Report of Proceedings of the One Hundred and Third Annual General Meeting

April 19th to 21st, 2012
Fairmont Banff Springs Hotel
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Past Presidents—Standing, left to right: Larry Pals, Stan Longson, Dave McWilliam, Jerry Rasmuson, Dirk VandenBrink, Jim Halliday
Seated, left to right: Ron Hall, Bob Baker, Bob Wallace, Don George, Lyall Pratt

New Members— Standing, left to right: Ryan Pals, Davinder Parmar, Cody Moser, Kevin Way, Michal Dudek, Tyler Robinson, Ian Cleland
Seated, left to right: Christopher Fox, Peter Yorke, Jonathan Tingley, Jennifer Rosenkranz, Andrew King, Peter Lund, Hector Muniz
## Past Presidents of the Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>W. Pearce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>L.C. Charlesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>L.C. Charlesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>R.W. Cautley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>A.C. Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>J.L. Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>H.H. Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>A.S. Weekes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>G.W. McLeod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>R.H. Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>A.P.C. Belyea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>C.M. Hoar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>J.L. Doupe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>B.J. Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>O. Inkster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>C.M. Hoar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>R.H. Cautley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>E.D. Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>T.W. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>N.H. Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>C.B. Atkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>H.S. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>A. Cormack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>W.E. Zinkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>W. Humphreys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>J.W. Doze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>R.M. Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>G.Z. Pinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>J.H. Holloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>R. McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>G.C. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>G.C. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>R. McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>C.W. Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>W.D. Usher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>D.K.F. Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>C.H. Weir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>W.A. Wolley-Dod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>L.O. Olsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>C.W. Younsg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>E.J. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>G.C. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>A.J. Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>G. Oslund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>W.E. Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>T.E. Rippon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>T.C. Swanby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>D.C. Holmberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>D.B. Gillmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>M.A. MacCrimmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>R.A.F. Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>T. Okamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>M.L. Sexauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>R.J. Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>J.W. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>J. Deyholos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>E.J. Tessari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>N.R. Mattson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>J.E. Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>B.R. Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>W.R. Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>R.A. Bassil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>R.J. Fulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>A.D. Hosford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>R.E.D. McCuaig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>L.W. Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>G.E. Olsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>I.C. Maltais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>S.M. Loeppky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>G.L. Haggerty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>R.F. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>H.E. Impey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>L.H. Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>J.H. Holm Lund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>W.R. Dabbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>S.J. Longson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>D.R. Jaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>L.M. Pals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>G.K. Allred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>D.R. McWilliam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>J.G. Halliday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>A.W. Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>S.C. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>D.H. VandenBrink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>R.M. Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>R.O. Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>D.R. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>B.D. Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>D.R. Thomson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.R. Thomson
President 2011-2012
### ACTIVE MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. Abbey</th>
<th>R.J. Deis</th>
<th>J.G. Halliday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.A. Adair</td>
<td>T.M. Dempsey</td>
<td>W. Halma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.J. Amantea</td>
<td>P.A. Densmore</td>
<td>C.M. Hanrahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.O. Amundrud</td>
<td>J.P. Deschamp</td>
<td>T. Harding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Annett</td>
<td>D.P.E. Deslauriers</td>
<td>A.M. Hasham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.G.B. Arthurs</td>
<td>F. Dion</td>
<td>D.M. Haub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.L. Baete</td>
<td>L.A. Dixon</td>
<td>C.E. Henrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Barich</td>
<td>P.S. Dixon</td>
<td>D.B. Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.J. Barvir</td>
<td>R.T. Dobson</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.P. Bates</td>
<td>W.B. Doyle</td>
<td>G.M. Hobbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Benson</td>
<td>B.M. Drake</td>
<td>I.L. Hortness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.M. Bily</td>
<td>M.A. Dudek</td>
<td>J.D. Howden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Blatz</td>
<td>S.C. DuFour</td>
<td>B.L. Huber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.P.J. Blommaert</td>
<td>J.P. Dupuis</td>
<td>C.C. Huber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.A. Boggs</td>
<td>W.L. Edgerton</td>
<td>A.J. Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.J. Boudreau</td>
<td>D.L. Edmundson</td>
<td>V.G. Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Boulanger</td>
<td>L.W. Edwards</td>
<td>S.R. Hyatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.M. Bourgeois</td>
<td>R.D. Egger</td>
<td>G. Illchuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. Bourgouin</td>
<td>D.G. Eklund</td>
<td>M.R. Ingalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Bridges</td>
<td>I.R. Emmerson</td>
<td>J.L. Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.N. Broderick</td>
<td>H.C. Engler</td>
<td>D.A. Jamieson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.E. Broderick</td>
<td>S.A. Fediow</td>
<td>C. Jeschke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.S. Brooks</td>
<td>B.G. Fleece</td>
<td>K. Jewett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.D. Brown</td>
<td>A.V. Flim</td>
<td>J.H. Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.J. Bruce</td>
<td>W.C. Foran</td>
<td>B.W. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.P. Cammaert</td>
<td>M. Forsyth</td>
<td>D.R. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.J. Card</td>
<td>T.J. Fox</td>
<td>H.G. Karash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. Chan</td>
<td>L.J. Frederick</td>
<td>S.R. Keddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Chandler</td>
<td>M. Fretwell</td>
<td>J.H. Keong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.S. Cheng</td>
<td>R.R. Gauthier</td>
<td>J.A. King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.J. Chiasson</td>
<td>J. Gibson</td>
<td>R.G. King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.J. Chiddy</td>
<td>B.R. Giesbrecht</td>
<td>M. Knott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.W. Christian</td>
<td>D. Gillis</td>
<td>M.S. Kocher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.R. Clapperton</td>
<td>D.C. Gillmore</td>
<td>M.J. Koncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.B. Clark</td>
<td>J.C. Godard</td>
<td>W.K. Kubacki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D.R. Cleland</td>
<td>H.J. Goosens</td>
<td>C.D. Kuntz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Connatty</td>
<td>R.T. Gordon</td>
<td>J.E. Landry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A. Corcoran</td>
<td>S.C. Green</td>
<td>A.J.S. Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. Cousins</td>
<td>K.T. Grenkie</td>
<td>C. Larsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.K. Croucher</td>
<td>B.W. Gudim</td>
<td>M.A. Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.W. Davidson</td>
<td>R.C. Guy</td>
<td>M.P. Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Davies</td>
<td>D.J. Hagen</td>
<td>J.H. Lehnners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.A. deBruyne</td>
<td>R.O. Hall</td>
<td>S.P. Lin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G.M. Linnell  J.A. Olsen  S. Spence
W.A. Lippitt  L.M. Pals  C.A.S. Sprott
J. Lohnes  R.M. Pals  J.D. Stephens
S.J. Longson  W. Pang  P.C. Stoliker
P. Lund  J.L. Park  D.W. Strachan
H.D. MacAulay  D.S. Parmar  P. Strozyk
M.A. MacDonald  S.S. Partridge  I.J.P. Stuart
G.R. MacDonald  J.R. Paziuk  M.A. Sutter
R.B. MacDorman  C.W. Pennell  K.T. Swabey
C.S. MacKeen  T.C. Penner  J.E. Sweeney
J.W. MacLeod  C.R. Petersen  A.J. Tarapaski
K.N. MacLeod  A.T. Pham  D.C. ten Broek
S.K. Mahendru  J. Phillips  M.P. Theuerkauf
J.I. Maidment  R.A. Pinkerton  D.M. Thomas
A.R. Main  J.M. Plante  J. Thompson
J.A. Main  R.B. Pollard  M.A. Thompson
I.C. Maltais  R.J. Pominville  C.R. Thompson
D.N. Marquardt  W.T. Powley  D.R. Thomson
T.G. Martin  N.L. Prins  D.N. Tomkinson
J.M. Matejko  G.A. Quarmby  C.J. Tripp
J.D. Matichuk  A.R. Rachynski  C.R. Tucker
D.C. Mazurkewich  J.E. Rasmuson  C.J. Turner
C.A. McBride  D.R. Regan  D.H. VandenBrink
D. McKee  A.L. Robertson  A. Vasynda
B.J. McKenna  M.D. Robinson  S.M. Vollick
L.S. Mehrer  N.R. Ronsko  R.M. Wallace
A.L. Melton  A.W. Roop  L. Wang
R.O. Metcalfe  J.A. Rosenkranz  K. Way
P.M. Michaud  B.D. Ross  W.A. Wesolowsky
A.F. Miles  R.C. Ross  D. Westacott
A.M. Miller  D.J. Rutherford  S. Westlund
J. Misic  W.M. Savoury  B.R. Wetter
P. Moloney  G.A. Schirrmacher  G.S. Whaley
R. Morrison  R.W.M. Scott  C.A. White
C.B. Moser  M.A. Selander  B.M. Wilson
H.L. Muniz  D. Sharpe  B.E. Winton
A.T. Na Chiengmai  J.C. Sharpe  K.C. Wong
I.S. Natt  D.R. Shaw  J.B. Woods
B.D. Necyk  K. Shayestehfar  N.R. Woolgar
K.J. Nemrava  L.A. Sick  M.D. Woychuk
D.B. Neufeld  J. Siu  S.T. Yanish
H. Nguyen  I. Skinner  P.L. Yorke
R.E. Nixon  G. Smith  A.N. Zaver
E. Oh  R.C. Smith  G.D. Smyth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorary Life Members</th>
<th>R.F. Baker</th>
<th>D.R. McWilliam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.R. George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retired Members</th>
<th>R.H. Beaumont</th>
<th>C.J. Nederveen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articled Pupils</td>
<td>I.B. Anderson</td>
<td>E.E.J. Gibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Badran</td>
<td>A. Gorelik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Bansal</td>
<td>L.J. Greenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.A. Beck</td>
<td>A.O. Hals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.D. Bryan</td>
<td>J.D. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.L. Bryks</td>
<td>M.J.R. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Caraba</td>
<td>S.L. Hao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.G. Caraba</td>
<td>G.B. Hebb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.E. Clarke</td>
<td>N. Holdbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.W. Cream</td>
<td>M. Hua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.E. de la Cruz</td>
<td>J.L. Inman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Dillabough</td>
<td>J.R.P. Klein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.L. Dugand</td>
<td>N.D. Kroeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.D. Ellis</td>
<td>W.L. MacIcssac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Ernst</td>
<td>T. MacKenzie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.G. Fraser</td>
<td>N.P. Madarash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Members</th>
<th>S. Cornett</th>
<th>M. Lemke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Heilman</td>
<td>M.D. Merrick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorary Members</th>
<th>S.D. Armstrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Totals                | Active Members.................................268 |
|                       | Honorary Life Members..........................3  |
|                       | Retired Member...................................2 |
|                       | Articled Pupils..................................48 |
|                       | Affiliate Member..................................0  |
|                       | Associate Members...............................4  |
|                       | Honorary Member...................................1  |
| Total...............................326            |
OFFICERS AND STAFF —2012-2013

PRESIDENT
C.R. Petersen, Lethbridge

VICE PRESIDENT
R.W.M. Scott, Calgary

PAST PRESIDENT
D.R. Thomson, Calgary
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J. Haggerty, Grande Prairie (2010-2013)
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W.B. Clark, St. Albert (2011-2013)
B.M. Drake, Edmonton (2011-2013)
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**STANDING COMMITTEES**

**OTHER EXTERNAL COMMITTEES/GROUPS**
President David Thomson brought the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and asked the assembly to rise for Canada’s national anthem.

Mr. Thomson announced that if anyone’s cell phone makes any noise of any kind, a donation of $50 to the JH Holloway Scholarship Foundation will be gratefully accepted. If the phone is answered, another $50 will be gratefully accepted.

The assembly learned that the parliamentarian for the meeting will be Larry Pals, ALS and that the meeting will follow Robert’s Rules of Order Rules of Order as interpreted by president, or the parliamentarian if requested.

President Thomson advised the assembly of the voting privileges of the various classes of membership as follows:

• Active and Honorary Life members may propose motions and resolutions and vote on all issues.
• Honorary members cannot propose motions or resolutions and cannot vote although they may engage in the discussions relative to the motions and resolutions before the assembly.
• Retired members may propose motions and resolutions and vote on all matters except those that affect professional legislation.
• Articled students, affiliate members, and associate members may not propose motions or resolutions but may discuss and vote on all matters except professional legislation and standards of practice.

The 2011-2012 Council members and public members Russ Barnes (Council) and Rudy Palovcik (Practice Review Board) were introduced.

General Manager Francisco Gomez brought greetings to the assembly from the Fairmont Banff Springs Hotel.
Visiting delegates and guests were introduced as follows:

Nigel Hemingway, President
Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors

Wayne Adams, President
Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association

Don Bourgeois, President
Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors

Paul Benedict, President
Association of Ontario Land Surveyors

Carl Hartlen, President
Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors

Rick Beaumont, President
Association of Canada Lands Surveyors

Sarah Cornett, Executive Director
Professional Surveyors Canada

Ray Heilman, President
Alberta Society of Surveying & Mapping Technologies

Mike Michaud, ALS
Director of Surveys

Roy Mosher, Director
Land Titles and Surveys, South

Bill Smienk
Lethbridge College

David Jardine
Shores Jardine

President Thomson then introduced Mr. Ray Gilmour, Deputy Minister of Alberta Sustainable Resource Development, who addressed the assembly on behalf of the Government of Alberta as follows:

I am pleased to bring greetings on behalf of the Minister of Sustainable Resource Development. Our mandate at the department is very closely tied to the work that you do as well. We are called upon to work with Albertans, communities, industry, other levels of government, and we have the responsibility to plan and manage public land and renewable resources in the province of Alberta. We must ensure those lands benefit Albertans now and into the future.

