unless he has delivered to the purchaser a copy of (total of seven)
· Name six of the items referred to in the above.
See section 9(1) of the Act.
(6 marks) (44.0%)
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4. The doors and windows are part of the (unit). (1 mark)  
66.7%

The Land Titles Act
9. Certificates of title under the system used in Alberta are said to MIRROR or REFLECT the title.  
No one had the correct answer.  
(1 mark)  
0.0%

10. Other than the land surveyor, the commissioner for oaths and the registrar, who must endorse:  
· A re-establishment / establishment of monuments plan?  
No one.  
(2 marks)  
38.9%

11. Define the following terms as they apply to the Land Titles Act.  
(1 mark each)  
See section 1(a) to (z) of the Act.  
(d) Instrument.  (l)  
(f) Registration.  (w)

Surveys Act
13. Define the following terms as they apply to the Surveys Act.  
(1 mark each)  
See Section 1(a-t) of the Surveys Act  
(e) Marker  
(66.7%)

14. Name the principal system of survey authorized in Alberta.  
The Third System of Survey  
(1 mark)  
58.3%

Municipal Government Act.
20. In making a decision as to whether or not to approve an application for subdivision, the subdivision authority must consider, with respect to the land that is the subject of the application a number of points (total of seven).  
List six of these points  
See section 7 subdivision and development regulations.  
(1 mark each)  
56.0%

The Surveying Profession

Questions with an average mark less than 75%.
3. Where should you monument the following:  
a) pipeline right of way plan?  
b) a road in a subdivision plan?  
Read the Manual of Standard Practice for both answers

7. (a) Purpose of the ALS Code of Ethics:  
Maintain the integrity of the profession and show the public the ethical standard that they can expect from an ALS.  
(b) Name and discuss the article in the Code of Ethics concerning “fair compensation.”  
Study the Code of Ethics

9. What table is required on all Condominium Plans? Name the three items that must be shown in this table—Table of Unit Factors.  
Unit number, unit factor, and unit area

15. (a) Does an ALS have a right to enter onto public or private lands? If so, what Act gives them this authority?  
Yes, The Surveys Act.  
(b) Name 2 other relevant Acts.  
Surface Rights Act, Expropriation Act

Upcoming Events

Extending Oil and Gas Operations into the Yukon and NWT  
October 27-28  
Find out what you need to know to tap into exciting new exploration opportunities in the North.  
For more information contact:  
Insight Information Co.  
55 University Avenue, Suite 1800  
Toronto, Ontario  M5J 2V6  
Tel:  (416) 777-2020  
Fax:  (416-1292  
E-mail: order@insightinfo.com

City of Edmonton  
7th Annual GBIS Conference  
(Geographic Base Information System)  
December 1 and 2, 1999  
The event will feature educational sessions for professional development, workshops and a trade exhibition from today’s leading vendors, prizes, give-aways, a map gallery, and more.  
For more information visit website:  
www.gov.edmonton.ab.ca/gbis/coff
EUB Presentation to Alberta Land Surveyors

On June 4, 1999 from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon, the EUB hosted an “Information Exchange” in their boardroom.

In attendance were Stephen Smith and Martin Vandenbeld, representing EUB and twenty-seven other individuals representing various survey firms or other organizations.

Stephen Smith started the meeting by introducing himself and Mr. Vandenbeld and outlined the structure, role and process that the Board is involved in. Some of the items that came up in the presentation were:

- Approximately 25,000 applications for licenses are made per year, 93% are classified as routine.
- EUB has committed to a 5-day turn around time for approval of completed applications.
- Guide 56 will likely be updated in the fall of 1999; last revision was October 1997.
- EUB has gone to post approval audits as opposed to pre-approved review, in most cases; this increases applicants’ accountability.
- They outlined various types of application (i.e. routine vs. non-routine) and covered their degree of validation checks.
- EUB validates Alberta Environment approval on 5metre elevation difference across well site on freehold lands.
- Significant water body was not defined as anything that would hold water for 12 hours, as per Mr. Smith.
- Closest residence—maximum distance required: 0.5 km on sweet well; 10.0 km on sour well (these distances are not firm figures).
- Hamlet has no corporate limits.
- EUB uses “Guide 56” as a main Referral Guide on requirements.
- EUB is open to any better ideas or definitions from surveyors.
- They encourage calls to their help line at (403)297-4369 or e-mail (full name) @eub.gov.ab.ca

The following is a list of questions asked along with the EUB’s responses:

**Q:** 1) What is the quality and timing of updating information of low-pressure gas co-op lines?
**A:** As far as EUB it is now a courtesy as they do not have any jurisdiction over them. Information is updated once a year by Alberta Infrastructure (formerly Transportation and Utilities), likely the fall or winter.

**Q:** 2) Are there any future plans for accepting digital submissions of survey plans and other information?
**A:** No! Y2K concerns and a lack of available funding. If it is ever implemented, it would not be till late 2000.

**Q:** 3) Could “Surveyors” be added back onto “Well Licenses Issued” daily list?
**A:** No! It is not pertinent to the EUB who surveyed the well.

**Q:** 4) Is the Manual of Standard Practice now current with the expectations of the EUB?
**A:** Only just received: will review and provide comments to Association through Don George.

**Q:** 5) Are surveys required prior to construction for pipeline right of ways?
**A:** Yes, unless EUB gives an exemption and only exemptions given to date are in the Zama fields.

**Q:** 6) Who administers the Pipeline Act?
**A:** EUB does, mostly done through their audit department.

**Q:** 7) EUB can grant exemptions to the Pipeline Act—who normally gets these exemptions and why?
**A:** They seldom grant exemptions (see answer to #5). The crown is exempt.

**Q:** 8) Could Pipeline Act be amended to require a plan to be registered in the LTO prior to allowing operation of the line (i.e. line to flow)?
**A:** Presentations should be submitted to Tom Pesta as he is in charge of regulatory changes.

**Q:** 9) Regarding “land types within 200 meters of the well” are the plans better since this concern arose?
**A:** Definitely yes, they are pleased with the improvement in this area.

**Q:** 10) Does the EUB consider the following to be surface improvement:
- Undeveloped Road Allowances?
**A:** No.
- Well-site facilities?
**A:** Yes.
- Gas Co-ops?
**A:** Yes.
- Flood irrigation lines?
**A:** Yes.
- Dugouts?
**A:** Yes.
- Well heads?
**A:** Yes.

**Q:** 11) Can the wording “Surveyed Road” be changed to “Public Road” (assuming it is okay to put a well within 40m of a private road)—many private roads, such as oil and gas roads are “surveyed”?
**A:** Point well taken, consider presenting to EUB prior to future changes to Guide 56. Proposed new edition likely in fall of 1999.

**Q:** 12) What does the EUB consider to be an “urban centre”?
**A:** 50 occupied residences or more. Phone operations (help line) for urban centre list.

**Q:** 13) Does the EUB consider the following to be “Significant Water Bodies”: swamps, man made lagoons, seasonal drainages, seasonal ponds and sloughs?
**A:** Yes to all.

Many thanks to Al Jamieson, A.L.S. for organizing this information exchange and to the EUB for their assistance.
This column is the first of a series planned for sharing information with the ALSA membership on activities at SDW Ltd. & AltaLIS Ltd.

Spatial Data Warehouse Ltd. (SDW) is an organization which was formed in June 1996 when the Government of Alberta discontinued its traditional role of funding and managing Alberta’s Provincial base mapping. SDW is a consortium consisting of some companies within the ATCO Group (formerly Alberta Power Limited, Canadian Western Natural Gas Company Limited, Northwestern Utilities Limited), TELUS Advanced Communications Inc., TransAlta Corporation and the Government of Alberta.

AltaLIS Ltd. (AltaLIS) is the agent selected by Spatial Data Warehouse Ltd. through an RFP process, and is responsible for the updating, re-engineering, storage, distribution, marketing and general management of the Province’s primary mapping data sets. AltaLIS is a joint venture of QC Data Ltd. and Martin Newby Consulting Ltd., for the purpose of making Alberta’s base mapping infrastructure more available, accessible, accurate and affordable.