Much of our work involves a survey at some point in time. We need to know where industry plans to put roads, oil and gas wells, pipeline and gravel pits. We are working with municipalities when it comes to accommodating growth. We, of course, need surveys to establish township plans. Municipalities, in turn, need map sites and commercial and residential construction.

Over the past several years, how we do our business has also been changing. Changes have been driven by new technologies and a need to respond to more and more activity on
the land. The ability of industry to use technology to find accurate and current information to work, has to be recognized. Our goal is to ensure public interests are protected and if the use of new technologies remains compatible with that, then we are certainly supportive of that.

There’s been a lot a talk lately about Alberta being on the brink of another boom. I’m sure everyone in the room, as I, remembers when we were in the last boom after the turn of about 2000 to 2006 or 2007. Everybody had to respond to the increased demand through numerous initiatives to recognize and help us move forward. This has been done by recognizing credentials of surveyors from other provinces and providing a way for them to qualify to practice here in accepting new technology and innovation.

Within Sustainable Resource Development, as most of you know, the demand for qualified surveyors has made the search for a Director of Surveys more difficult. Our current director, having provided great service for a number of years, is looking forward to retirement and replacing him will certainly be a challenge. A search for a new director has started and I certainly would encourage anybody in the room, if you are interested, to apply. We are looking at other ways to respond to this and to draw upon the pool of people that are available. If needed, we will look at possible legislation changes later this year. But, of course, we will need to wait until the new government is formed to take any steps in that direction.

As a ministry, we are responsible for two pieces of legislation directly relevant to you as professionals; the Boundary Surveys Act and the Surveys Act. Those responsibilities lead to our involvement with you on matters like the setting of standards and procedures. They also provide a way to receive your input on trends and issues that affect your business and which may also affect industries, municipalities and land owners in this province.

It is important that we continue to work together to meet the needs and the demands of future growth. The work of surveyors has been essential at every step of this province’s development and to every Albertan. The fact that we can live and work relatively free from dispute over land and structures we build on the land, is a direct result of your professionalism and attention to accuracy and detail.

I want to thank you again very much for inviting me to your conference and I wish you all the success in the future.

President Thomson then introduced Adrian Pritchard, Director for Professions & Occupations which is the department
that is responsible for the *Land Surveyors Act* and its regulations.

Mr. Pritchard addressed the assembly as follows:

It’s a great pleasure to be here representing the Minister of our new department, Human Services. It’s always a welcome opportunity to come here to hear what’s going on in the world of land surveying. As President Dave has said, my office is responsible for your governing legislation—the *Land Surveyors Act*.

It’s certainly been a very busy time for my area this past year. It always seems to be at this time. Just to give you some idea of what we do, we work with thirty professional organizations from the very big, like APEGGA, to some very small organizations. Somewhere in that mix are the land surveyors. I’ve been the Director of the Professions and Occupations Office now for over a decade. We’ve developed an incredibly good, strong and cordial working relationship with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and it’s much welcomed.

To give you some brief idea of what we’re working on, in recent weeks, we’ve completed some final work with the engineers in bringing to a conclusion the removal of a “g” from “APEGGA.” That removal took almost six years to complete. We had to make major changes to the Act and the supporting regulations. APEGGA now is the geo-science as well as the engineering organization for the province. From that point of view, I will be meeting with APEGGA officials tomorrow. It’s always a pleasure to know that, in addition to the people here who are land surveyors, many people here also hold professional designations within APEGGA.

We’ve also been doing considerable work with some of the other organizations such as the agrology profession and seeing how they move forward with some of their professional practice considerations.

One of the big things we are working on right now—and I think we heard something of that last year—is the idea of how you can have a more efficient and more inclusive type of organization. This is absolute music to my ears. One of the things that I’m working on, in conjunction with a number of our other professional associations, is the idea of bringing all those who fit into the larger world of whatever that discipline is, to see how well they can bring the membership levels up and be more inclusive, have the ability to be more cost effective, to have the financial wherewithall to do many more things than they already do and to also provide some form of assistance to a much larger exercise that’s going on Canada-wide right now. One of things that we are finding
that is important is the whole question of, not just labour mobility or labour attraction, bringing in skilled professionals from outside of Canada. People come from all over the world and when they arrive here, they find that the message is that they don’t meet the qualifications of a particular organization. What we have been striving to do is to say, if we have the inclusivity model out there, we can have people coming in from the level of a technologist or a technician to an interim licensee right through to a full professional member and from that, is to gauge where that incoming professional from overseas will fit. Certainly, when it comes to that exercise, it has been very challenging but it’s something that we’ll being seeing with a lot of legislative activity in the next little while.

The other thing is something that I must commend the ALSA on. Your organization has always been very professional and very much a leader in getting on with things as they move forward. One of the things I’m thinking of here is when we were looking at the whole question of mutual recognition between professional associations Canada-wide. I must commend Council, Executive and particularly the staff of the ALSA—people like Brian Munday—in pushing forward the move towards having mutual recognition through our domestic trade agreements, be it the AIT, and what we’ve seen through TILMA with BC and this new entity with BC and Saskatchewan. You’ve been a leader in that direction and it’s massively appreciated.

Again, today is another great opportunity to be here. I thoroughly enjoy coming to see the land surveyors. The level of support that your organization gets over the years has been truly astonishing. To see the kind of support that you have right now with the 320 who are here today, that is really a superb announcement and validation for the work that you do as land surveyors. I don’t believe that I’ve ever seen, in all the other organizations that I work with, the same level of commitment as what I’ve seen in this organization.

I wish you all the best for this year’s AGM and for the future.

A moment of silence was observed in recognition of the following Alberta Land Surveyors who passed away in the last year:

**Army MacCrimmon, ALS (Hon. Life) #271**: passed away May 1, 2011;

**Bernie Rachansky, ALS #270**: passed away May 5, 2011;

**Rod Nagina, ALS #378**: passed away June 3, 2011;

**Paul White, ALS #295**: passed away October 8, 2011;
George Walker, ALS (Hon. Life) #172: passed away February 10, 2012; Bruce Eby, ALS #260: passed away March 18, 2012.

University of Calgary Professor, Klaus-Peter Schwarz was also remembered.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Hagen, seconded by Mr. Cheng, that the 2011 Report of Proceedings be adopted.*

**Motion Carried**

President Dave Thomson addressed the assembly as follows:

Oh where has the time gone? It seems only a short time ago I stood before this assembly in Jasper. That was a year ago and it is certainly true that time flies by when you’re busy and having fun.

This past year I’ve had the great opportunity to serve as your president and to work with an energetic and engaged Council who were so willing to give of themselves in service to this association. It was truly a very positive experience for me.

Dailing the clock back a year, Council was asked to examine a different relationship with government and, in particular, with Land Titles and the Director of Surveys offices. Council diligently examined the matter and launched a number of initiatives intended to improve the dialogue with government and to constructively engage the government by offering solutions to the issues surrounding land surveying for the benefit of Albertans. It’s a slow process to change the mindset of government; however, I’m confident we have pointed our ship in the right direction. We are proactively taking ownership of the profession and offering our assistance to the government in matters related to land tenure and boundaries.

This year we moved forward the issue of examining our regulation pertaining to ownership of a surveyor’s corporation. This has evolved into a big issue and warrants all the careful consideration it has received. The Legislation Ad Hoc Committee has worked tirelessly in an effort to find a path forward which will lead us to the best recommendation made for the profession, and the public it serves. We’ll hear more about that later.

In this past year, we began the process of examining what role the survey technologist plays in the profession and is it in the public interest to bring them under our Act. This initiative has far-reaching implications and it’s important, in the interest of the public, that we move proactively towards examining the issue.
Early in the term, Council met for a day for the purpose of prioritizing its strategic initiatives. In light of issues such as GPS location plans and the impending changes at the Director of Surveys Office, it quickly became clear that the Association needed to develop a more focused campaign to educate government, industry and other professions about the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and what it is that we do. We concluded that we wanted to position the ALSA as the “first to call” on matters related to land and boundaries. It would be important, if we are to properly fulfill our mandate, that we had a seat at the table. It’s an easy thing to say but it would require a great deal of effort from us to effectively interface with the many government officials, industry and professional associations.

This challenge gave rise to the formation of the “External Relations Committee” whose task shall be to coordinate the effort of our members who will be reaching out to these bodies and representing the Association while educating those public segments about what it is land surveyors do and why it is important.

In my travels across our country representing our Association, I came to appreciate how fortunate we are to have such an engaged membership. Our participation today is testimony to that fact. We are growing in numbers and enjoy funding which allow us to implement programs like the Boundary Panel; programs that help Albertans and programs which benefit the public and allow us to better fulfill our mandate.

Yes indeed, we are fortunate but it quickly became apparent to me how important it is to work closely with our sister associations from across the country. We must work together constructively to build a healthy land surveying profession across the nation. We are all linked together so, on that note, I would urge our members to become involved in Professional Surveyors Canada.

Finally, I have a few “shout outs” or thank-yous I would like to express before I finish.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to all our ALSA staff led by our Executive Director Brian Munday. I’ve come to appreciate how truly fortunate we are to have each and every one of them on our team. They are skilled, professional, hard-working and a lot of fun to work with. Thank you for all your help this year.

Next, I would like to thank Council for their effort, input and debate on everything we covered this year. It’s true that preparing for Council can be a “wee bit of work” but each and every time, the rewards were in working with an energetic group of professionals.
I would like to give a “shout out” to all of all our committee volunteers and chairs. Without your efforts our Association would not be the association that I am so proud of being a member of.

With all the travel and meetings to attend, being president would not have been possible for me without the support of my family, my partner and the folks at Challenger Geomatics who were left picking up the slack while I travelled about. I thank them all for their support and patience this past year.

Last, I would like to thank the membership for allowing me the privilege of being president. It truly is a career highlight for me and I’ll be forever grateful for the experience.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Pals, seconded by Mr. Pratt, that the committee reports for 2011-2012 be received as circulated.*

*Motion Carried*

President Thomson welcomed and introduced honorary life, retired and associate members to the assembly.

Vice-President Connie Petersen was called upon to present the financial report in the absence of Secretary-Treasurer John Haggerty.

*It was MOVED by Ms. Petersen, seconded by Mr. Kocher, that the 2010-2011 financial statements for the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association be received.*

*Motion Carried*

Ms. Petersen informed the assembly that the financial statements were prepared by the Association’s accountant and are almost one year old. She indicated that the statements show a strong surplus due to a strong rebound in post sales and cost controls that are still in place.

Ms. Petersen drew the assembly’s attention to note 16 (Ministeral Order Funds) and advised that under the agreement, the ALSA must pay back to the government any unused funds over a two-year period. The end of 2010 marked the end of the first year and, while there was a surplus in both the ministerial order and the boundary panel accounts in 2011, a surplus is not anticipated for 2012.

Mr. McKenna drew the assembly’s attention to the cost of $13,637 in the Discipline Revolving fund and asked what it was for and whether it is anticipated that there will be any costs for the year ending April 30, 2012.
Mr. Munday responded that the expense was for an annual discipline or administrative law seminar put on by the Association’s solicitor to help Discipline Committee, Practice Review Board and Boundary Panel members gain an understanding of administrative law. The other part of it, and probably the bulk of the expenditure, relates to discipline cases that the Association is pursuing against practitioners. He explained that when a complaint comes in against a member, the registrar will perform an investigation which may result in a formal hearing and perhaps an appeal.

Mr. Munday anticipated that the costs for the 2011-2012 fiscal year will be much lower as there were very few discipline cases. Most of the costs will be related to the administrative law seminar.

President Thomson asked Ms. Petersen to comment on the 2011-2012 projected financial statements.

Ms. Petersen advised that the statements are projected to January 31, 2012 and things have changed. She advised that post sales are stronger and there have been more Boundary Panel expenses. Investment levels show a large unrealized loss but the investment account has been flat over the past year. She further advised that more equipment is expensed now rather than capitalized and committees are projected to spend only two-thirds of their budgets. The Continuing Competency Review Program is below budget due to spending less on consultants than originally anticipated and the Boundary Panel shows a loss of $168,000 but that will be higher now as there is a contract for the 20th baseline.

In presenting the 2012-2013 budget, Ms. Petersen advised that it is very much a stay-the-course budget with only a couple of significant changes. Under committees, $41,000 has been allocated for government liaison which Council subsequently renamed the External Relations Committee. Council expects the Association to have more dealings and develop more relationships with government and industry. Council also committed significant funding towards new public awareness initiatives and the convention levy increased for 2012-2013 to $120 after not changing since 2001.

Mr. Stephens drew the assembly’s attention to the iron post and marker post revenue shown in the budget. He asked if there was anything in place to monitor this item as gas drilling is almost non-existent and there will not be a need for a lot of pipeline surveys which translates into not needing as many iron posts. He asked whether that was factored in when the budget was prepared.
Mr. Munday advised that the budget is prepared in November/December and approved in January. He indicated that it is very hard to predict what things may happen three to six months from now, let alone a year from now. Mr. Munday continued by stating that one of the things that Council does is that at every meeting post sales are considered as to where they were expected to be and where they actually are and whether the budget is ahead of the curve or below the curve. There is contingency planning in place to cut back if post sales do start to trend downward. If post sales start to go above the trend, there is never a shortage of committees that have things that they would like to have implemented.