One of the first objectives of AltaLIS was to re-engineer and reduce the costs associated with maintaining the cadastral datasets (Parcel and Misam). Much of this work is complete and a 50% reduction in costs is expected over time, reducing the cadastral updating costs from $200 to approximately $100 per plan.

AltaLIS and SDW are currently finalizing a joint venture agreement that will initiate a longer-term commitment to further re-engineering and investment in the digital basemap product line.

The major issues or difficulties have been segregating the plan information according to the LTO layer structure.

Cadastral Mapping Project

Most surveyors are now aware of the requirement for plans of survey to be submitted to Registries in digital format. Since June 1, 1999, it has been necessary to submit the following information:

- a survey plan in hardcopy (mylar) format;
- a CAD file, in AutoCAD, MicroStation or DXF format (according to the LTO layer structure);

---

**SMY DRAFTING ENTERPRISES LTD.**

Suite 206, 10441 - 124 Street, Edmonton, Alberta T5N 1R7
Phone: (bus) 482-2054  (fax) 482-2054  (res) 487-2340
Contact: Ken Smy, C.S.T. (Senior Survey Technologist)

**DRAFTING & GRAPHICS SERVICES**
for surveyors, engineers & architects

**Specializing in:**

- **LEGAL SURVEY & WELLSITE PLANS**
- **DRAFT & FINAL SUBDIVISION PLANS**
- **TOPOGRAPHICAL SURVEY PLANS**
- **STAKE—OUT PLANS**
- **MUNICIPAL, CIVIL & ENGINEERING DRAWINGS**
- **FIELD NOTE REDUCTION & CALCULATIONS**
- **ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS, ELEVATIONS & DETAILING**

**Computer Assisted Drafting**
- precision input
- "LARGE PLAN" digitizing facilities
Registries received approximately 700 plans in digital format in the months of June and July. There has also been a record number of total survey plans registered in 1998 and 1999. Traditionally, there had been about 7,200 plans registered yearly; in 1998, 10,300 plans were registered – an increase of 43%. In the first seven months of this year, over 7,000 plans have been registered. If this trend continues, approximately 12,000 plans will be registered in 1999.

This unexpected increase in registrations has generated a backlog in plans waiting to be integrated into the base maps. It was originally projected for the backlog to be cleared by November 1999 based on 1998 registration statistics; however, this date will be extended subject to the number actually registered in 1999.

Once the backlog is eliminated, plans will be entered within 30 days of registration.

The quality of digital plan submissions has steadily improved since June 1st. The major issues or difficulties have been segregating the plan information according to the LTO layer structure. In addition, many “descriptive plans” have been submitted with incomplete information or have inconsistencies in lot and block layers. In response to these problems, the AltaLIS Help Desk phone line (403-294-1028) has dealt with many ALSA member questions. Alberta Registries has also released an updated FAQ bulletin mail-out and a website notice at www.gov.ab.ca/ma/reg/lt/SIB4.pdf.

Funds generated through this cost redirection are only applied to cadastral map updating. All other costs associated with re-engineering and operations are covered through a combination of SDW and AltaLIS financing along with revenues generated from the sale of licensed data. SDW’s role (which includes the GoA) is to monitor performance, costs, and profit to ensure all contract agreement terms are met. Future issues of this column will include developments in new products, licenses and pricing as AltaLIS continues to work closely with its clients and stakeholders.
35th annual
ALSA golf tournament

And the Winners Are ..............

What a great day for golf!! The Sylvan Lake Golf and Country Club hosted 145 golfers this year.

The tournament would not be as successful without all the hard work done by volunteers. Many thanks to Don and Linda Jaques (J.H. Holloway Scholarship Foundation is $925 richer) for selling mulligans; Chairman Greg Stromsmoe, Mark Kocher, Les Frederick, and especially George Smith who sold North/South tickets, headed up the scoring, and purchased a good portion of the prizes.

Texas Scramble Winners:
Team #32 (Score: net 62)
Dale Knock, Land Measurements Systems Inc.
Peter Makarus, A.L.S. (Ret.)
David Marquardt, A.L.S.
Scott Westlund, Articled Student

Hole Prize Winners
Hole #1: Chad Taylor
Shortest Drive—Men
Hole #2: Vivian Repp
Longest Putt—Ladies
Hole #3: Peter Brown
Closest to Pin
Hole #4: Norm Mattson
Longest Putt—Men
Hole #5: Garth Hartung
Longest Drive—Men
Hole #6: Tom O’Hare
Closest to Pin
Hole #7: Linda McWilliam
Longest Putt—Ladies
Hole #8: Randy Hudson
Closest to Line (drive)
Hole #9: Barb Jamieson
Longest Drive—Ladies
Hole #10: Anne Windsor
Shortest Drive—Ladies
Hole #11: Paul Densmore
Ball in Sand Trap—Draw
Hole #12: Brian Munday
Closest to Pin—Men
Hole #13: Grant Cross
Closest to Pin From Behind Creek
Hole #14: Cam Foran
Closest to Pin—Men
Hole #15: Joyce Schellenberg
Ball in Water (2 chances)—Draw
Hole #16: Al Nelson
Closest to Pin
Hole #17: Len Leiman
Closest to Circle Drive
Hole #18: Farley McKenzie
Ball in Water—Draw

Hole-In-One Sponsors
Hole #3 ............................
Spectra Precision of Canada Ltd.
Geodimeter Series 600 Robotic Total Station. Valued at $38,000 (open to ALSA members and articled students only)
Annual Trophy
(closest to the pin on the 3rd Hole)
Hole #6 ............................
Howard Douglas & Farnell Insurance Limited
Vehicle Valued at $25,000
Hole #14 ............................
Canadian Airlines International
A trip for two anywhere
Canadian Airlines flies
Hole #16 ............................
Leica Canada Inc.
Robotic Total Station System.
Valued at $43,500 (open to ALSA members and articled students only)

North/South Challenge Winners
The winning side of the North/South Challenge was
N O R T H !! Winners were presented with a small momento.

Thank you to . . . .

Alberta One-Call Corporation
All Alberta Plumbing & Gasfitting Ltd.
Aramark Canada Ltd.
Boyd Geomatics Ltd.
Bridgeport Printing
Butler Survey Supplies Ltd.
Can-Am Surveys Ltd.
Canadian Airlines International
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce
Cansel Survey Equipment
Corrpro Canada
Crowne Plaza - Chateau Lacombe
D.W. Data Services
Ensight Information Services Ltd.
Fine-Line Engravers Ltd.
First Order Measurement Solutions Inc.
Focus Corporation Ltd., The
Gemini Positioning Systems Ltd.
Hennessey Welding Ltd.
Howard Douglas Farnell Insurance Ltd.
IHS Energy Group
Jardine Insurance Services Canada, Inc.
Jasper Park Lodge
Kellam Berg Engineering & Surveys Ltd.
Land Measurement Systems Inc.
Leica Canada Inc.
Midwest Surveys Inc.
Mountain Edge & Silver Birch
Northcan Surveys Ltd.
Peerless Printers Ltd.
Red Deer Lodge
Rose Country Communications Ltd.
Russel Metals
S.E.S.L. Geomatics Ltd.
Sharpline Imaging Products Inc.
Shores Belzil
Sierra Spring Water Company
Snow’s Court Reporting Services Ltd.
Spectra Precision of Canada Ltd.
Stewart Weir & Co. Ltd.
TAL Private Management Ltd.
Tarin Resource Services Ltd.
The Driving Force
Trizec Hahn Office Properties Ltd.
UMA Geomatics
Westel Supply Ltd.
Westin Calgary
Westmark Products Ltd.
Demarcation and Accuracy Preferences:
A study of parcel boundaries as if people mattered

by Brian Ballantyne
Department of Geomatics Engineering
University of Calgary

Abstract:
The boundary preferences of 225 residential land owners and tenants were obtained through door-to-door interviews in six communities in and around Calgary. Residents indicated whether they had seen a boundary monument (only 25% had), by what means (natural feature, artificial feature, monument, coordinate) they wanted their boundaries marked, and to what level of accuracy such marking should take place. Preferences varied from 32% for natural features to 20% for coordinates; and from 33% for perfect accuracy to 10% for an error greater than 30cm. Seven factors were examined for evidence of a significant link with preferences. Tenancy and assessed value influenced demarcation preference; lot areas and assessed value influenced accuracy preferences. Although there was no link between demarcation and accuracy, there was a link between those who had seen a monument and those who chose a monument. To the extent that land surveyors accept that the community can express coherent preferences about property boundaries, the findings should be useful in the debate about the cadastre in Alberta.