President Thomson added that Council has a practice of establishing priority spending areas and as money becomes available, the funding for those projects gets released. This is reviewed at every Council meeting. He went on to say that in the fall of 2011, sales were trending down and there were large gaps between actual sales and what was budgeted. The sales have since rebounded and it turns out that the Association is slightly ahead of what was forecasted for the past year. A similar cautious approach has been taken by Council in going forward.

President Thomson introduced the exhibitors and invited each of them to make a short presentation to the assembly.

During the presentations, Mr. Rick Kurash of Spatial Technologies announced that the South was the winner (6-4) of the Jules Brassard Memorial Cup.

President Thomson personally thanked the exhibitors for their support at the 103rd AGM and throughout the year. He added that Mr. Rick Kurash will be retiring in 2012. Mr. Thomson indicated that Mr. Kurash has been attending the ALSA AGM for approximately forty years. He thanked Mr. Kurash for all his support over the years and wished him all the best in his retirement.

It was announced that Alonzo de la Cruz was the early bird prize winner of a complimentary evening stay for two at the Banff Springs Hotel.

President Thompson advised that a new External Relations Committee was struck for the coming year that will address improving the ALSA's relationship with government and some industry sectors. Council identified a large number of government departments and industry organizations that

Introduction of Exhibitors (see Appendix J)
it would like to liaise with on an annual basis. He encouraged Alberta Land Surveyors to volunteer to meet with these groups and indicated that each committee member would be responsible for liaising with only one or two groups a couple of times per year. He added that it wouldn’t require a huge time commitment on any one member’s part.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Lohnes, seconded by Mr. Hagen, that Part C, Section 5.8 of the Manual of Standard Practice (Lost Monuments on Subdivision Surveys) be amended as follows:*

Before February 16, 1912, it was mandatory to monument all lot and block corners on subdivision surveys. Between February 16, 1912 and June 9, 1988, posting was required only for block outlines, deflections, and those lot corners falling on a curvilinear block boundary. On June 9, 1988 the Surveys Act was amended, again making monumentation mandatory at all lot and block corners.

It is therefore essential to search for original monuments at all corners when retracing lot boundaries originally created before February 16, 1912 and after June 9, 1988. When establishing or re-establishing a lot corner within a plan originally surveyed between February 16, 1912 and June 9, 1988, the positions of the property lines are governed by the plan dimensions in relation to the block corners and monuments on curvilinear boundaries. Proportioning from the original block corner monuments or from the re-established positions of these monuments is generally required.

*In the following interpretation, a parcel is an area of land within a subdivision plan for which one certificate of title was issued. For the purposes of interpreting Section 45(5) of the Surveys Act, a block is a group of one or more parcels and any adjoining lanes within a subdivision plan that meets one of the following criteria:*

  - All those parcels that have the same block number shown on the subdivision plan;
  - A single parcel or contiguous parcels designated only as lots; or
  - A single parcel designated as a unique “Block”, “Parcel,” “Area,” or anything else other than a “Lot.”

*Motion Carried*

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Lohnes indicated that the item was on the Standards Committee terms of reference for the previous year but it was felt that the Committee needed to come up with a definition of block before the Committee could look at the issue of dates when block corners govern.
Mr. Baker was opposed to the motion and asked why the amendment was necessary. He did not feel that this needed to be included in the Manual of Standard Practice (MSP). He went on to say that if an intelligent, professional land surveyor cannot determine what is needed to define a block or a parcel, they should not be practicing.

Mr. Stoliker spoke to the motion as a member of the Standards Committee involved in bringing this motion forward. He indicated that the definition of a block has been a topic of discussion among land surveyors and he felt that the Association needs a definition of block. Mr. Stoliker advised that the next step will be to give some guidance as to how to re-establish block boundaries. He concluded by stating that land surveyors can use their professional judgement with this issue but he felt it would be better to have a definition that can be agreed on.

Mr. Baker responded by advising that he has been dealing with the issue for fifty years and if he comes up with a problem that appears to be ambiguous regarding a lot or a block corner, he uses his professional judgement.

Mr. Marquardt did not have any issues with the motion but thought that the definition of block would be good for the benefit of the public to be able to understand what the term “block” means.

Mr. Baker did not disagree with Mr. Marquardt’s comments but asked who the MSP was for; the public or the land surveyor.

Mr. Stoliker commented that the Surveys Act talks about proportioning between block corners. He felt that the Act was deficient on providing a definition for block corners. The Standards Committee found that the difficult task was to define what the actual corner of a block was, but before they could do that, they needed to come up with a definition of what an actual block is. The task for the Committee next year is to define what a block corner is.

Mr. Moloney spoke in favour of the motion, indicating that a block typically has a lane through the middle and plans sometimes will have pins indicated on the lot corners but very often there will be pins indicated on the lanes as well. Mr. Moloney went on to say that in trying to define a block corner, he has heard different opinions from land surveyors.
as to what it is. He felt that passing the motion would clarify the situation.

Mr. Woolgar commented that for the last 103 years, land surveyors have been practicing using the acts of the day. He asked why it came up now that no one can figure out what a block is.

Mr. Baker advised that when the Surveys Act was rewritten in the 1980s, many survey principles and operations were dropped because the Committee, at that time, thought that surveyors should be able to figure out how to survey and put in block corners because of the new technology that was coming in. The idea was that a surveyor was professional and intelligent enough to define how to put in a lot and block corner.

It was MOVED by Mr. Hagen, seconded by Mr. Strozyk, that Part D, Section 8.5 and Part D, Section 8.8 of the Manual of Standard Practice (Real Property Reports) be amended as follows:

PART D, SECTION 8.5 — IMPROVEMENTS
The improvements to be shown on the plan for an Alberta Land Surveyor’s Real Property Report include, at minimum, the following:

1. All buildings and projections therefrom, together with their dimensions. Minimum setback dimensions shall be shown from the boundaries of the subject parcel to exterior walls and/or foundation as required by the municipality. A statement clarifying the extent of setback dimensions is to be shown. This also includes:
   a) All permanent sheds,
   b) Any shed that encroaches from or onto the property, and
   c) Any non-permanent sheds that are larger than 9.3 square metres in footprint.

2. Eaves, dimensioned to the line of the fascia or foundation, together with a note showing this in the legend.
3. Driveways if they encroach onto the adjacent parcel.
4. Eavestroughs, steps, and landings if they encroach onto the adjacent parcel, street, or lane.

5. All permanent sheds and their dimensions.

5. Retaining walls that appear to define property lines or that encroach onto adjacent parcels, rights-of-way, streets, or lanes.

6. Utility poles and pedestals if they encroach onto the subject parcel.
7. Decks and their height above ground.

8. In-ground swimming pools.

9. In urban areas, fences that appear to define property lines. Indicate in the legend that all fences are within 0.20 metres of the property line unless otherwise noted. Fences more than 0.20 metres from the property line shall be dimensioned. Fences shall not be indicated as encroaching unless the encroachment is onto public lands. To avoid confusion and conflict, fence ownership should not be inferred.

10. Adjacent municipal sidewalks and curbs, together with the distance from the property line to the back of each sidewalk and curb.

PART D, SECTION 8.8 — AUTHENTICATION

To identify original Real Property Reports, each original report shall bear a permit stamp in red, if applicable, and an original signature in blue. The colour of both the permit stamp and the original signature are to be different from the colour of the printed document.

Mr. Hagen stated that prior to 2000, the standard was to show all sheds. The Real Estate Transaction Committee established in that year, had representation from all of the stakeholders involved with real property reports (RPRs). Some of the stakeholders were frustrated with the fact that real estate transactions were being held up because of sheds. It was decided to only show the permanent sheds. This issue has come up again because of the ambiguity of what a shed is and what is considered permanent or not permanent.

Mr. Wallace expressed concern about “9.3 square metres in footprint” in item 1(c). He continued by stating that now that the MSP is written into the listing agreement as a set of requirements for RPRs, everyone follows it. If 9.3 is included the lawyers in the city of Calgary and the City of Calgary are going to have issues because the minimum requirement there is 10.0 square metres.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Wallace, seconded by Mr. Nemrava, that “9.3 square metres” be changed to “10 square metres.”

Amendment Carried

Mr. Nemrava confirmed that 10.0 is what the City of Calgary uses and anticipated that there will be problems if it is left at 9.3.
Mr. Edwards commented that in Fort McMurray, whether or not a shed needs to be shown is laid out in the land use bylaws and it goes by height, not by square metres. He felt that the motion would introduce another stumbling block in the real estate transaction.

Mr. Fretwell asked whether there are any other jurisdictions in Alberta where the square metre requirement would come into play.

Mr. Doyle commented that in the municipalities around Edmonton the measurement is 10.0 square metres or 107 square feet.

Mr. Bob Wallace remarked that, in his view, the MSP is not just for land surveyors as the Alberta Real Estate Association has adopted it as a standard for RPRs across Alberta. He advised that the land surveyors are working with them to design a product that works efficiently. Mr. Wallace was amenable to whatever number works and if any other municipality has an issue, it should be considered.

In speaking to the main motion, Mr. Pals stated that a picture is worth a thousand words. If a client wants a thousand words there is the option of a title insurance policy. If they want a picture, they should go to a surveyor. He felt that a real property report should show everything; a picture of what the surveyor is doing on an RPR on.

Mr. Metcalfe agreed with Mr. Pals, and felt that the RPR should show what is being tied in. He did not feel that a client would appreciate the RPR not showing something that is there. Mr. Metcalfe concluded that these ideas are coming from outside influences that are telling the land surveyors how to do their job.

Mr. Hagen responded that the motion is just a minimum and that if a surveyor wants to show everything, that is allowed.

Mr. Don Bourgeois, President of the Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors, commented that his association has not tried to codify the issue and has handled it by having a section in the back of their manual with local jurisdictional requirements and it seems to work well.

Mr. Marty Robinson indicated that many municipalities he deals with require that the shed be shown regardless of the size or movability. He felt that adding it to the MSP will
lead to lawyers or homeowners asking that the sheds not be shown when, in essence, it may be a violation to the bylaws of a particular municipality. In reference to (b), he advised that often, if there is an encroachment into the right-of-way, it becomes an issue. Mr. Robinson was not in favour of the motion.

Mr. Hagen reiterated his statement that the motion just addresses a minimum standard so that if a municipality requires that all the sheds be shown, there is no restriction against that.

**MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED**

_that Part D, Section 8.5 and Part D, Section 8.8 of the Manual of Standard Practice (Real Property Reports) be amended as follows:_

**PART D, SECTION 8.5 — IMPROVEMENTS**

The improvements to be shown on the plan for an Alberta Land Surveyor’s Real Property Report include, at minimum, the following:

1. All buildings and projections therefrom, together with their dimensions. Minimum setback dimensions shall be shown from the boundaries of the subject parcel to exterior walls and/or foundation as required by the municipality. A statement clarifying the extent of setback dimensions is to be shown. This also includes:
   a) **All permanent sheds,**
   b) **Any shed that encroaches from or onto the property,** and
   c) **Any non-permanent sheds that are larger than 10.0 square metres in footprint.**
2. Eaves, dimensioned to the line of the fascia or foundation, together with a note showing this in the legend.
3. Driveways if they encroach onto the adjacent parcel.
4. Eavestroughs, steps, and landings if they encroach onto the adjacent parcel, street, or lane.
5. **All permanent sheds and their dimensions:**
6. Retaining walls that appear to define property lines or that encroach onto adjacent parcels, rights-of-way, streets, or lanes.
7. Utility poles and pedestals if they encroach onto the subject parcel.
8. Decks and their height above ground.
9. In-ground swimming pools.
10. In urban areas, fences that appear to define property lines. Indicate in the legend that all fences are within 0.20 metres of the property line unless otherwise noted.
Fences more than 0.20 metres from the property line shall be dimensioned. Fences shall not be indicated as encroaching unless the encroachment is onto public lands. To avoid confusion and conflict, fence ownership should not be inferred.

10. Adjacent municipal sidewalks and curbs, together with the distance from the property line to the back of each sidewalk and curb.

**PART D, SECTION 8.8 — AUTHENTICATION**

To identify original Real Property Reports, each original report shall bear a permit stamp in red, if applicable, and an original signature in blue. The colour of both the permit stamp and the original signature are to be different from the colour of the printed document.

*Motion Defeated*

It was MOVED by Mr. Lohnes, seconded by Mr. Cheng, Part D, Section 5.2.2 (Reference Boundary) and Part D, Section 5.8.4 (Public Land Dispositions except License of Occupation) in the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

**PART D, SECTION 5.2 — REFERENCE BOUNDARY**

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

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

*Recommendation #3*

(see Appendix E for rationale document)
• Alberta Survey Control Markers directly connected to Part 2 or Part 3 monuments that define the theoretical section boundaries.

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

PART D, SECTION 5.8 — PUBLIC LAND DISPOSITIONS EXCEPT LICENCE OF OCCUPATION (LOC)

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


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

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

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

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

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

1. Mark the positions of the boundary lines to be established by placing monuments at every change in direction and at the beginning and end of every curve. The type of monument to be placed is stipulated in the document cited on the previous page entitled *Disposition Plan Types/Formats*.

2. Intersect and monument all surveyed section boundaries crossed.

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

4. In Unsurveyed Territory, locate and confirm sufficient monuments to define the theoretical section in which the disposition is located in order to determine the position of the disposition in relation to the theoretical section boundaries. The word “monuments” here refers to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the *Surveys Act*, those shown on a Wellsite Control Plan on file with the Director of Surveys Office, *monuments shown on a Plan of Survey signed by an Alberta Land Surveyor and registered at Alberta Sustainable Resource Development on or after August 1, 2009*, or Alberta Survey Control Markers integrated with the Alberta Survey Control System.

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

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

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

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

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

10. Certify the plan in accordance with the ALS Statutory Declaration for Public Land Disposition: [http://srd.al-](http://srd.al-).
Mr. Lohnes informed the assembly that the matter was recommended by a member and was given to the Standards Committee by Council for the 2011-2012 terms of reference. He added that the Committee felt it was a housekeeping issue in the MSP. Mr. Lohnes advised that on August 1, 2009, the Director of Surveys Office required anything that had statutory iron posts be submitted with an affidavit attached to the plan. There was nothing in the MSP that allowed recognition of the disposition plans because they are not sent to the Land Titles Office for registration.

Mr. Forsyth commented that there are plans registered at Sustainable Resources Development (SRD) prior to the date of August 1, 2009 which are signed by Alberta Land Surveyors.

**AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Forsyth, seconded by Mr. McBride, that “on or after August 1, 2009” be removed.**

**Amendment Defeated**

Mr. Lohnes responded that he did not feel that the Committee would object to the amendment as there was a grandfathering period after that.

Mr. Roger Ross mentioned that the Committee did consider the issue and felt that August 1, 2009 should be part of the recommendation.

Mr. Gillis spoke against the amendment because the subgroup felt that there were plans filed with Sustainable Resource Development that do not have a signature. As of August 1, 2009 all plans submitted to SRD had to be certified.

Mr. Hagen also spoke against the amendment and agreed with Mr. Gillis that the date should be left in the recommendation.

Mr. Fretwell commented that, prior to August 1, 2009, it was very clear that any land surveyor who wanted monuments to be registered at the Land Titles Office would have their plan registered at that office. He added that ambiguity was brought in after August 1, 2009 and prior to that it did not exist.
Mr. McBride asked whether any consideration was given to the establishment of monument plans that are registered at the Land Titles Office. He advised that there are plans that are not prepared under Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act that are filed at the Land Titles Office that could be used as reference boundaries.

Mr. Lohnes responded that, as far as he was aware, that issue was not discussed but it could be brought up under new business.

At this juncture in the meeting, President Thomson invited principals to introduce their articling students. He also invited an introduction of labour mobility candidates.

It was MOVED by Mr. Lohnes, seconded by Mr. Engler, that Part C, Section 3.4 (Intersection) and Part D, Section 5.8 (Public Land Dispositions Except License of Occupation) in the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

PART C: SECTION 3.4 — INTERSECTIONS
When surveying boundaries that intersect surveyed section or quarter sections lines, the intersections shall be made using the nearest section of quarter section corners on each side of the point of intersection. If the monuments at these corners are lost, the lost corners and all section and quarter section corners between the survey evidence used to re-establish the lost corners shall be re-established and monumented, giving due consideration to all available evidence.

When surveying Public Land Dispositions requiring monumentation to be statutory iron posts, intersections must be made with any other Public Land Disposition boundary that is defined by statutory iron posts. The intersection shall be made by using the nearest monuments on either side of the point of intersection. If the monuments at these positions are lost, the lost monuments and all monuments between the survey evidence used to re-establish the lost monuments shall be re-established and monumented, giving due consideration to all available evidence.

PART D: SECTION 5.8 —
PUBLIC LAND DISPOSITIONS EXCEPT
LICENCE OF OCCUPATION (LOC)
This sub-section refers to the requirements for surveys of public land dispositions. If disposition plans are registered at the Land Titles Office, the Surveyor should refer to the appropriate section of the Manual.

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

The above-cited document entitled Disposition Plan Types/Formats specifies:
• when a survey is required and when a proposed plan or sketch plan, without a survey, is allowed;
• the content requirements for a proposed plan or sketch plan at the application stage; and
• the content requirements for survey plans at the final stage after construction.

When determining the boundaries of public land dispositions, Surveyors should be guided by the following criteria:
• Where the disposition boundaries are surveyed and monumented, the boundaries shall be defined by the monuments placed for that purpose.
• Where the disposition boundaries are surveyed and not monumented, the boundaries shall be defined by the best evidence governing those boundaries.
• Where the disposition boundaries are not surveyed, the boundaries shall be defined by the best physical evidence governing those boundaries.

When conducting a survey and preparing a plan for a public land disposition, an Alberta Land Surveyor shall:
1. Mark the positions of the boundary lines to be established by placing monuments at every change in direction and at the beginning and end of every curve. The type of monument to be placed is stipulated in the document cited on the previous page entitled Disposition Plan Types/Formats.
2. Intersect and monument all surveyed section boundaries crossed.
3. Intersect and monument public land dispositions that are required to be defined by statutory iron posts. This applies to a public land disposition re-
quiring the use of statutory iron posts that crosses another public land disposition that is already defined by statutory iron posts.

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

5. In Unsurveyed Territory, locate and confirm sufficient monuments to define the theoretical section in which the disposition is located in order to determine the position of the disposition in relation to the theoretical section boundaries. The word “monuments” here refers to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act, those shown on a Wellsite Control Plan on file with the Director of Surveys Office, monuments shown on a Plan of Survey signed by an Alberta Land Surveyor and registered at Alberta Sustainable Resource Development on or after August 1, 2009, or Alberta Survey Control Markers integrated with the Alberta Survey Control System.

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

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

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

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

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


Mr. Lohnes advised the assembly that the matter was brought to Council by the Director of Surveys as he was concerned that the perception was that it was not required to intersect statutory iron posts that were placed on SRD dispositions. Mr. Lohnes went on to say that he did not believe it differs much from what is done on freehold land, that is, boundaries
are intersected in freehold lands if they are posted with statutory iron posts and registered.

**AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Frederick, seconded by Mr. Pratt, that “governing” be inserted between “nearest” and “monuments.”**

*Amendment Carried*

Mr. Frederick pointed out that there are situations where the nearest monuments would not be governing evidence.

Mr. Egger commented that if there is a need to tell the membership that it has to do something right, they should also be told how to do it right.

Mr. Larsen suggested if the wording in the paragraph is changed, the wording in the preceding paragraph will need to be changed as well.

Mr. Madarash advised that the preceding paragraph refers to the nearest section corner or quarter section so he felt that the word “governing” would not be appropriate because there is just one.

Mr. Dupuis pointed out that the recommendation refers to a public land disposition boundary and recommendation #2 refers to a signed plan. He asked whether any consideration was given to the fact that there are posts that are not on signed plans. He clarified that a sketch plan with monuments indicated on it could be submitted and felt that the recommendation insinuates that the sketch plan would have to be intersected.

Mr. Lohnes responded that was not the intent and asked for Sub-Group Committee members to comment.

Mr. Chandler advised that some firms show monuments on sketch plans and others do not until as-built plans are done. He did not feel that the concern applies to the recommendation.

Mr. Engler felt that the word “governing” would cover the concern as he did not feel that a monument could govern on a plan that was not signed.

Mr. Dupuis asked whether the recommendation refers to the application plan or the final plan that would be intersected. He went on to say that a plan can be signed for application
and then an as-built is required when it is done. If he intersects a plan and then it is amended and the as-built goes to final plan, is there a requirement for him to go back and place the monuments or is it at the time of survey. He suggested that, because of all the different types of plans and different definitions of what they are, is creating confusion. Mr. Dupuis asked the Director of Surveys to clarify what he expected.

Director of Surveys Mike Michaud suggested that issue go back to the Standards Committee for more detailed discussion because it does get complicated because of the types of plans that the Department accepts.

Mr. Cheng expressed the view that the word “governing” implies that the surveyed parcel of land has been blessed by law.

Mr. Chandler encouraged the membership to defeat the motion as there was no clarification provided by the Director of Surveys.

Mr. Pratt spoke in favour of the amended motion. He felt that the profession would be intersecting posted boundaries which is done on freehold land and, if it is not posted, it should not be intersected. He added that if a sketch plan has posts in the ground, then a posted boundary would be intersected.

Mr. Larsen commented that the motion is just representing a practice that is going on at the present time. He suggested that to defeat the motion would not make any sense to him as it would go against what is being practiced by the membership. Mr. Larsen added that this originally came to the Committee because the Director of Surveys was not sure if all the land surveyors were posting intersections of a PLA with another PLA. The Committee found out that and surveyors were doing that and also intersecting any other disposition that was posted with statutory iron posts.

Mr. Hume also spoke in favour of the motion. He indicated that an analogy would be that on titled land, if an unregistered pipeline right-of-way is discovered, it is intersected and suggested that the motion is very similar to that situation.
AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr. Egger, that “between the survey evidence” be removed.

Amendment Carried

Mr. Thompson felt that the wording was ambiguous and that it should be up to the land surveyor to determine what gets re-established as they would on freehold land.

Mr. Larsen expressed concern that if the wording is changed the wording in the preceding paragraph may also need to be changed.

Mr. Thompson did not feel that the preceding paragraph would need to be changed as it refers to the section corners.

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED

that Part C, Section 3.4 (Intersection) and Part D, Section 5.8 (Public Land Dispositions Except License of Occupation) in the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

PART C: SECTION 3.4 — INTERSECTIONS
When surveying boundaries that intersect surveyed section or quarter sections lines, the intersections shall be made using the nearest section of quarter section corners on each side of the point of intersection. If the monuments at these corners are lost, the lost corners and all section and quarter section corners between the survey evidence used to re-establish the lost corners shall be re-established and monumented, giving due consideration to all available evidence.

When surveying Public Land Dispositions requiring monumentation to be statutory iron posts, intersections must be made with any other Public Land Disposition boundary that is defined by statutory iron posts. The intersection shall be made by using the nearest governing monuments on either side of the point of intersection. If the monuments at these positions are lost, the lost monuments and all monuments between the survey evidence used to re-establish the lost monuments shall be re-established and monumented, giving due consideration to all available evidence.

PART D: SECTION 5.8 —
PUBLIC LAND DISPOSITIONS EXCEPT LICENCE OF OCCUPATION (LOC)
This sub-section refers to the requirements for surveys of public land dispositions. If disposition plans are registered
at the Land Titles Office, the Surveyor should refer to the appropriate section of the Manual.


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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Mark the positions of the boundary lines to be established by placing monuments at every change in direction and at the beginning and end of every curve. The type of monument to be placed is stipulated in the document cited on the previous page entitled Disposition Plan Types/Formats.
2. Intersect and monument all surveyed section boundaries crossed.
3. **Intersect and monument public land dispositions that are required to be defined by statutory iron posts.** This applies to a public land disposition requiring the use of statutory iron posts that crosses another public land disposition that is already defined by statutory iron posts.

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

5. In Unsurveyed Territory, locate and confirm sufficient monuments to define the theoretical section in which the disposition is located in order to determine the position of the disposition in relation to the theoretical section boundaries. The word “monuments” here refers to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act, those shown on a Wellsite Control Plan on file with the Director of Surveys Office, **monuments shown on a Plan of Survey signed by an Alberta Land Surveyor and registered at Alberta Sustainable Resource Development on or after August 1, 2009**, or Alberta Survey Control Markers integrated with the Alberta Survey Control System.

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

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

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

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

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


*Motion Carried*
**Recommendation #5**
(see Appendix E for rationale document)

It was MOVED by Mr. Lohnes, seconded by Mr. Maidment, that Part C, Section 5.10 (Restoration of Monuments) in the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

All damaged or obliterated monuments used in a survey, whether urban or rural should be restored. However, pits, mounds, and trenches on original Township Surveys shall not be reconstructed or restored unless the surveyor is instructed to do so by the Director of Surveys. **All restored monuments must be recorded in the Corner Recordation Index or registered on a plan of survey at the Land Titles Office, Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (Lands Division), or the Metis Settlements Land Registry.**

**Motion Defeated**

Mr. Lohnes advised that the recommendation originated at Council as it appeared that the Director of Surveys felt there might be some confusion as to whether a plan needs to be registered when a monument is restored. He went on to say that the Standards Committee felt that the membership should be encouraged to restore monuments.

Mr. Lohnes clarified to Mr. Marty Robinson that he would be required to create a drawing for submission to the Corner Recordation Index for every bent pin that he restores on a stakeout or real property report.

President Thomson thanked Mr. Lohnes for bringing forward the recommendations from the Standards Committee.

**Recommendation #6**
(see Appendix E for rationale document)

It was MOVED by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr. Hittel, that Section 61 of the bylaws (Permit Stamps) be amended as follows:

61 (1) The permit stamp of a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership shall be a rubber stamp or contain the following information:

(a) the name of the corporation or partnership to which the stamp is issued,
(b) the permit number of the corporation or partnership, and
(c) the words “ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION.”

(2) The permit stamp shall be designed in the following form:
(3) The Registrar is the only person entitled to issue a stamp to a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership.

(4) The cost of the permit stamp shall be borne by the surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership to whom it is issued.

(5) A surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership may apply to the Registrar for one or more duplicate rubber permit stamps to be issued to it.

(6) The Registrar may grant approval to a surveyor’s corporation or partnership to integrate the permit stamp design issued by the Registrar into their computer assisted drafting system, to facilitate the use of the stamp on plans, drawings and documents, being certified by an Alberta Land Surveyor who is a member or an employee of the surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership to whom the permit was issued.