Introduction:
This is a condensed and yet more robust version of a 1998 report submitted to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association entitled: Methods of demarcation and measures of accuracy of property boundaries: What do land owners want? The study sought the answers to two questions. First, by what means do people want their real property boundaries demarcated? Second, to what degree of accuracy do people want their boundaries marked? The research was driven by the increasing interest in Alberta in the use of coordinates to represent boundaries, as witnessed by the work since 1996 of the Coordinate-Based Cadastre Study Group of the ALSA. This interest has been paralleled by arguments on the merits of relying heavily on coordinates, and by analysis of the legal status of such coordinates. What was lacking, however, was empirical evidence about how people, whom the cadastre must serve, view their boundaries. What was also absent was any analysis of which factors - either personal characteristics or parcel attributes - might affect peoples’ attitudes towards property boundaries.

Background:
The pronouncements of land surveyors and regulatory agencies about what sort of cadastral surveying people want or need is extensive. A 1993 United States report asserted that “higher-value lands require more accurate surveys.” A 1986 Australian article asked whether accuracy should vary according to different land uses, and according to the value of the land, or whether one standard should be applied to all lands. A senior employee of the Geodetic Surveys Division of NRCan (untroubled by the absence of any evidence), confidently announced at a 1998 geomatics get-together that people want coordinates to define boundaries, because they have been seduced by low-cost GPS receivers.

A couple of studies have sought land owners’ preferences directly. A 1977 New Brunswick study found, through questions on 324 boundaries, that 42% of urban respondents tolerated no error in marking their boundary, whereas only 1% of rural respondents sought no error. In addition, rural respondents tolerated an average error of 4.1 feet, whereas urban respondents tolerated only an average error of 0.6 feet. For urban and rural cases, errors in marking boundaries were a function of lot size,
such that owners of larger parcels tolerated lower accuracy.

With a sample size of 260, a 1992 New Zealand study revealed a similar urban-rural split; 55% of urban respondents tolerated no error in marking their boundary, whereas only 30% of rural respondents sought no error. The study defined experienced respondents - 37% of the sample - as those who worked with the land, who had consulted a surveyor, who had had a boundary located, or who had experienced a boundary dispute. There was no significant difference between the preferences of experienced and amateur respondents.

**Comic strips tend to focus on the methods of marking boundaries, and not on the accuracy to which they are marked.**

Despite soliciting the views of land owners, neither study defined what was meant by “urban” and “rural” residents, and neither created a rigorous model which linked preferences with the attributes of the respondents or of their parcels. Most significantly, neither the New Brunswick nor the New Zealand study focused on the means by which people prefer to have their boundaries marked; there was no mention of type of monumentation.

This contrasts with studies in human ecology, and with the comic strip literature, both of which indicate a decided preference for visible features to mark boundaries. Two themes of human territoriality are defensible space and social behavior. A 1988 meta-analysis found that people use territorial markers in defining the boundaries of these spaces. These markers can be either permanent or symbolic and consist of physical elements that encompass such behaviors as maintenance and decoration. Permanent markers such as walls or fences tend to represent defensible space. Symbolic markers such as plantings or decorations are used to establish identity or exert control over their territories.

Comic strips tend to focus on the methods of marking boundaries, and not on the accuracy to which they are marked. In a recent Bizarro panel, two people were shown looking across an office filled with cubicles. One cubicle towers above the rest, with wooden sides that reach eight feet in height. The coffee-drinker says to the briefcase-holder: “Adams came in over the weekend and built a privacy fence around his cubicle.”

A preference for visible evidence of boundaries is also noted in studies of land tenure in the developing world. In the Kikuyu area of Kenya, trees were commonly used to demarcate the boundaries of sub-clan (mbari) lands, and the gitoka lily was used to mark out the boundaries of smaller land units (githaka). A 1995 study observed that “it was really the process of demarcation which eventually confirmed the use of trees in clarifying rights of land tenure.” In newer, formalized settlements around Durban and Cape Town, South Africa, both the Housing Authority and the residents desire visible boundary monuments — usually beacons at the corners of parcels, according to a 1997 study. Finally, a study which finished in 1997 of older, informal, unsurveyed settlements in Zimbabwe found that fences and hedges are preferred in marking boundaries, and are erected by landowners in the absence of any other boundary monuments and in agreement with neighbours.

**Research in Alberta:**

Given this backdrop, in late-1997 residents were canvassed in six communities in and around Calgary. Because people and their views were integral to the research, ethical approval was sought and obtained from the University of Calgary Committee on the Ethics of Human Studies. Two hundred and twenty-five residential land owners and tenants were canvassed door-to-door, using a questionnaire which took ten minutes to complete. The two-page questionnaire was designed to correlate Methods of Demarcation and Measures of Accuracy with seven factors:

- type of tenure (owner or tenant)
- length of residency (in years)
- level of expertise (a land-related occupation was defined as surveying, real estate, construction, architecture, property law, planning and so on)
- possession of an RPR
- area of lot (in square metres)
- assessed value of lot ($)
- degree of neighbourly relations (captured by a ladder scale from “very well” to “very poorly”)

The study defined experienced residents as those who worked with the land, who had consulted a surveyor, who had had a boundary located, or who had experienced a boundary dispute.

Hillhurst-Sunnyside and Dover were chosen as inner-city communities, whereas Country Hills/Panorama and Woodbine represented the suburbs. High River was chosen because it is both a self-contained, older community and a source of commuters to Calgary. Bearspaw was chosen so as to include residents of expensive houses on large parcels on the urban fringe. There was a range of socio-economic and geo-spatial variables in the sample.

To assist residents in answering the questions, three props accompanied each interview. An RPR was displayed so as to assist with question 4, which asked if the respondent possessed a Real Property Report or Survey Certificate of the lot. A Statutory Iron Post (SIP) was displayed to assist with questions 5 and 7. Question 5 asked the respondents if they had actually seen any survey monuments on the lot; question 7 asked how the respondents preferred to have the boundaries marked. The four options were:
• a natural feature, such as a ditch, watercourse, hedge or tree line
• an artificial feature, such as a fence, retaining wall, or driveway edge.
• a monument, such as a SIP,
• a coordinate, such as latitude and longitude.

The final prop was a paper diagram of a hypothetical boundary with linear dimensions, displayed to assist with question 8, which asked the respondents to indicate how much error they would tolerate in having the boundaries marked.

Findings:

One-tenth of the respondents were tenants, and 22% of the respondents identified themselves as having expertise. An RPR was held by 26% of respondents. In response to question 5 (Have you actually seen any survey monuments on this lot?), 75% of respondents had not seen a monument.

In response to question 7 (How would you prefer to have your boundaries marked?), 32% preferred natural features, 26% preferred artificial features, 22% preferred monuments, and 20% preferred coordinates.

In response to the open-ended question 8 (In marking your boundaries, how much error would you tolerate?), there were some 20 different responses. By aggregating the responses, 33% wanted perfect accuracy; 19% would tolerate an error of up to 10cm; 16% would tolerate an error of up to 20cm; 22% would tolerate an error of up to 30cm; and 10% would tolerate an error greater than 30cm.

The two parcel attributes were lot area and assessed value of the property. A preliminary comparison of a few responses with the true areas and values revealed significant discrepancies. Therefore, the true lot areas and values were obtained from the City of Calgary, after the door-to-door sampling was completed. True lot areas were aggregated into three categories: less than 500 square metres; up to 1000 square metres; greater than 1000 square metres. True lot values were aggregated into four categories: less than $100,000, up to $200,000; up to $300,000; greater than $300,000.