(7) The permit stamp of a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership is owned by the Association and is issued to a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership in accordance with the Act. The surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership must return any rubber permit stamps and confirm that it has stopped using a digital permit stamp, and must be returned,

(a) if the corporation or partnership ceases to comply with the Act, regulations or bylaws,

(b) if the corporation or partnership is wound up or otherwise ceases to be a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership, and

(c) if the registration of the corporation or partnership is suspended or cancelled.

(8) A surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership shall not use a stamp in the practice of surveying except the stamp issued to it by the Registrar or the stamp approved by the Registrar.

(9) The stamp of a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership shall be used on plans, drawings and documents that are being certified by an Alberta Land Surveyor who is also a member or an employee of the surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership to whom the permit stamp was issued.

Motion Carried
Mr. Thompson advised that the genesis for the recommendation is that the majority of practitioners use digital permit stamps. He added that the rubber permit stamp would still be provided upon request. The motion changes the default permit stamp to the digital version.

Mr. Thompson asked Legislation Ad Hoc Committee members Greg Illchuk and Michael Thompson to present recommendation #7.

Mr. Illchuk advised that the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee will present some options for change—everything from remaining at the status quo to moving to something completely different than what is in place in the Professional Practice Regulation. He further advised that the Committee is not advocating for one option or the other but would like the membership to give guidance on moving forward. Mr. Illchuk went on to say that the Committee will take the input gathered from the membership at the meeting and come back the following year with an actual proposed change to the regulations.

Mr. Illchuk indicated that the presentation will deal with last year’s recommendation to the membership, last year’s referral back to Committee, why the issue is being discussed, is there a problem, what has changed since the existing regulation came into effect, what is taking place in other jurisdictions and what the Committee has been doing with this issue since the last annual general meeting.

Mr. Illchuk continued as follows:

At the AGM last year, the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee brought forward a recommendation to change the Professional Practice Regulation to specifically remove the existing ownership requirements and replace that with the Professional Practice Management Plan. The membership asked that the Committee do more work and research. The issue that came up from last year was that the membership wanted more stakeholder involvement and to be able to voice an opinion on the subject.

There were three reasons that brought this issue to the forefront. First, at the 2010 AGM, a member of the Association brought forward a new business motion directing Council to review the Professional Practice Regulation dealing with surveyor’s corporations. The practitioner was particularly concerned about trying to set up one survey corporation consisting of both Alberta Land Surveyors and Saskatchewan Land Surveyors in a practice that was operating on both sides of the border.

Recommendation #7
(see Appendix E for rationale document)
About the same time that happened, a member of the public that employs a land surveyor petitioned the ALSA for a permit to practice even though they did not meet the ownership requirements. They did not want to establish a separate survey company as others have done and requested the ALSA to review the ownership requirements under the regulation.

Both the governments of Alberta and British Columbia have mentioned to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors that the ownership requirements in our respective pieces of legislation may cause concern under the Trade Investment Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA). Under TILMA, investment between the two provinces is supposed to be free-flowing and if there is unnecessary ownership restrictions or requirements, it may be deemed that those requirements restrict the free flow of investment back and forth between the provinces.

What has changed? In 2010, Council asked the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee to review the ownership requirements under this regulation. One of the things the Committee had to look at was whether or not there was a problem that needed to be solved. The current regulation came into effect in 1982 and has served the profession well over the last thirty years. The polling of the membership resulted in 86% of the respondents believing that the current regulation adequately protects the public. We did not have rationale documents thirty years ago like we do today. The Committee’s understanding is that the ownership requirements that came into place under the Professional Practice Regulation were put in there to ensure that the Alberta Land Surveyor had some form of control over the company so that it was not trying to dictate how the land surveyor was to do things that might cause a conflict to the surveyor’s ethics and/or the surveyor’s professional responsibilities.

Today, the business environment and how things are done both from a business and land surveying perspective, have changed. The Committee felt it was only natural to look at a thirty-year-old regulation to see if it needs to be changed or not, starting with what has changed during that thirty-year period. One of the first things is that there are a lot more surveyor’s corporations that are practicing in multiple jurisdictions. Many companies are working in BC, Alberta and Saskatchewan. There are more Alberta Land Surveyors and surveyor’s corporations that have formal working relationships with other professionals and there are more engineering and other companies that have a greater interest in establishing land surveying practices in Canada.
Before the members get into a discussion on possible changes, it is important to go through and understand the existing regulation. Basically, a corporation has to meet four criteria in order to be eligible to be registered as a surveyor’s corporation. The first one is that the name must be appropriate. Second, an Alberta Land Surveyor must be designated to take responsibility for the supervision, direction and control of the practice at all material times. Third, and this is a big portion of the genesis of the change, is that it must meet the ownership requirements of the regulation. The fourth is that the majority of the directors must be Alberta Land Surveyors unless there are only two directors in which case, one must be an Alberta Land Surveyor.

There is nothing in the proposal that changes the first or the second requirement. The third one is where the question of ownership comes up. There are two aspects to the ownership requirement. First, if a corporation does not have an APEGA permit to practice, Alberta Land Surveyors must hold the majority of the voting shares in the corporation. Ownership of 50.1% to 100% of that corporation has to be vested in Alberta Land Surveyors. Second, if a corporation does have a permit to practice, Alberta Land Surveyors and professional engineers must hold the majority of the voting shares and the Alberta Land Surveyors must hold 10% of the voting shares of the corporation.

In its research, the Committee looked at BC which used to have stricter requirements for survey corporations but they recently amended their requirements to be more in line with Alberta’s current requirements. In Manitoba, survey corporations exist but the Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors (AMLS) does not licence or control them in any way. The AMLS licences the individual land surveyors and there is no licensing for the corporation. In engineering in Alberta, there are no ownership requirements but the engineering corporation must have in place a document called the *Professional Practice Management Plan* which outlines how the professionals and the corporation intend to interact. An engineering corporation must designate a responsible member for the practice. In the legal profession, the ownership requirements of corporations are limited strictly to lawyers and their immediate families. Pharmacy is different again, with one person responsible for the business portion of the pharmacy and a pharmacist, who may or may not be the same person, responsible for the business and the day-to-day operations of the pharmacy itself. Professional corporations are dealing with the ownership issues in a variety of ways both within the different professions and across the country.
In moving forward, the Committee realized from discussion at the AGM the previous year, that different members had different concerns about what was being proposed. That is why the Committee is bringing forward the options. This is not your typical AGM recommendation. The Committee is not asking for an actual change at this point but is asking the membership for feedback. The polling results indicated that the membership had enough of a varied opinion to present just an either/or solution; concepts for the membership to consider and vote on. It is the Committee’s intent to get into the details of how to make the final wording changes over the next year.

Each of the following six recommendations proposes something different and each one builds upon the other, adding a greater scope to the overall change.

The first recommendation will be a potential amendment to the regulation requiring a governing document for all surveyor’s corporations even though owned 100% by Alberta Land Surveyors. The second recommendation will ask the membership whether or not it supports opening the regulation to include licensed land surveyors from other Canadian jurisdictions. The third will open the ownership requirements a little bit further to include professional engineers from Alberta and the fourth will be a little further from that and the fifth and so on. The ownership requirements are removed entirely and replaced with something different when we get to the very end. If the membership would like to see the ownership requirements removed entirely, the Committee will work towards rewriting the regulation to meet that intent. If the membership does not want to see any changes, the Committee will look towards preparing a report explaining why the existing regulations are best and in the best interests of protecting the public.

It is the Committee’s intent that each of these recommendations be debated and discussed and voted on regardless of whether the previous recommendations are passed or not. It is important for everyone to understand that if you are in favour of Recommendation #7F and that is your preferred solution, you can still be voting in favour of Recommendations #7A through #7E in order to ensure that there is a clear direction back to Council and the Committee. You are not limited to voting in favour of just one of these recommendations. In presenting these recommendations, the Committee would like to know what level of change and openness to ownership is the membership prepared to accept as a group.
It was MOVED by Mr. Stephens, seconded by Mr. Winton, that the ALSA maintain the current Professional Practice Regulation.

Mr. Stephens indicated that he moved the motion because the recommendation does not start off by stating that the current regulations and ownership structure should be maintained.

Mr. Thomson confirmed that if Mr. Stephens’ motion passes, then there will be no need for debate on the recommendations brought forward by the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. Illchuk spoke against the motion as he felt the concerns expressed by the membership at the previous year’s AGM needed to be addressed and there is a need to have discussion on the topic. He added that the Committee is not bringing forward changes but recommendations for discussion to see what the membership wants as a whole.

As a point of order, Mr. Pinkerton asked that the motion be ruled out of order as he felt it belonged in new business.

Parliamentarian, Larry Pals, ruled that the motion was in order and could be dealt with because the presentations at the regional meetings did talk about the status quo and none of the six recommendations deal with the status quo. He confirmed that if any of the recommendations get passed, the status quo does not necessarily stand.

Mr. Vollick spoke against the motion by advising that the current regulation regarding ownership requirements is thirty years old and was developed to serve a purpose. He went on to say that many other jurisdictions and professions are considering ownership requirements. Mr. Vollick added that the requirements of the existing Professional Practice Regulation are being bypassed by several large corporations that operate a shell company as a work-around. The intent of a professional practice management plan is to ensure that both the corporation and professional are responsible. Mr. Vollick continued by stating that in order to protect the public and have land surveyors in control of the practice of land surveying, the corporation and the professional must adhere to principles outlined in the professional practice management plan. He remembered a segment from a presentation made the previous day that suggested that the profession can’t let
the world move past and have change forced upon it by others. Mr. Vollick commented that ownership of a corporation by Alberta Land Surveyors or other professionals does not guarantee public protection and it is incumbent upon individual Alberta Land Surveyors to adhere to the Code of Ethics as is expected of all professionals. He stressed that this Association and its members must ensure that all corporations and the individual professionals abide by the terms of a professional practice management plan just as they ensure that an individual Alberta Land Surveyor abides by the Code of Ethics. The expansion of the profession into other corporations allows for the overall growth of the industry and more control of the surveys being completed in the province, leading to further protection of the public. It also promotes the opportunity to expand the profession through education of other professionals and stakeholders in the industry. Through positive promotion of what the profession can offer both internally and externally, it provides an opportunity for the profession to become more recognized and have greater influence in those areas that may affect the public domain. Mr. Vollick concluded by stating that if the membership agrees with his rationale, it has no choice but to vote yes for all of the recommendations being put forward. Voting yes would support the protection of the public through a professional practice management plan, defining the relationship of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and the corporation as opposed to just adding a professional practice management plan.

Mr. Winton suggested that the intention of the motion was not to limit discussion. He felt that there has been a regulation in place for the past thirty years that has served the profession well. Mr. Winton added that the poll indicated that 86% of the members felt that the current practice protects the public. He felt that the current practice protects the public and the profession. Mr. Winton advised that he works for a firm that operates in multiple jurisdictions and has a company set up that is owned solely by Alberta Land Surveyors. He felt that the practice as well as the current legislation works well, is not onerous and does not stymie productivity in any way.

Mr. Michael Thompson spoke against the motion as he felt that the recommendation showed that the Association is very pro-active and is addressing the concerns of the public. He added that the current regulation may be the best solution for the public, but the Association has been asked to address concerns with respect to the regulation.
In speaking in favour of the motion, Mr. Hagen felt that the status quo does protect the public. He went on to say that there has not really been any demand from the public to review the regulation, other than the two examples that came up at a previous AGM. Mr. Hagen commented that land surveyors that practice close to Alberta’s borders can write one exam and become Alberta Land Surveyors. He suggested that Alberta may want to consider harmonizing its regulation with that of BC.

Mr. Wallace agreed that the system works well today but felt that the Committee has done a lot of work on the issue and the members should listen to what they have to offer. He suggested that the members of the Association need to be wary of the fact that if the Association is not pro-active, the government may just dictate regulation such as ruling the Professional Practice Regulation out of order and asking that it amended according to their recommendation. Mr. Wallace felt that the members should consider what the Committee has brought forward and generate some discussion in mind of what may happen in the future, be flexible enough to deal with it and produce a product that works for everyone.

Mr. Engler spoke against the motion because it would stop discussion on the issue. He felt that it was important that the discussion be held. Mr. Engler understood that the term of reference was only a direction to the Committee to further explore the details of what could take place.

Mr. Quarmby commented that he was anxious for the debate to take place on this recommendation and would be disappointed to see it cut off. He agreed that the recommendations may work for some but may not work for others. Mr. Quarmby advised that he is unique because he lives in BC but his work takes him all across western Canada and he has to have a surveyor’s corporation to practice for the company that he works for. He further advised that he was not aware of the difference in being an employee of a non-land surveying company. He commented that it could be argued that he is under pressure to do things a certain way for fear of getting fired or reprimanded but suggested he could still get fired or reprimanded. He stated that the onus is on the land surveyor to be a professional.

Mr. Drake spoke against the motion because his recollection of the wishes of the members from the previous year’s AGM indicated the desire was for the Committee to provide more feedback. The Committee did that through the online survey.
and through the presentations at the regional meetings. He
continued by stating that he felt it was a great opportunity to
have the largest annual meeting in the Association’s history.
His concern with the motion was that if it is passed, then
discussion would end.

It was MOVED by Mr. Drake, seconded by Mr. Illchuk, that
the motion be TABLED.

**Motion Carried**

It was MOVED by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr.
Illchuk, that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association pre-
pare revisions to the Professional Practice Regulation by
requiring that, in addition to the existing ownership require-
ments, each surveyor’s corporation/partnership shall have a
document outlining how the corporation/ partnership and its
Alberta land Surveyors intend to govern their interaction.

INTENT: The document outlining how the corporation and
the Alberta Land Surveyors intend to govern their interaction
has been called a professional practice management plan. If
this recommendation is approved, the committee will need to
develop a guideline and a sample indicating what would be
needed to be included in this document and this would be put
before the membership for approval. If this recommendation
passes, that means that a surveyor’s corporation would be
required to meet the ownership provisions currently in the
Professional Practice Regulation and prepare this governing
document.

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Thompson advised that the in-
tent of the recommendation is to keep the existing ownership
requirements in place for Alberta Land Surveyors, however,
it would require the surveyor’s corporation and the Alberta
Land Surveyor(s) prepare a governing document outlining
their interaction. The document would be a requirement for
Alberta Land Surveyors and surveyor’s corporations in addi-
tion to the existing ownership requirements. Mr. Thompson
advised that in the previous year, the document was called
a professional practice management plan and it is called a
governing document this year because the Committee has
not brought forward a recommendation on what the docu-
ment is going to be called or entail. He went on to say that
all the Committee was asking for at this point, is whether the
membership wants to have a requirement in place for survey-
or’s corporations and Alberta Land Surveyors to have such
da document. Mr. Thompson concluded by indicating if the
answer is yes, then there will be a recommendation in 2013
that would detail what that requirement would look like and what exactly needs to be shown in the governing document.

In speaking against the motion Mr. Hagen felt that if the ownership requirements are maintained, the professional practice management plan or the governing document would become moot as the majority control of the corporation would be by Alberta Land Surveyors.

Mr. Edwards asked whether the remaining recommendations would be defeated if recommendation #7A is defeated.

Mr. Thompson clarified that even if #7A is defeated the following motions under recommendation #7 will still be brought forward for discussion. He further clarified that recommendation #7A would require all Alberta Land Surveyors to have a governing document in place and the following motions would require just those referenced to have a governing document in place.

Parliamentarian Larry Pals ruled that there are subtle changes in the wording of the next sections in recommendation #7 that would allow there to be a professional practice plan in place. He felt that a professional practice plan could be instituted even if recommendation #7A was defeated.

Mr. Edwards personally felt that the way the regulation is written right now protects ownership and the public.

Mr. Illchuk commented that the Committee took into account the order in presenting the recommendations. He advised that the Committee felt the membership needed to be provided the opportunity to decide whether the document was needed and whether it was needed when other professionals or individuals were added to the ownership mix. Mr. Illchuk further advised that the Committee felt that the way the recommendations are presented seemed to be the most logical and allowed for the greatest use of debate and discourse and mirrors what was indicated in the survey that was conducted.

Mr. Engler presented the following example of why the governing document may be useful. If a company started out with 49% of it being owned by others and 51% owned by one land surveyor, there is not a problem. If the land surveyor decides to divide that 51% into three (17% each), there are now three individuals who are land surveyors and one individual who is not. The non-land surveyor and one other

---

*Hugo Engler, ALS*
individual will now rule that company. Mr. Engler concluded that is why the governing document is needed.

Mr. Munday clarified that if part #7A passes, the regulation remains as is with the addition of a governing document or a professional practice management plan. For the remaining parts in recommendation #7, it would mean that there is a governing document requirement for other professionals or individuals.

Parliamentarian Larry Pals believed that each part of recommendation #7 is a motion and that the requirement for a governing document can be removed from each motion. He did not feel that it changes or puts in place a document for each motion. The motions can be amended and the only motion on the floor presently is #7A.

Mr. Frederick was under the impression that the motions were recommendations for the Committee to do further work. He did not understand if #7A is passed and #7B is defeated how the membership can move on to #7C.

Mr. Pals advised that legislation will not be changed by passing or defeating any of the motions and they are just recommendations for the Committee to work on.

Mr. Drake suggested that the other thing the Committee is looking for is what the governing document should entail. He encouraged the membership to consider what needs to be included in the document. He suggested that a document should be created by the membership that best serves the public in Alberta or, as others have suggested, if the status quo is perfect then it should be left alone.

Mr. Maidment spoke in favour of the motion and felt it was time for a change. He liked the idea of the governing document as it would make the relationship very clear for both employees and employers.

Mr. Edwards expressed concern that the way the motion is worded it appears that, if it is passed, it will be instituted. He felt that the motion should have indicated that it would be sent back to the Committee as a recommendation or information.

Parliamentarian Larry Pals confirmed that, in order for the professional practice regulation to go forward to government to make the changes, they have to be passed at an annual
general meeting of the membership. After that, the recommended changes go to government. He added that the Committee is gathering information so they can bring back proposed revisions to the Professional Practice Regulation to an annual general meeting for approval by the membership before being sent on to government.

**AMENDMENT MOVED** by Mr. Edwards, seconded by Mr. Stoliker, that the word “proposed” be inserted before revisions.

**Amendment Carried**

**MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED**

That the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association prepare proposed revisions to the Professional Practice Regulation by requiring that, in addition to the existing ownership requirements, each surveyor’s corporation/partnership shall have a document outline how the corporation/partnership and its Alberta land Surveyors intend to govern their interaction.

**Motion Carried**

Ms. Sprott spoke in favour of the motion and indicated that she did not feel that having the document would in any way be harmful to the public.

Mr. Gillmore spoke against the motion and did not feel that the document was necessary as it implies that someone other than the Alberta Land Surveyor is in charge. He added that, in his opinion, the land surveyor should be in charge at all times.

It was **MOVED** by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr. Illchuk, that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association prepare proposed revisions to the Professional Practice Regulation so that land surveyors licensed to practice land surveying in any Canadian jurisdiction (or corporations with whom the majority of whose voting shares are vested in one or more land surveyors license to practice in any Canadian jurisdiction) can hold the majority of the voting shares (and a majority of the director positions) in an Alberta surveyor’s corporation provided they prepare a document outline how the corporation/partnership and its Alberta Land Surveyors intend to govern their interaction.

**Motion Carried**

**INTENT:** If this recommendation is passed, land surveyors from other Canadian jurisdictions will be allowed to hold a majority of the voting shares in an Alberta surveyor’s corporation provided they prepare a governing document com-
monly referred to as a professional practice management plan. 74.8% of the members who responded to the poll supported this option.

Mr. Thompson advised that the motion asks the membership whether or not they would like to see the ownership requirements changed to allow licensed land surveyors to practice land surveying in any Canadian jurisdiction to be included in what makes the majority of the voting shares. He added that if the motion is passed, the Committee will come back to the next annual general meeting with proposed changes to the Professional Practice Regulation. If the motion is passed, a surveyor’s corporation that has land surveyors licensed to practice in other Canadian jurisdictions would be required to have a governing document in place. Mr. Thompson advised that the rationale for the document is so that land surveyors from other Canadian jurisdictions become conversant with the Professional Practice Regulation even though they are not licensed in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Hagen advised that he did not have a problem with the inclusion of licensed land surveyors from Saskatchewan or BC as the systems of survey are much the same but felt that with institution of TILMA, it is easy for an SLS or BCLS to become an ALS. He felt that land surveyors from other jurisdictions that are further away have less in common with the Alberta’s system of survey.

Mr. Egger understood that an Alberta Land Surveyor would still need to be required to do the surveying in Alberta and the motion only refers to ownership.

Mr. Woychuk spoke in favour of the motion as an Alberta Land Surveyor is still required to be in charge of the practice at all material times, regardless of who owns the company.

Mr. Nemrava agreed with Mr. Woychuk but asked if a motion for the next year was developed based on the motion on the floor, what would be the minimum ownership of land surveyors for a corporation operating in Alberta? He further asked if it would be required to have a land surveyor to have ownership in the company.

Mr. Thompson answered no, but that it would be required to have an Alberta Land Surveyor to have direction and control of the practice of land surveying at material times.
Recommendation #7C
(see Appendix E for rationale document)

It was MOVED by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr. Illchuk, that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association prepare proposed revisions to the Professional Practice Regulation so that professional engineers licensed in Alberta can hold the majority of the voting shares (and a majority of the director positions) in an Alberta surveyor’s corporation provided they prepare a document outlining how the corporation/partnership and its Alberta Land Surveyors intend to govern their interaction and providing that the corporation already has a valid APEGA permit to practice.

Motion Defeated

INTENT: If this recommendation is passed, professional engineers licensed in Alberta would be able to hold all of the voting shares in an Alberta surveyor’s corporation and the current minimum 10% requirement would be removed. 58.3% of the members who responded to the poll supported this option.

Mr. Thompson advised that the recommendation would open up the regulation for surveyor’s corporations that also have an APEGA permit to practice. Currently, surveyor’s corporations with an APEGA permit to practice must have Alberta Land Surveyors that have at least 10% of the voting shares of the corporation and Alberta Land Surveyors and professional engineers must hold the majority of the voting shares. Mr. Thompson went on to say that if the recommendation was passed, the 10% minimum requirement would be removed and professional engineers could hold the majority of the voting shares and Alberta Land Surveyors could hold some or even none of the voting shares.

Mr. Pratt asked for clarification on what changes were made to BC’s professional practice regulation to align with Alberta’s.

Mr. Nigel Hemingway, President of the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors, advised that the ABCLS came up with a model that is very similar to the Alberta model to protect the public and satisfy its members’ desires for corporate structure. He felt it was a misconception that the ABCLS changed their regulations to align with Alberta’s.

Mr. Larsen spoke against the motion and commented that professional engineers outnumber Alberta Land Surveyors approximately 100 to 1. He felt that the professional engi-
neer could use the ownership to put pressure on the Alberta Land Surveyor in decision making.

Mr. Hagen spoke against the motion as he felt that if professional engineers can own surveyor’s corporations, the next step is that the land surveying profession will be brought under the engineering profession.

Mr. Blatz spoke for the motion indicating that he did not feel that Alberta Land Surveyors need to be protectionist. If a professional land surveyor is going to be swayed by a client or ownership rules, the discipline and practice review processes and continuing competency review program will enter into the equation.

Mr. Partridge agreed with Mr. Blatz and suggested that the intent to protect the public is served by the commitment as an Alberta Land Surveyor to carry on obligations as a professional regardless of who the employer is. He added that opening up the ownership rules may have an impact on increasing competition and driving professional land surveyors towards continuing excellence. Mr. Partridge felt that the governing document needs to clarify the relationship between the land surveyor and the ownership group. He commented that opening up the ownership requirements could also have the effect of encouraging professional land surveyors to take ethics and principles in place now, more seriously. Mr. Partridge encouraged the membership to vote in favour of all the recommendations with respect to the Professional Practice Regulation as the issue will ultimately go back to the Ad Hoc Legislation Committee for fine-tuning. He concluded by stating that he felt the membership needs to keep an open mind about the recommendations being brought forward and recognize that land surveyors are professionals and will always continue to be professionals.

Mr. Engler suggested that the agreement between the owners and the professional land surveyors in a corporate environment will get more complicated as the issue of what to do with remaining projects will come up if and when the land surveyor leaves the corporation.

Mr. Jewett felt that just because someone else owns the corporation does not control how that individual would practice as a professional land surveyor. He suggested that just because the individual is a land surveyor does not mean that he is a good businessman. Mr. Jewett added that he was strong-
ly in favour of the recommendation on the floor and all those that will come after.

Mr. Pina advised that he originally came from South American and there is no legislation there about who can own the corporation. He felt that the issue of ownership is very important and not something that should be taken lightly.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr. Illchuk, that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association prepare proposed revisions to the Professional Practice Regulation so that professional engineers licensed in any Canadian jurisdiction can hold the majority of the voting shares (and a majority of the director positions) in an Alberta surveyor’s corporation provided they prepare a document outlining how the corporation/partnership and its Alberta Land Surveyors intend to govern their interaction.*

*Motion Defeated*

INTENT: If this recommendation is passed, professional engineers licensed in any Canadian jurisdiction (not just Alberta) would be able to hold all of the voting shares in an Alberta surveyor’s corporation provided a governing document, commonly called a professional practice management plan, is prepared. This specific question was not asked in the poll.

Mr. Thompson advised that recommendation #7D mirrored recommendation #7C with the exception that all Canadian licensed professional engineers would be included in those that can own surveyor’s corporations.

Mr. Hut spoke in favour of the motion and suggested that this type of situation already exists. He added that, if anything, under the current regulation, there are work-arounds. Mr. Hut suggested that by adding that Canadian professional engineers be included, does not really change anything but what it does do is add transparency. He continued by indicating that the main thing that he is in favour of is the professional practice management plan (PPMP). He felt that is what the profession needs as that is what puts the power and control in the hands of the individual land surveyor.

Mr. Woychuk agreed with Mr. Hut and expressed his disappointment that Recommendation #7C did not pass. He stated that, at the end of the day, professional land surveyors are in charge and it does not really matter who owns the company. The PPMP protects against what it appears most members
are afraid of. Mr. Woychuk failed to understand why there is a fear of opening up ownership requirements as it is the will and the strength of the land surveyor that matters. Even if a land surveyor is the sole owner of a company, they are still subject to the same influence from a client.

Mr. Ronsko spoke against the motion as he believed when the present regulation was formulated, the intent was to protect the public interest. He added that he was concerned about how the public would perceive having individuals outside of the profession of land surveying, buy into surveying. Mr. Ronsko felt that the public would not perceive the land surveying profession as being independent of big business.