Analysis:

The seven personal characteristics and parcel attributes were considered to affect preferences only if significant at the 95% confidence level. In the following analysis of relationships, only those which are significant are described. Thus, the preferred method of demarcation was independent of the preferred measure of accuracy. There was no link, for instance, between a preference for monuments and a preference for high accuracy, or between a preference for coordinates and a tolerance for 20cm of error, or between …

Methods of demarcation

Some 58% of residents did have a preference for visible features to mark boundaries (moreover, some of the respondents who indicated a preference for monuments included the condition that the monument be visible). This is consistent with the experience in informal settlements, and with the literature on territoriality (and with comic strips).

Only two factors influenced marking preference. The first was type of tenure: tenants were more likely to want a visible and physical feature (as opposed to a buried monument) marking the boundaries of their parcels. The second was assessed value, with two apparent relationships. Residents in houses worth less than $100,000 tended to prefer perfect accuracy, as did residents of houses worth more than $300,000.

Assessed value thus appears to be the most critical factor influencing preferences. For both demarcation and accuracy, there were bi-polar distributions of preferences. Residents of houses at either end of the range of assessed values (very inexpensive and very expensive) both preferred visible, physical markings to be put in exactly on the boundary.

For four of the factors - length of residency, level of expertise, presence of an RPR, and degree of neighbourly relations - there were no significant links either with preferences for demarcation or for accuracy. The absence of any difference in preferences, between those involved in a land-related occupation and others, is consistent with the New Zealand data.

Analysis of One Neighbourhood:

Hillhurst-Sunnyside (H-S) is an inner-city Calgary community, whose east-west axis is Kensington Road, and whose north-south axes are 10th and
Land Measurement Systems
(new)
14th Streets. Much of the community was subdivided before 1912, and most of the houses were built in that era, in the 1940s, or in the 1990s. Forty residents were sampled in H-S. On the one hand, residents’ responses were consistent with the other communities, insofar as the means of demarcation were concerned.

On the other hand, their responses differed from the rest of the sample. First, not one resident had seen a boundary monument (recall that 25% of the entire sample had seen such a monument). Second, they differed in how much error they would accept: 28% wanted their boundaries marked to within 10cm (recall that 49% of the entire sample wanted such accuracies), and 23% would accept errors in excess of 30cm (recall that only 10% of the entire sample were so tolerant).

Why these significant differences? Let me speculate. First, H-S has proportionally more tenants than the entire sample: 23% of the residents in the former, as opposed to a mere 6% for the other communities. Second, H-S tenants have different views on accuracies than tenants in other communities: 89% of the former would accept errors greater than 10cm, whereas only 17% of the latter would accept such levels. The inference is that the higher proportion of tenants and their more tolerant views on accuracies, combined to make H-S significantly different from the other communities which were canvassed.

Caveat and Conclusion:

Some commentators have suggested that the respondents’ views should be discounted or, at the very least, treated warily. The notion that the public is either ignorant of boundary matters, or else is misinformed, or else is only interested upon learning of an encroachment, is hinted at in the New Brunswick study: “the average citizen cannot visualize boundaries.” It concluded that boundaries must be “explained to the consumer” by the land surveying profession, and recommended that boundary accuracies be much higher than the average preferred accuracy of 18cm.

Research continues in answering three questions. First, what is the relationship between true and perceived property values and between true and perceived lot areas? Second, are there any relationships between boundary preferences and perceived values and areas? Third, will a more complex sample - which includes the preferences of the residents of six different sample - which includes the preferences of the residents of six other provinces across three other provinces - yield a better model?

...big question...What do these findings mean for the debate about a coordinate-based cadastre in Alberta?

Therefore, to the extent that the “consumer” (also referred to as the “public,” the community,” and the “proprietor”) is unable to express coherent preferences for how and to what accuracy their boundaries should be marked, the Alberta findings should be ignored. In the alternative, the big question must be: What do these findings mean for the debate about a coordinate-based cadastre in Alberta?

There appear to be two possible answers, depending upon one’s agenda. The first answer is that most land owners want something visible marking their boundary, which excludes both buried monuments and coordinates. The second answer is that the proportion of landowners who prefer coordinates is not significantly different than the proportions who prefer either natural features, artificial features, or monuments.
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his seems like a good time to update everyone on the Systematic Practice Review Program and a couple of areas of recent concern.

Program Update

Phase One as of August 1999

All 171 of the initial reviews have been completed but two have yet to be considered by the Practice Review Board. Forty follow up reviews have been conducted with eight yet to be considered by the Practice Review Board. Four second follow up reviews have been conducted with 1 yet to be considered by the Practice Review Board. Six supplementary reviews are completed with one still open pending the results of a follow up review. This is a total of 221 Phase One reviews to date with 11 of them yet to be considered by the Practice Review Board. Although several are scheduled for the September 1999 Board meeting.

Phase Two as of August 1999

Sixteen Phase Two reviews have been conducted to date and several are scheduled. The Practice Review Board at their September 1999 meeting will consider three of the sixteen. The other 13 conducted to date are in various stages of completion.

In scheduling Phase Two reviews, the first 40% of the practices reviewed in Phase One that are still active will also be the first 40% to be reviewed in Phase Two although not necessarily in the same order as phase One. New practices not yet reviewed will be included in here as well. After completing this batch, we intend to select the next 40% or so and complete them in a similar fashion. The remaining practices would then be reviewed to complete Phase Two. The objective in selecting this format was to keep a relative spacing between Phase One and Phase Two reviews for all practices. As Phase Two has a five-year term, we intend to complete approximately 20% of the Phase Two reviews each year.

Alleged Plan Errors

Alleged plan errors are inconsistencies in plans registered at the Land Titles Office discovered during cadastral mapping by the mapping contractors. Since September 1997 these mapping contractors have forwarded copies of correspondence regarding the alleged plan error to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association office. This information is filed as it comes in and becomes a discussion item during the review process. Part B Section 1.6 of the Manual of Standard Practice is a commentary on the Code of Ethics. It says in part:

An Alberta Land Surveyor shall assist in maintaining and improving the integrity and competence of the profession of surveying. This responsibility includes maintaining the survey system, by cooperating with colleagues to resolve any apparent errors or discrepancies in his work and taking all necessary measures to remedy those errors or discrepancies

Statistics indicate that nearly 15% of the reported Alleged Plan errors were for missing ASCM ties. This is a very high number, since not all plans require ASCM ties, and our records do not contain alleged plan errors from either the City of Edmonton or the City of Calgary, large urban centers where all plans would require integration. The Survey Regulation requiring integration with survey control was rescinded this year. The former regulation was modified slightly and inserted into our Manual of Standard Practice. With one exception, Part C, Section 5 of the Manual of Standard Practice requires integration with Alberta Survey Control, or ties to survey control if any monument found or placed by the survey is within 1km of an Alberta Survey Control marker. A search for survey control markers in the vicinity of all surveys undertaken should be standard procedure for all projects. During the course of reviews, we often find that updated marker condition reports have not been filed with the Director of Surveys as required by Part C Section 3.11 of the Manual of Standard Practice.

Descriptive Plans

As part of the plan examination stage of Systematic Practice Review Program, we often examine Descriptive Plans. Recently several issues related to Descriptive Plans have been discovered. Land Surveyors should take into consideration the following points in the preparation of Descriptive Plans.

Statistics indicate that nearly 15% of the reported Alleged Plan errors were for missing ASCM ties. This is a very high number, since not all plans require ASCM ties, and our records do not contain alleged plan errors from either the City of Edmonton or the City of Calgary, large urban centers where all plans would require integration. The Survey Regulation requiring integration with survey control was rescinded this year. The former regulation was modified slightly and inserted into our Manual of Standard Practice. With one exception, Part C, Section 5 of the Manual of Standard Practice requires integration with Alberta Survey Control, or ties to survey control if any monument found or placed by the survey is within 1km of an Alberta Survey Control marker. A search for survey control markers in the vicinity of all surveys undertaken should be standard procedure for all projects. During the course of reviews, we often find that updated marker condition reports have not been filed with the Director of Surveys as required by Part C Section 3.11 of the Manual of Standard Practice.

Descriptive Plans

As part of the plan examination stage of Systematic Practice Review Program, we often examine Descriptive Plans. Recently several issues related to Descriptive Plans have been discovered. Land Surveyors should take into consideration the following points in the preparation of Descriptive Plans.
1. Don’t over dimension the parcel and always relate the parcel to an established point in the survey system. Only use sufficient dimensions to locate accurately the parcel and never use calculated dimensions.

2. Get the prior approval of Land Titles Office before preparing a descriptive plan as required by Section 89(1)(b)(ii) of the Land Titles Act.

3. Never relate a boundary of a Descriptive Plan to a limit shown on an unregistered plan. If the unregistered plan is revised prior to registration or is abandoned, boundary conflicts could result.

4. If the boundary of a parcel is to be coincident with the limit of a right of way or other plan, say so. For example, east limit of right of way plan 991 XXXX or north limit of Road plan 992 XXXX. Do not attempt to dimension the plan to make it coincident.

5. If necessary, use a detail in congested areas to clearly define the boundaries being created by the plan.

6. Section 89(2) of the Land Title Act says that no Descriptive Plan shall include more than two parcels of land, and that no Descriptive Plan shall include any land dedicated for public purposes.

In addition, the Land Titles Procedures Manual, Part D Section 6 of the Manual of Standard Practice, and Section 89 of the Land Titles Act should be considered when preparing Descriptive Plans. Descriptive Plans were authorized under Section 89 of the Land Titles Act in 1988, largely to replace the use of metes and bounds descriptions with graphic representations of the parcels. Currently Descriptive Plans can only be utilized for subdivision or consolidation purposes. The Standards Committee and Land Titles Office are presently looking at the use of Descriptive Plans.
Case Study No. 2

Double Monumentation

This is the second in a continuing series of articles featuring problems commonly encountered in Systematic Practice Review. The purpose of these articles is purely educational and, although the material is taken from an actual practice review, no names or identifying legal descriptions are included.

The Project

The practitioner conducted a subdivision survey of a property in NE¼ Section 24. The survey, done in 1999, involved the consolidation of a parcel previously surveyed in 1974, the east limit of which was coincident with a metes and bounds description described as the North 532 feet of the East 330 feet of the NE¼ of Section 24. The 1974 survey had laid out the parcel as being 330 feet (100.584 m.) west of the NE corner of Section 24. This should have left the metes and bounds description with its prescribed distance west of the NE 24.

The Plan Examination

The practitioner’s subdivision plan shows finding the NE 24 and the monuments on the east limit of the parcel surveyed in 1974. The dimension shown between the NE 24 and the monument found at the NE corner of the previously surveyed parcel shows as 100.48, or approximately 0.10m shorter than the distance prescribed by the metes and bounds description and the distance shown on the 1974 subdivision survey plan. The practitioner called the monument at the NE corner of the previously surveyed parcel 0.10 east of the corner to account for the difference in measurement versus the prescribed dimension. He also indicated that the found monument at the SE corner of the 1974 parcel was 0.08m east of the corner.

The NE 24 was originally placed by the township survey in 1884. A subdivision survey done in 1948 indicates not finding the NE 24 and re-establishes it from what appears to be original evidence at E¼ Sec 24, E¼ Sec 25, and the NE 23. This 1948 subdivision showed laying out the north limit of the subdivision as being 532’ south of NE 24 and parallel to the north limit of Sec 24, indicating that the metes and bounds description (North 532’ of the East 330’ of NE¼) existed then. A subdivision survey registered in 1970 did not locate the monument at the NE 24 and re-established it and placed a new monument.

The Field Inspection

The SPR field inspection found two iron posts at the NE 24, approximately 0.10m apart. Both appeared slightly bent and what appeared to be the older of the two was 0.10m northeast of the newer one. It is not certain that the older of the two monuments is the original; it is more likely from the 1948 survey that had re-established the section corner. I believe that the newer of the two monuments is the one re-established by the 1970 survey as its yellow color is consistent with the monuments used in that era. The 1974 survey would appear to have found the 1948 monument, while the 1999 survey appears to have found the 1970 monument.

Both monuments found along the east limit of the 1974 parcel (being consolidated) and shown by the practitioner as being east of their corners appear to be in good shape. On the surface, this appears to be a boundary conflict. The metes and bounds description limit is governed by the title dimension of 330 feet, while the limit of the 1974 parcel is governed by the monuments placed for that purpose.

The Legislation

Section 41 (4) of the Surveys Act declares: All the boundary lines surveyed and established in accordance with subsection (1) shall be defined by the monuments placed for that purpose as shown on the plan of survey registered at the Land Titles Office, whether or not the dimensions or areas expressed on the plan are found by re-measurement to be different.

This section indicates that unless the monuments placed by the previously surveyed parcel were found to be disturbed, the monuments define the corners they were placed to govern, regardless of the measurements. Without any further investigation, the practitioner’s plan seemed to claim that the monuments were disturbed, as he did not accept them as governing the corners. The conflict between the metes and bounds description and the measurement between monuments would suggest a boundary uncertainty.

Section 40(1) and (2) of the Surveys Act declares:

(1) When a surveyor is required to re-establish the position of a monument placed by the original survey in accordance with Section 29 that cannot be found, the surveyor shall do so from the best available evidence respecting the position of the monument.

(2) If the position of the monument cannot be satisfactorily ascertained under subsection (1) or if the corner was not previously marked by a monument in the original survey, the surveyor shall re-establish the corner’s position in relation to those monuments of the original or subsequent surveys that can be found, in a manner that carries out the evident intention of the original survey as shown in the original field notes and the official plan of record in the Director’s office.

Neither monument found by the SPR field inspection at the NE 24 had been placed by the practitioner. Nor does it appear that either monument is the
original placed by the 1884 township survey.

The Doctrine of Original Monumentation and the reasons for it were outlined in an article entitled “The Judicial Functions of Surveyors,” by Mr. Justice Thomas Cooley of the Michigan Supreme Court in 1880. This Doctrine of Original Monumentation has been adopted into the Surveys Act (Section 41(4)) and has been part of survey law in Alberta since the formation of the Province. In re-establishing the position of any monument, the assignment is to place the re-established monument where the original was, not necessarily where a plan dimension might say it should have been.

Over the years the Courts, through their boundary related decisions, have helped establish a hierarchy of evidence that can be utilized by the land surveyor in weighting the boundary evidence he collects. As the law adopting the Doctrine of Original Evidence has not changed in Alberta, neither has the hierarchy of evidence changed. This hierarchy of evidence is outlined in Part E Section 4.2 of the Manual of Standard Practice.

Part B Section 1.6 of the Manual of Standard Practice, being part of the Code of Ethics with commentary sets out the land surveyor’s ethical responsibility to assist in resolving the errors and discrepancies in his work:

An Alberta Land Surveyor shall assist in maintaining and improving the integrity and competence of the profession of surveying. This responsibility includes maintaining the survey system, by cooperating with colleagues to resolve any apparent errors or discrepancies in his work and taking all necessary measures to remedy those errors or discrepancies.

The Corrections

Plan corrections for this project have not been completed as of the date of writing. It should be noted that other plans and surveys may be affected by any plan corrections made. Even though the practitioner did not place either monument, his survey required his opinion as to the location of the NE 24. Accepting the location of an incorrectly placed monument places the same obligation upon the surveyor as if he had re-established it. In this case, where it is very likely that both of the found monuments are re-established, both locations could be incorrect and it is possible that the original or traces of it still exist, although our field inspection would not indicate that this is very likely.

The surveyor’s duty is to weigh all of the evidence before him and arrive at a best evidence conclusion by taking into account the hierarchy of evidence in all evidence evaluations and restorations. I believe that, in the case in point, one has to place more weight on the 1948 survey, as it is the first after the original and was more likely to have found and used original evidence in the re-establishment than later surveys.

The Message

The original monument in its original position governs the location of a corner. Re-established monuments are merely another land surveyor’s opinion as to the location of the original boundary. That land surveyor’s task was to do an exhaustive search for the original monument or traces of it, prior to re-establishing it. If a later survey accepts the re-established position and the original monument is subsequently discovered, the re-established monument has absolutely no value in defining the corner. Any surveys relying on the incorrect location may require plan corrections, including owners’ consents or a judge’s order to correct the plan and survey.