Mr. Sutter referred to Mr. Pritchard’s comments earlier in the day where he commended the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for being a leader and tackling difficult situations to come up with change.

Mr. Stephens commented that the membership just defeated a motion that involved Alberta engineers and recommendation #7D suggests any Canadian jurisdiction which brings the issue back. He added that if this motion passes, it counteracts the previous motion which was defeated.

The meeting and the vote on recommendation #7D was adjourned until Saturday, April 21, 2012.

President Thomson called the meeting back to order at 8:41 a.m.

_It was MOVED by Mr. Pinkerton, seconded by Mr. Gillis, to postpone discussion and debate on recommendation #7C until after the election._

*Motion Carried*

Registrar Dave McWilliam was called upon to conduct the elections. The 2011-2012 Council members were asked to retire to the floor for the elections.

Mr. McWilliam announced that new members Cody Moser, Ryan Pals, Tyler Robinson and Jennifer Rosenkranz were appointed as scrutineers if needed.

The assembly was advised that the biographies of the candidates submitted by the Nominating Committee were received 55 days prior to the annual general meeting and were included in the March issue of _ALS News_ and published on-
line. The slate of candidates was also included in the recommendations package.

Mr. McWilliam announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the name of Ms. Connie R. Petersen, ALS for the position of president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2012-2013.

Mr. McWilliam asked for further nominations from the floor for the position of president for 2012-2013.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Edgerton, seconded by Mr. George, that nominations for the position of president cease.*

*Motion Carried*

The assembly gave a round of applause to Ms. Petersen as the 2012-2013 president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

Mr. McWilliam announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the name of Robert W.M. Scott, ALS for the position of vice-president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2012-2013.

There was no response to a call by Mr. McWilliam for further nominations from the floor for the position of vice-president for 2012-2013.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Edgerton, seconded by Mr. Maltais, that nominations for the position of vice-president cease.*

*Motion Carried*

The assembly gave a congratulatory round of applause to Mr. Scott as the 2012-2013 vice-president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

The assembly learned that the Nominating Committee put forward the names of M.S. Kocher, ALS, K.T. Swabey, ALS and C.A. White, ALS for the position of councillor of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2012-2014.

Mr. McWilliam called for further nominations from the floor.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Larry Pals, seconded by Mr. Beaumont, that nominations cease for the position of councillor for 2012-2014.*

*Motion Carried*
The assembly congratulated Messrs. Kocher, Swabey and White as councillors of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2012-2014.

President Thomson returned to the podium by asking Council to return to the head table and advised that debate will continue on recommendation #7D.

Mr. Thompson reminded the assembly that recommendation #7D would open up the Professional Practice Regulation to allow professional engineers licensed in Canada, but not necessarily in Alberta, to have a majority of voting shares in a corporation.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr. Johnston, that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association prepare proposed revisions to the Professional Practice Regulation so that licensed professionals in Alberta can hold the majority of the voting shares (and a majority of the director positions) in an Alberta surveyor’s corporation provided they prepare a document outlining how the corporation/partnership and its Alberta Land Surveyors intend to govern their interaction.*

**Motion Defeated**

**INTENT:** If this recommendation is passed, licensed professionals in Alberta would be able to hold all of the voting shares in an Alberta surveyor’s corporation provided they prepare a governing document commonly called a professional practice management plan. Licensed professionals are those individuals who are licensed members of a self-governing professional regulatory organization in Alberta. While a licensed professional may not be familiar with the practice of land surveying, they are bound by a code of ethics and statute and should not stand in the way of Alberta Land Surveyors carrying out their professional responsibilities. A list of qualifying Acts would be listed in the regulation.

Mr. Thompson explained that up until the above motion being brought forward, the debate has been limited to land surveyors licensed in Alberta, elsewhere in Canada and professional engineers licensed in Alberta and elsewhere in Canada. He indicated that the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee would like to get the membership’s feedback in opening the ownership requirements up to include licensed professionals who are members of self-governing, professional regulatory organizations in Alberta. Mr. Thompson added that the idea of putting the recommendation forward to the membership was to
gauge whether or not the membership is willing to open up the ownership requirements to include other licensed professionals bound by a similar code of ethics.

In reply to a question asked by Mr. Kocher as to whether doctors, lawyers, accountants and so on could own surveyor’s corporations, Mr. Thompson indicated that the list of licensed professionals would be considered by the Council and the Committee but would be limited to those professionals that meet certain criteria.

Mr. Blatz spoke for the recommendation and expressed concern that the profession seems to be worried about what the other guy will do if given too much leeway to use professional discretion or the exposure to outside influences. He felt that the members should not be limiting the profession’s ability to attract new investment because of the fear of the conduct of some members. Mr. Blatz further stated that the Association has the means to deal with instances of unprofessional conduct and if any member is concerned about the conduct of the rest of the membership, they should join the Registration Committee, Practice Review Board or Discipline Committee to make a positive contribution to the Association. He suggested that land surveyors know how to produce their product and should not be afraid to have someone else own 51% of the corporation. Mr. Blatz also suggested that many land surveyors would like to own their own firms but need more mentorship from business owners. He felt that the members should not limit their opportunities.

Mr. Pratt pointed out that recommendations #7C and #7D were defeated and if #7E is passed it would appear to discriminate against engineers.

It was MOVED by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr. Fleece, that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association prepare proposed revisions to the Professional Practice Regulation so that the existing voting shares and director requirements currently in the Professional Practice Regulation be removed and replaced with a requirement to have a document outlining how the corporation and its Alberta Land Surveyors intend to govern their interaction.

Motion Defeated

INTENT: If this recommendation is passed, anyone may own an Alberta surveyor’s corporation. However, the Alberta Land Surveyors and the corporation would be required to have a document in place indicating how they intend to
govern their interactions. This document is often called a professional practice management plan. It is expected that the document would be required to include information such as management organization, responsibilities and professional resources although the specific details would need to be worked out and presented at a future AGM if this recommendation is passed in 2012.

Mr. Thompson advised that recommendation #7F was the same motion brought forward the previous year as recommendation #6. He indicated that there would be no ownership requirements for a surveyor’s corporation and instead of ownership, the corporation would be regulated through the governing document. The Alberta Land Surveyors will still be designated to take responsibility for the supervision, direction and control of the practice at all material times. Mr. Thompson went on to say that, under this scenario, utility companies, oil & gas companies and publicly traded engineering companies could all obtain a permit to practice provided the name is appropriate and the Alberta Land Surveyor takes responsibility for the supervision, direction and control of the practice at all material times and a governing document is in place.

Mr. Winton asked who would be responsible for approving the governing document.

Mr. Thompson responded that issue has not been discussed at the Committee level as yet.

Mr. Drake advised that under the APEGA model, which was one example the Committee looked at, it is a requirement to have a document in place. He added that part of the process, in his view, is that it is going to be a surveyor’s document if accepted by the membership. Mr. Drake indicated that the decision as to who reviews the document, who approves the document and what needs to be included in it will be up to the members.

It was MOVED by Mr. McKenna, seconded by Mr. Edgerton, that the motion be removed from the table.

Motion Carried

TABLED MOTION
It was MOVED by Mr. Stephens, seconded by Mr. Winton that the ALSA maintain the current Professional Practice Regulation.
President Thomson ruled that the motion be considered withdrawn as requested by the mover, Mr. Stephens, and agreed to by the seconder, Mr. Winton.

President Thomson reported that the ALSA Council established a new ad hoc committee in 2011-2012 in response to a request from the Alberta Society of Surveying & Mapping Technologies (ASSMT), to look at the credentials that should be required for someone who would call themselves a Registered Survey Technologist or RST. He advised that Council broadened the mandate to have the Committee look at the relationship between the Alberta Land Surveyor and the survey technologist and between the ALSA and the ASSMT. He called on RST Ad Hoc Committee Chair Rob Scott to address the membership regarding the Committee’s activities over the past year.

Mr. Scott advised that in the spring of 2011, the ALSA Council established the RST Ad Hoc Committee with the following terms of reference:
1. Develop a concept document outlining what the different roles and responsibilities of Alberta Land Surveyors and survey technologists (whether ASSMT members or not, whether employed by an Alberta Land Surveyor or not) should be.
2. Develop a concept document outlining a model and framework for a partnership between the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and the Alberta Society of Surveying & Mapping Technologies.
3. Prepare the concept documents for the ALSA Council no later than November 30, 2011 so that ALSA Council may discuss it with the ASSMT Council.

Mr. Scott advised that the Committee presented the following document to the ALSA Council in January 2012.

**ALSA AND ASSMT MODEL FRAMEWORK**

**PRINCIPLE:** Only Alberta Land Surveyors will be able to engage in the practice of land surveying. Alberta Land Surveyors will be able to engage in the practice of surveying and will be held to the same standard of professionalism. The practice of surveying and the practice of land surveying are as defined by the *Land Surveyors Act*.

*This is the current standard and requirement.*

PRINCIPLE: Survey technologists may assist in the practice of land surveying if they are under the supervision direc-
tion and control of an Alberta Land Surveyor. Survey technologists may engage in the practice of surveying but not the practice of land surveying.

*This is the current standard and requirement.*

**PRINCIPLE:** Alberta Land Surveyors will be regulated by the ALSA.

*This is the current standard and requirement.*

**PRINCIPLE:** Survey technologists working under the supervision direction and control of an Alberta Land Surveyor will be regulated by ASSMT.

*Survey technologists will be members of ASSMT only and will pay dues to ASSMT.*

**PRINCIPLE:** Registered Survey Technologists practicing surveying independently of an Alberta Land Surveyor will be regulated jointly by ASSMT and the ALSA.

*It is proposed to create a new category of technologists – Registered Survey Technologists (RST) - who are licensed to practice surveying (but not land surveying) independently of an Alberta Land Surveyor in accordance with applicable legislation and industry recognized codes, standards, procedures and practices.*

*While non-Registered Survey Technologists may also practice surveying (but not land surveying), it is hoped that the RST designation will become a respected designation providing those who hold it with greater opportunity.*

*Registered Survey Technologists will be members of ASSMT and regulated jointly by the ALSA and ASSMT.*

**WHAT IS A REGISTERED SURVEY TECHNOLOGIST (RST)**

- Registered Survey Technologist will be able to differentiate when a project requires the practice of surveying or the practice of land surveying as defined by the Land Surveyors Act.
- Registered Survey Technologists will be able to perform and verify all survey work whether in the office or the field to the accuracy, standards and/or legislation required for the specific project.
- Registered Survey Technologists will be able to perform quality control assessments on all survey related work to the accuracy, standards and/or legislation required for the specific project.
- Registered Survey Technologists will be able to perform his or her duties while adhering to a standard of profes-
sionalism, to be outlined in an amended Land Surveyors’ Act.
• Registered Survey Technologists will have the knowledge and skills (based on the requirement to become an RST) to assist an Alberta land Surveyor (ALS) with minimal direction from the ALS, but have the aptitude to know when direction from an ALS is necessary.
• It is hoped that the introduction of a Registered Survey Technologist (RST) will allow technologists that obtain a designation to perform and verify survey work (not land surveying) for its correctness and accuracy.
• It is hoped that the introduction of a Registered Survey Technologist (RST) will allow technologists that obtain a designation to perform and verify survey work (not land surveying) for its correctness and accuracy.
• It is also expected that someone that achieves the designation of a RST will have the knowledge and skills (based in requirements to become a RST) to assist an Alberta Land Surveyor (ALS) with minimal direction from the ALS, but to have the aptitude to know when direction from an ALS is necessary.

Mr. Scott informed the assembly that the ALSA is waiting to hear back from the Association of Surveying and Mapping Technologies (ASSMT) on the documents.

Mr. Scott felt that the initiative was important as all surveying offices employ those individuals that Alberta Land Surveyors rely on to get the job done. He suggested that the documents will give those recognition for the service that RSTs provide and is a good step forward.

Mr. Engler asked who decides where one discipline starts and the other one ends; what constitutes a land survey? He cited examples such as laying out a building, house stake-outs from Section 47 plans and suggested that there is still much work to be done to define the boundaries between the two groups. He expressed concern that the land surveyor will end up doing strictly legal surveys and nothing else.

Mr. Linnell pointed to the principle that suggested that an RST not operating under an ALS in a separate company would be overseen by both ASSMT and the ALSA. He asked Mr. Scott to expand on who would be responsible for that within the ALSA and what sort of framework that individual would fall under.
Mr. Scott replied that what he presented was a concept document and who would oversee the operations would be one of the details that the Committee would have to consider.

Mr. Blatz suggested that most of the claims on insurance are made for non-land surveyor errors such as incorrect pile layouts. He asked if an RST was doing an incorrect pile layout, who’s insurance would pay for the damages. Further, he asked whether RSTs will be able to get insurance.

Mr. Scott reiterated that Mr. Blatz’s question referred to the details of the document and suggested that those types of questions should be answered in the coming year when the Committee looks at the issue in further detail.

Mr. Hagen asked whether a dual membership under one umbrella was considered.

Mr. Scott advised that the ALSA was asked by ASSMT to provide some input and it is not the intent for the ALSA to take on the RSTs as members. He added that it is the intent to work with ASSMT to be a strong organization in conjunction with the ALSA.

Mr. Marty Robinson advised that he was involved on the Committee over the previous year. He suggested that government may ask the land surveying profession to change similar to what the engineering profession was asked to do. The ALSA wants to be proactive in working with technologists to try to bring them under the umbrella of both ASSMT and the ALSA in formulating standards. Mr. Robinson felt that this would go a long way to satisfy the wishes of government in broadening which designation can do what types of work.