While the case outlined here found two re-established monuments at a section corner, we also find cases where the original monument or traces of the original monument exist along with a re-established monument. In these situations one thing is abundantly clear: all of them could be the incorrect location of the corner but all of them cannot be correct. It is imperative that a thorough search is conducted for the original monument or traces of it prior to declaring found no mark and re-establishing the monument. In the case described here, it would appear that the 1970 survey initiated the double posting and did not locate an existing monument at NE 24.

In addition to looking for original monuments, traces of original monuments such as pits, mounds, post holes, rust holes and possessory evidence must all be looked for and weighed into the surveyor’s assessment of evidence prior to resorting to mechanical re-establishment. Many future surveys could be impacted by an improper re-establishment, or a poor search for original evidence. A surveyor should never blindly accept the location of a re-established monument without doing sufficient research to verify that either the original is not there or that he agrees with the re-established position. If that re-established location is subsequently proven to be wrong, the surveyor will be obligated to correct his survey and plan.

I urge all surveyors to review Part E Section 4 of the Manual of Standard Practice, entitled “Guidelines for Retracements and Restorations,” and always keep the hierarchy of evidence in mind when re-establishing monuments.
Sharpline
(new)
..it is my opinion that our current registration practices do not severely restrict the opportunities for other provincial qualified professionals.

...it is my opinion that our current registration practices do not severely restrict the opportunities for other provincial qualified professionals.

I am also of the opinion that we need to proceed with caution internally and in consultation with the other provinces to ensure that only qualified professionals are offering services to the public everywhere.

To that extent, the Registration Committee is looking at some form of reciprocity with the other three western provinces.

The profession was granted limited self-governing legislation because the profession is best qualified to assess and register or licence professionals. This obligates the professions to work with the government to achieve the objectives of both groups, remembering that the mandate remains the same—the protection of the public.

Net Notes

As all students are now back in school, here are some education-related web sites.

**Geomatics Skills Network**
www.geoexperts.net/main.html

**Western Canadian Board of Examiners (WCBE)**
www.ensu.ucalgary.ca/wcbe/index.htm

**University of Calgary**
www.ensu.ucalgary.ca/

**University of Calgary Geomatics Engineering Students’ Society**
www.ensu.ucalgary.ca/~gess/

**Northern Alberta Institute of Technology**
www.nait.ab.ca

**Southern Alberta Institute of Technology**
www.sait.ab.ca
Allan John Spence
July 22, 1917 - June 4, 1999

Allan John Spence passed away at the Rockyview Hospital in Calgary on June 4th 1999, at the age of eighty-one years. A Memorial Service celebrating Allan’s life was held at Central United Church on June 12th, 1999.

He was born in Calgary on July 22nd 1917, son of William and Grace Margaret Spence. He had two brothers and one sister, all of whom predeceased him.

Allan completed Grade 12 in June, 1937 and then wrote to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association requesting information on examinations and articles. His wish was to serve articles with his grandfather, A.P. Patrick, A.L.S., D.L.S., D.T.S. He enrolled in first year university at Mount Royal College and was awarded a scholarship towards the study of Civil Engineering at the University of Alberta.

Allan served D.L.S. articles with Harry S. Day, A.L.S., D.L.S. from 1944 to 1946. He worked on miscellaneous road and other surveys for the department of Public Works in various locations in northern Alberta. During the war, Allan participated in a Canadian Army University Training Program, (C.O.T.C.) and became a commissioned officer in 1945. On May 15th 1946, he graduated from the University of Alberta with a B.Sc. in Civil Engineering. His articles were transferred from Mr. Day to Seabury K. Pearce, A.L.S., D.L.S. He served Mr. Pearce until December 1st 1947, where he gained experience in the survey of roads and rights of way, damsites, and river and lakeshore traverses for Calgary Power Ltd. in the Seebe, Kananaskis and Lake Minnewanka areas.

Allan started his career with the Land Titles Office in 1949 under the direction of his uncle, James C. Glenday, Manager of the Survey Department. His D.L.S. articles were accepted by the Association, and on the strength of his engineering degree, he was exempted from all preliminary and intermediate examinations, as well as a number of the finals. He was required to sit six exams before taking the oral examination. Allan and I were preparing to write the limited final exam in May 1952, and we studied together on several occasions. He shared his knowledge of the Land Titles Act and descriptions with me, and I helped him prepare for the examination on astronomy. Allan was registered as an Alberta Land Surveyor on June 26th, 1952—commission no. 173—and was subsequently appointed Surveyor to the Land Titles Office.

Allan retired in 1979 after thirty years of service with the Land Titles Office and became registered in the Association’s inactive roster.

Rumor has it that Allan owned a car, but he preferred to ride his bicycle to work every day, no matter what the weather. He was very athletic, having played hockey at the University level, and was an excellent handball player. His lunch hours were often spent playing handball at the YMCA. Allan also enjoyed golfing.

In 1969 he ventured into the publishing business, producing a forty-eight page book on Descriptions of Land which sold for $2.00 a copy! Allan was a believer in brevity in description writing and this is reflected in his examples. Explanatory notes were appended to most descriptions for the benefit of the reader.

He applied to resign his commission, which Council approved with regret in early 1980.

Following his retirement, the Southern Regional Group of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association held a dinner and social evening in his honor at the Calgary Winter Club. An account of this event was published in the Summer 1979 issue of ALS News.

Allan was diagnosed with Alzheimer’s Disease in March 1998, but fortunately was able to remain at home, thereby maintaining a measure of quality of life. He is survived by his daughter Barbara (Michael) Ward of Calgary, his son Brian (Marina) Spence of Perth, Western Australia, and two granddaughters, Melanie and Jennifer Ward.

This gentle, courteous man will be sorely missed by those members of the surveying and legal professions, and others who had the privilege of knowing him during his career at the Land Titles Office.

The assistance provided by Barbara Ward, Army MacCrimmon, A.L.S. (Ret.) and Syd Loeppky, A.L.S. is greatly appreciated.

W.A. WOLLEY-DOD, A.L.S.

Regional Meetings 1999 - 2000

Edmonton
- January 27, 2000
- March 30, 2000

Calgary
- February 1, 2000
- April 4, 2000
Mathias Wuhr
December 15, 1929 - July 21, 1999

Mathias Wuhr was born on December 15, 1929 in Minto, New Brunswick where he lived throughout his early years, graduating from high school in 1946 from the Minto Newcastle Consolidated School. After graduation, Matt worked for a while in the coal mines in Minto where he had often worked during his summer vacations from high school. He next had a brief stint as a mariner on a merchant ship plying between Europe and North America. He also worked for a while in a logging operation in the Queen Charlotte Islands off British Columbia but a falling log broke his ankle and that sent him back home to Minto to recover.

In November 1949, he joined the Topographical Survey of the then Department of Mines and Technical Surveys and spent two years working on various phases of topographic mapping both in the office and in the field. In 1951, he spent the summer in Newfoundland working under Howard Spence on mapping control.

In 1952, he jumped at the chance to go to the Northwest Territories with the Legal Surveys Division to work on the survey of the highway right-of-way west of Yellowknife. That summer he also worked on townsites surveys in Pine Point, NWT and some township subdivision surveys in Pigeon Lake Indian Reserve in Alberta. In the following years, still with Legal Surveys, Matt earned himself the reputation of being a bit of a prankster. While working with Lorne Anderson and Bob McCurdy on mineral claim surveys in the Yukon, he succeeded in setting the cook’s alarm clock ahead during the night and then surreptitiously turning it back during the day so that the cook got the breakfast ready an hour early on several occasions.

His experiences on property surveys in the west convinced Matt that he wanted a career in land surveying. He immediately started studying for the Dominion Land Surveyor commission and successfully completed the examinations in 1956. In the same year, he also acquired his Alberta and Nova Scotia Land Surveyor certificates. In the years that followed, he certainly did have a most successful career as a land surveyor, working with the Legal Surveys Division until his retirement in September 1989.

He spent many summers doing settlement surveys in the arctic and surveying Indian Reserves and National Parks in Alberta and was never happier than when he was clambering up and down the Rocky Mountain peaks and foothills in western Alberta. It was during this era that the Division received a letter from a Banff Park official expressing high praise for Matt who, at considerable risk to himself, had recovered the body of a park visitor who had died in a climbing fall. In later years, he preferred to work in less arduous terrain and was assigned to surveys in his native Maritimes where he soon acquired both the Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick Land Surveyor certificates.

In 1979, Matt reluctantly gave up the pleasures of an outdoor life doing surveys. He returned to a sedentary position in Ottawa where he took on the task of evaluating the operational effectiveness and efficiency of completed survey projects that had been managed by the Division. Declining health obliged him to continue in this function until his retirement in 1989.

Matt married Yvonne Gallant, also a native of Minto, New Brunswick in 1965 and has two sons, Matt junior and Konrad. He is also survived by a brother, Wolfgang living in Minto.

Bodian F. Bayda
March 7, 1945 - July 10, 1999

Bodian (Bob) Bayda passed away at the age of fifty-four on July 10, 1999. He leaves his loving wife Joyce, of twenty-nine years of marriage, and four children; Ronald, Elana, Oksana, and David. He is also survived by his mother Mary Bayda of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, two brothers, Mervin (Inger) of Surrey, B.C. and Terry (Sonia) of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. He was predeceased by his father, Fred, in 1998.

Bob was born on March 7, 1945 in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan the oldest son of Fred and May Bayda. Along with his two younger brothers, Mervin and Terry, he milked cows and did chores on the family farm. He loved sports, participating in track and field, hockey, softball, and bowling. After completing high school in Aberdeen, Saskatchewan in 1963, he worked in Saskatoon for a while and then attended the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Moose Jaw. There he completed a diploma in Architectural Technology in 1967. After college, he moved to Edmonton and worked for the provincial government. Bob gained employment with Stewart, Weir & Co. Ltd. and in 1970

Matt was at home in Ottawa with his family when he died peacefully on July 21, 1999 following a long struggle with cancer.

Bill Blackie
he became a member of the Alberta Society of Engineering Technologists. Bob articulated to R.J. Watson, A.L.S. and received his commission as an Alberta Land Surveyor in February of 1976. Shortly thereafter, he started his own surveying company, Bayda and Associates Surveys Inc., which he ran with Joyce until his death.

Bob was proud to be an Alberta Land Surveyor. Land surveying was never just a job to him. His love and devotion to the profession contributed to his personal satisfaction. Bob and I worked at the public relations booth at the Agricom Trade Fair, where he enjoyed answering questions and explaining his profession to others.

Bob loved being outdoors doing field work for house stakeouts and subdivisions. He enjoyed new challenges that came his way. Bob’s clients will miss his great service; a house builder could arrive at any time in the day or evening with a roll of house plans and Bob would find time to discuss the job with him. Bob could accurately hand draft surveyor’s certificates and subdivision plans on linen with ease.

He had done a lot of drafting while at Stewart, Weir and didn’t even require a drafting arm. A table, pens, scale, and triangles were all Bob needed. He rarely used Leroy and had his own distinct drafting style. It was a pleasure to have known Bob and to work and article with him.

Bob’s life work was assisting others and caring for his family. He volunteered in an executive capacity for many different organizations. He spent a considerable amount of time involved with his church, St. John Ukrainian Orthodox Cathedral, St. Johns Senior Citizens Home, Ukrainian Bilingual Association, Foresters, and the Edmonton Sabres and Edmonton Crusaders Marching Bands. Bob was involved for many years with the Dovercourt Community League. He volunteered many hours of his time for all organizations that his children were associated with. He always stressed that an education was a very important part of their life.

He also assisted and billeted many Ukrainians and other people from overseas and the United States that were visiting or relocating to Edmonton.

Bob enjoyed helping and meeting people. His personality could spark a conversation with anyone and the people always remembered him.

He was up every day working at 5:00 a.m. After a long day’s work and supper, he would take the children to Beavers, Brownies, Cubs, Ukrainian dancing, a church or school function, band practice, or other activity before heading off to attend a meeting or work bingo.

He loved to return to the family farm, especially during harvest. Family gatherings were very important in the large extended family on both the Bayda and Dmyterko sides. It was well known that Bob loved having visitors—the more people he had in their home, the happier he seemed. His keen sense of humour, his smile, his jokes, and his bubbly personality will be remembered by all who knew him.

BRIAN DOYLE, A.L.S.
building contracts

Tendering—bid which was submitted 30 seconds after a deadline was valid.—also, miscalculation of GST did not render the bid uncertain.

On an appeal, the court was required to determine the validity of a tender for a construction contract. In the spring of 1998, school board invited five contractors to bid on a contract to build a new high school and library in Stoney Creek. Appellant contractor, BMCL, and respondent contractor, BCC were two of the five bidders. The deadline for submitting tenders was May 8, 1998 at 1:00 p.m. BMCL and three other bidders submitted their tenders before 1:00 p.m. BCC’s tender was submitted 30 seconds after 1:00 p.m. and it contained discrepancies in its bid price. However, school board awarded BCC the contract. BMCL brought an application for a declaration that BCC’s tender was invalid either because it was submitted late or because its price was uncertain. The application was dismissed. It was found that BCC’s tender was valid because it was submitted before school board’s clock, which had no second hand, read 1:01 p.m. Further, it was found that there was no discrepancy between the printed and numerical price contained in BCC’s bid. The only problem that arose was in a subsequent calculation paragraph which appeared to be superfluous and was not considered by school board as being the operative part of the tender. School board considered that a price contained in a tax calculation paragraph resulted from a clerical error and that such an error ought not to have prevented BCC from obtaining the contract.

Held: appeal dismissed. The judge who heard the application was faced with two reasonable interpretations concerning the time when a tender was to be submitted. He made no error in the application of the relevant legal principles, and therefore the appellate court was to defer to his finding. Deference to his decision reflected sound judicial policy, avoided a damages claim against a public body that made good faith efforts to resolve a difficult problem and produced a rule that the Ontario industry could follow.

With respect to BMCL’s argument that the tender was invalid because its price was uncertain, the court was not persuaded that the lower court judge erred in rejecting BMCL’s arguments. The error contained in the tax calculation paragraph did not disqualify the bid. This paragraph, if not superfluous, was at least subordinate to the paragraph where the bidder had to set out its bid price.

Reprinted from the April 9/99 edition of the Lawyers Weekly with permission from the author.
David Scovill Bursary

As reported in the last issue of ALS News, articling student David Scovill passed away suddenly on May 4, 1999 at the age of 24 years.

A memorial bursary has been established by the University of Calgary in David's name...

A memorial bursary has been established by the University of Calgary in David’s name and they are attempting to raise $10,000 for the endowment fund.

The bursary of $500 will be offered annually to a student entering third year in the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Calgary who has chosen Geomatics Engineering as his/her program specialization.

The award will be based on demonstrated financial need and on academic merit on at least five full course equivalents taken in the first year of Engineering.

Members who wish to make their own contribution may sign a cheque payable to the University of Calgary accompanied by a letter stating that it be put towards the David Scovill Memorial Bursary.

New NSERC/UFA-Sponsored Faculty Member in Geomatics Engineering

The Department of Geomatics Engineering is pleased to announce that Dr. Susan Skone has been awarded a three-year NSERC University Faculty Award. Dr. Skone was one of fifteen candidates selected nationally for this distinction and the only successful candidate from the University of Calgary. The initial award is for three years with an additional two-year renewal option. Dr. Skone recently completed her Ph.D. in Geomatics Engineering at the University of Calgary, in the area of satellite-based navigation. Her area of expertise is the effect of atmospheric phenomena on satellite systems. Her academic background also includes undergraduate degrees in mathematics and physics, and a M.Sc. in space physics (University of Alberta). Her research as a faculty member will focus on assessing the effect of auroral substorm events on GPS applications, and determining the magnitude and impact of ionospheric scintillation effects in the auroral and equatorial regions. Dr. Skone was also a Killam scholar, the recipient of the International Amelia Earhart Fellowship, and the recipient of many international best paper awards.

She is also involved in Women in Science and Engineering activities at the University of Calgary.

Dr. Alec McEwen Becomes Emeritus Professor

The Department of Geomatics Engineering is pleased to announce that the University of Calgary has granted the status of Emeritus Professor to Dr. Alec McEwen.

Dr. McEwen has had a truly distinguished career and he is a highly respected member of the land surveying profession in Canada. He holds three degrees in law, in addition to five professional land surveying commissions, including three in Canada and two in Africa. He has distinguished himself in numerous capacities throughout his long career, both in Canada and abroad. He has worked in numerous countries as an advisor to the United Nations, the Canadian International Development Agency and other international sponsors. For 15 years, he was Canadian Commissioner, and received an Order in Council appointment.

Dr. McEwen was a faculty member in the Department of Geomatics Engineering during the period 1991-95. His teaching and research in the Department and effective liaison with the land surveying profession resulted in the re-accreditation of the Geomatics Engineering program by the Canadian Council of Land Surveyors.

...Dr. McEwen has taken a keen interest in scholarly work and he is internationally known for his numerous contributions to land tenure issues.

Throughout his career, Dr. McEwen has taken a keen interest in scholarly work and he is internationally known for his numerous contributions to land tenure issues. Since his retirement from the University of Calgary, Dr. McEwen has remained very active. He has been involved as an expert in a score of land reform projects around the world and has continued to publish scholarly material.
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As the Professional Development Committee gears up for another series of meetings after a summer hiatus, there are a couple of issues that should be brought to the members’ attention.

The Getting It Right seminar remains the flagship of the Committee. The Committee wishes to thank the Getting It Right Re-Design Team for their many hours of work in preparing and presenting this seminar.

A trial run was held in Edmonton earlier in the year while the first “real” test of the new seminar was sold out in Calgary in June. During the redesign, it was hoped that the seminar could be held in locations other than Edmonton or Calgary. One has just been held in Lethbridge while Grande Prairie has been suggested as another possible location.

Prior to this year’s annual meeting, it was suggested that articling students’ technical reports contain a wealth of information and should be made more widely available. While everyone agreed that this would be an excellent idea, several issues must be resolved. They are: copyright (the former student retains ownership of the report), cost of implementation, and the fact that the Registration Committee may replace the technical report with several smaller project reports. Nevertheless, the Professional Development Committee hopes to be able to make several of the existing technical reports available from the Association’s website. We hope that the many of the recently commissioned members will voluntarily submit a digital file of their technical report and allow their fellow members to obtain a copy to promote a free-flow exchange of information.

Continuing Professional Development is also a hot topic but an update on that subject will have to wait until another time.
Cansel

(repeat)
Our newly installed Council reconvened on June 17th in Red Deer and quickly got down to work. The first order of business was to determine the certification of nine worthy applicants. We would now like to introduce our newest members and congratulate them. They are:

Jay Blackman  
Owner of JBX Surveys, Calgary

John Coons  
Party Chief  
All West Surveys Ltd., Calgary

Wade Heck  
Survey Technologist  
Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association

Curt Hegel  
Party Chief  
The Focus Corporation Ltd.,  
Grande Prairie

Rick James  
Survey Drafting  
Computer & Webmaster Consulting  
Fort Smith, NT

Glen Jensen  
Party Chief, The City of Calgary

Kelly Kostiuk  
Draftsperson  
Global Surveys Corp., Calgary

Lawrence Priest  
Draftsperson, Midwest Surveys Inc., Edmonton

Robert Ravingnat  
Drafting and Information Supervisor  
McElhanney Associates  
Fort St. John, B.C.

In addition, Council has determined that certifications will be set for the meetings in October, February, and June in order to let applicants know when their applications will be considered.

In order to bring the membership online to the new directions we will be taking, the publication of Link was set for Summer 1999, October, and March.

The committee chairs are now in place. They are:

Wayne Latam  
Legislation

Farley McKenzie  
Education

Peter Charlebois  
Membership

Barry Bleay  
Public Relations, Annual  
Meeting, Nominations

Farley McKenzie and Stutt Pottruff  
Publication

The committees are now preparing for the upcoming year and millennium. The Public Relations Committee intends to ensure that we have a stronger presence at NAIT and SAIT. This will take the form of information sessions and booths at their annual Career Fairs. We have been invited to take part in Crescent Heights High School’s Career Day in Calgary on October 28th. The Committee is planning to upgrade our present brochure and create one for our fine Safety Certification Program. Incidentally, dates will be set for our fall and spring sessions shortly.

The Annual ALSA Golf Tournament at Sylvan Lake is now history. I am sure it was a great success. I expect many of our members took part. I was on holiday in Britain and enjoyed wonderful weather.

I understand that we will all be quite busy this fall and winter because of the welcome increase in oil and gas activity. I am sure our members are up for the task as always.

Council met again on September 16th to set the tone for the fall and winter. I will be reporting on our activities in December. Have a great fall.
J.H. Holloway Scholarship Foundation

March 1, 1997 — June 15, 1999

Donors have contributed up to $500 to the Foundation.

Ken Allred, A.L.S.
Earl Amankwah
Alpine Land Surveys Limited
Dr. Brian Ballantyne
Dick Bassil, A.L.S. (Ret.)
Kevin Beatty, A.L.S.
Blaine Benson, A.L.S.
Lou Breton, A.L.S. (Ret.)
Caltech Surveys Ltd.
Jim Chorel
Cam Christianson, A.L.S.
Barry Clarkson, A.L.S.
Control Land Surveys (1982) Ltd.
John Deyholos, A.L.S.
Stephen Fediow, A.L.S.
Frontier Survey Services Inc.
Don George, A.L.S.

Stephen Green, A.L.S.
Bruce Gudim, A.L.S.
Hamilton & Olsen Surveys Ltd.
Alex Hittel, A.L.S.
David Holmberg, A.L.S. (Ret.)
Hal Janes, A.L.S.
K & M Survey Services Ltd.
Kellam Berg Engineering & Surveys Ltd.
Doug Krempien, A.L.S.
Daniel Lachance, A.L.S.
Roger Leeman, A.L.S.
L.R. Olson & Associates Ltd.
Joseph Longo, A.L.S.
Longstaff Land Surveying Ltd.
Army MacCrimmon, A.L.S. (Ret.)
Jim MacLeod, A.L.S.

Craig McBride, A.L.S.
Dr. Alec McEwen
George Moore, A.L.S.
Northland Surveys
Buck Olsen, A.L.S.
Henry Palindat, A.L.S. (Ret.)
Lyall Pratt, A.L.S.
Ted Rippon, A.L.S.
Gail Robertson
Kasimir Sawicki, A.L.S. (Ret.)
John Sung, A.L.S.
Allan Theriault, A.L.S. (Ret.)
Stewart, Weir & Co. Ltd.
Dwayne Westacott, A.L.S.
Westacott Consulting Ltd.
Wolley-Dod & MacCrimmon Surveys

March 1, 1997 — August 31, 1999

Sponsors have contributed $500 or more to the Foundation.

All-Can Engineering & Surveys (1976) Ltd.
All West Surveys Ltd.
The Cadastral Group Inc.
Can-Am Surveys Ltd.
Challenger Surveys & Services Ltd.

Crape Land Surveys Ltd.
Focus Corporation Ltd., The
George Munro & Associates Ltd.
Hagen Surveys (1976) Ltd.
Lovse Surveys Ltd.
Maltais Associates Surveyors Ltd.
Bob Mayne, A.L.S.

Midwest Surveys Inc.
Stanley Geomatics Ltd.
Stantec Geomatics Ltd.
Don Tomkinson, A.L.S.
Usher Canada Limited
Jack Webb, A.L.S.

Thank you for your generosity and support!

For Sale

1 Sokkia Set 2B Total Station
- reads to one second
- A/C and D/C chargers
- extra large spare battery
- Sokkia altimeter
- case, straps, accessories
- SDR24 data collector
Unit is like new, will sell all for $5,000

1 Wild T-2 (new style theodolite)
with case—asking $600

Contact Dave Strachan, A.L.S.

Thank You

While you were out we entered your property.

Blank forms are available in pads of 50 from the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

If you wish to have your business card imprinted on these forms, please contact:

Rose Country Communications Ltd.
Tel: 451-5670 Fax: 452-2890 roseccom@supernet.ab.ca

1 Sokkia Set 2B Total Station
1 Wild T-2 (new style theodolite)
Contact Dave Strachan, A.L.S.