Mr. Pratt commented that only Alberta Land Surveyors can practice in the field of land surveying and asked whether membership would be mandatory in ASSMT for an RST to practice in the non-exclusive field of surveying.

Mr. Scott replied that if those individuals wanted the RST designation, they would be required to be a member of ASSMT. He added that it is hoped that the RST designation will encourage many independent operators to become qualified.

Mr. MacDormand expressed caution about the initiative. He cited one case where there was a company that was run by a
member of ASSMT who laid out a commercial building. Mr. MacDormand advised that his firm was asked to do the real property report at a later time and it was found that there was an encroachment onto a utility right-of-way. He continued by stating that it ended up being a complicated decision as to where the property boundary was and he had to consult with another Alberta Land Surveyor. He felt that the ALSA should be very cautious in moving forward.

Mr. Scott appreciated the concerns expressed by Mr. MacDormand but felt that moving forward in the direction of the concepts submitted by the Committee should alleviate those types of concerns. To obtain the RST designation, the individual is required to know the difference between surveying and land surveying.

It was clarified that it was never the intent to allow an RST to do any type of land surveying. The initiative involves providing the RST with the qualification to verify accuracy and standards outside of land surveying.

Mr. Engler asked whether it would be mandatory for anyone who wants to engage in the practice of surveying to become a member of ASSMT.

Mr. Scott replied that he appreciated the concerns expressed and suggested that there is much work to be done in opening up legislation and the questions brought up during his presentation will need to be answered.

Mr. Wallace was called upon to make a presentation with respect to the activities of Professional Surveyors Canada.

Mr. Wallace addressed the assembly as follows:

A few years ago, I was asked to be the Alberta-CCLS representative and, at about that time, the presidents across the country were re-evaluating what CCLS was doing. We managed to have a couple of sessions across Canada to discuss what CCLS was doing and how it was succeeding and where it was failing. It was decided, at that time, it would really be a good idea to create another entity to do what we wanted CCLS to do in the first place. We spent many days trying to formulate a committee that would act on behalf of not only the associations across Canada, but primarily for members.

The land surveying association’s mandate is to protect the public and can’t be self-serving. Professional Surveyors Canada is self-serving. We are looking after the interests of all of the members across Canada.
After numerous meetings, a vision and a plan was put together for Professional Surveyors Canada. One of the reasons we thought that this type of operation or association like this was needed was to provide a common link between all the land surveying associations across Canada. Today, we look around here and we have all these members and we think we are reasonably self-sufficient. That’s not the case in a lot of the other provinces. We have dwindling memberships; we have aging memberships. There are a lot of land surveyors that are my age and that’s not a good thing. In Alberta, we are blessed with a lot of younger members. We actually saw the light in the 1980s to have the capability to bring in some younger members. We are part of the land surveying community across the country so I think we really have to take some ownership in this.

What’s going to happen is that we are going to find that the surveying industry is going to implode because we do not have the resources. We always hear of certain places in Alberta where there are no land surveyors and people cannot get survey work done. That is a problem and that is in Alberta. There are many other places in Canada where it’s the same thing.

What do we need Professional Surveyors Canada for? Really, a voice and a champion (again, the self-serving aspect). Somebody to stand up, beat our chest and say, we are good at what we’re going to do and again, the connections between the land surveyors’ associations across Canada and, of course, a culture for life-long learning.

It is especially important for some of the smaller organizations. We have the luxury in Alberta to have the ability to earn some money through the sale of iron posts. As a result, we have many resources available to us but we reinvent the wheel with a lot of other associations across Canada. Everybody has the same committees; the Career Awareness Committee, the Public Relations Committee and so on. We are trying to provide a link of putting this all together.

CCLS was an organization that was acting on behalf of the legislative bodies. Professional Surveyors Canada does that as well, but is also linked for you as members across Canada. One of the big things that it is morphing into is an advocacy role for land surveyors. In Alberta, your Council, your president, your executive director can be an advocate as long as it is within the mandate of protecting the public. We want to be an advocate and be self-serving. There is a subtle difference. We butt our heads against the wall all the time when we make presentations to groups that use our products. We are advocating for an integrated profession across
Canada and again, I emphasize that it’s a national body of individual members.

Let me give you a little bit of a breakdown on how our financing works. The associations contribute money on your behalf to fulfill the association requirements that CCLS did, but then we also solicit memberships. That’s the difference between CCLS and Professional Surveyors Canada. We get back to the self-serving role; that’s why we are here—for individual members.

The mission statement of Professional Surveyors Canada is to work on behalf of its members to encourage and enable an environment where their work is valued as the underpinning fabric of society for the well-being of Canadians. Again, we’ve expanded to try and encompass the many different practicing land surveyors and associated educational institutions across Canada. Professional Surveyors Canada serves registered land surveyors, firms, articulated students, the ten provincial licensing associations plus the ACLS, educators, students and retired land surveyors. Stakeholders are professional surveyors across Canada, interest groups, government regulators, licensing bodies and academia.

As a young association, we asked ourselves what can we do? We have a limited amount of funding and members—you can only do with what you got. So, we defined some roles that we think we can do on your behalf to get the best bang for the buck in order to provide something that might be lacking in other associations across Canada, including our own association.

Advocacy is a big thing. Over years and years, things are happing like SRD makes a decision about not requiring land surveyors to do certain plans or the Surveyor General’s office cutting back funding for land surveying or Manitoba making a decision which affects boundaries. As a smaller organization, we lack the oomph to go to the regulators to say this is wrong. But if you had a national group behind you, it would add credibility. That’s what we want to do. Of course, there is career enhancement and building community—things that we do as Alberta Land Surveyors but when you link it all together, it becomes more powerful.

The LightSquared issue is something that came to Professional Surveyors Canada from members. They said that they were hearing vibrations that our GPS might be threatened. It came from the United States and, of course, it was ludicrous to think that our GPS signals would all of a sudden be rendered inoperative. My first reaction was that it was crazy; they can’t let that happen; but it did. It was a real viable problem. You have a LightSquared that was so big in the US (and LightSquared for those of you that don’t
know, was a new 4G network that was going to be instituted in the US and the frequency of the LightSquared was adjacent to the GPS signals, but it was significantly stronger so that it compromised the GPS signals). As an association, we could say that was a bad thing but as a Professional Surveyors Canada group that represented land surveyors across Canada, we made the statement, produced a paper on it to our members, to the membership across Canada and gave our support behind the US group which gave the whole thing more credibility. That, combined with what the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and other groups had, caused Congress to back down and disallow it until it could be proven that it would work (actually, it won’t work so they will have to go back to the drawing board). That is something that Professional Surveyors Canada took on and was successful in doing. I think that we were better represented by what Professional Surveyors Canada did rather than the disjointed membership across Canada.

We participated in a compensation and segmentation study with Natural Resources Canada (NRC). We have a partnership with the National Society of Professional Surveyors (NSPS) which is really good because the US has the same kind of issues we do with the demographics of our membership. We are having dialogue with the Canadian Institute of Geomatics (CIG) and producing the best rights scenario for municipalities. We have also entertained dealing with some of the title insurance issues. These are issues that we have the ability to gather information on across Canada and derive a position on it and make a statement—hopefully, a statement that has more credibility than the ten or eleven disjointed statements that we get across Canada.

We produced a seminar last year (Project Management Seminar) which has been run a few times—most recently in Edmonton. We are having issues with getting enough interest in it in other areas in Alberta. We tried to get some interest in Calgary but were not successful. Our mandate is to produce more workshops and seminars and we are rethinking that perhaps we would like to do it in conjunction with AGMs.

Professional Surveyors Canada is administering the insurance policy for surveyors across Canada through Encon and Jardine Lloyd Thompson. We are actually working with the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors (ACLS) in the support and development of GeoED which is the distance learning mechanism which allows more interaction.

On our website, we have a job bank and equipment exchange. We have teleconferences between our members on regular occasions. We have the Horizon newsletter that is published monthly. Our executive is at every AGM to try to
participate in the proceedings to find out what the issues are and what we can bring back to the table. We also participate at the president’s forum to help the presidents have another avenue for issues that they deem important.

Professional Surveyors Canada has 400 members and has produced articles in *Geomatica* and *Professional Surveyors Magazine* in the US. Also, as part of your membership, you receive a subscription to *Professional Surveyors Magazine* but when you join, go to the website and actually sign up for it as you will not get it automatically.

As far as the percentage of membership across Canada, Saskatchewan appears to have the highest percentage of members that are included in Professional Surveyors Canada. When the template for Professional Surveyors Canada was designed, the thought was to make it voluntary for members so it is up to you to make a decision whether, in fact, Professional Surveyors Canada matters enough to you to make this decision. In Alberta, the percentage of membership is fairly low compared to the rest of the country. I challenge you today, to kick it up a notch and join Professional Surveyors Canada.

We have to get the word out that we are an advocate for our profession across Canada. I think we play a very vital role and we need this national organization acting on our behalf. I challenge Alberta to be leaders and help drive Professional Surveyors Canada.

Thank you for your time.

Ms. Sarah Cornett, Executive Director of Professional Surveyors Canada, pointed out that a free membership for one year is offered to all newly licensed surveyors across the Country.

Mr. Thomson mentioned that an Articling Process Ad Hoc Committee has been formed by Council which will consist of a small group of Alberta Land Surveyors who will be tasked with reviewing the articling process and make recommendations for change. He went on to say that the process will be similar to what was done when Systematic Practice Review moved to Continuing Competency Review. Mr. Thomson encouraged the members to consider joining the ad hoc committee.

Mr. Thomson also advised that Council also formed an External Relations Committee. Council concluded that the relationship between the ALSA with government and some industry sectors could improve as other organizations were talking with government and amongst themselves about
land surveying issues. For some reason, it seemed that the ALSA was not involved or involved as much as it should have been. He went on to say that Council felt that communication needs to be a priority in matters concerning boundaries. Council has identified a number of government departments and industry organizations that it would like to liaise with on an annual basis. Mr. Thomson encouraged Alberta Land Surveyors to volunteer to meet with these groups. In order to keep things manageable, each Committee member would be responsible for liaising with one or two groups one or two times per year. He suggested that if members work together on this Committee, it will not require a huge time commitment on any one person but volunteers are needed.

Mr. Thomson announced an open forum session which gives attendees the opportunity to report on something or ask a question, get feedback from the membership or encourage individuals to join a committee. He reported that there will be an opportunity later on for members to bring forward motions under new business.

President Thomson asked for a round of applause for all the committee members who volunteered over the past year.

Committee chairs were recognized and presented with a gift of appreciation from President Thomson.

President Thomson asked for a round of applause for those organizations that supported the 103 Annual General Meeting.

President Thomson then presented small gifts of appreciation to outgoing and remaining members of Council for their work over the past year.

Incoming President Connie Petersen was called to the podium to take the oath of office.

The outgoing president, David Thomson, presented President Connie Petersen with the gavel.

Ms. Petersen then presented David Thomson with the outgoing president’s plaque and pin.

New Council members were called to the head table as retiring Council members were asked to step down. New
Council members were led in the oath of office by President Petersen.

Ms. Petersen addressed the assembly as follows:

First of all, I would like to extend my thanks to the past year’s Council. We had many lively discussions and everyone came to the table prepared to share their ideas, thoughtfully consider the opinions expressed by others and arrive at a consensus. I encourage our new Council to approach the coming year with the same spirit.

Second, I’d like to thank Dave Thomson for laying the groundwork in so many areas that it’s difficult to summarize them all. I know that a good majority of the work ahead of me and us this year will be furthering the efforts that Dave has begun.

Last year we asked committees to consider three changes to the way we conduct business. The possibility of in-absentia elections along with the concept of creating a category for non-practicing or inactive members will be added to the terms of reference for the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee in the coming year.

As for enhancing our professional standing with the public and government, our Public Relations Committee has retained the services of Free Advertising and Council looks forward to their presentation and to giving the Public Relations Committee further direction in the coming months.

So, what do we have to look forward to in the coming year? We go to the polls on Monday to elect a new government. This means we will potentially have new ministers for our Council to contact in our continuing effort to find ways to raise the professional profile of all Alberta Land Surveyors so that we are the first people who come to mind when anyone thinks of land, boundaries and property rights.

We will be asking volunteers to step forward for the newly-formed External Relations Committee. Council will be tasking this committee with solidifying our presence with industry groups, educational institutions, sister organizations and government stakeholder groups and, as Dave mentioned earlier, we have also formed the Articling Process Ad Hoc Committee to review the articling process.

Someone once said, “volunteers aren’t paid, not because they are worthless, but because they are priceless.” There is a reason that our Association is held as an example to the rest of the country—our volunteers. Without your dedication and commitment, we would not have the opportunity to accomplish all that we do, nor would we be looked upon as leaders and innovators.
Our committees will be busy this year with all the tasks already at hand. However, if time allows, there are two campaigns that I would very much like to see initiated.

First, I've always felt that our Association could benefit from a mentoring program. Although we have investigated such a program in the past, it was not the right time or the right economic climate for us to pursue this venture. I believe we are moving into a phase in this Association where we would be remiss if we did not revisit such a program.

There are senior members of our Association who have so much valuable experience and knowledge to share, that we would be wise to ensure we have a mechanism in place to facilitate the passing of that priceless information on to our newer members.

Second, many of our sister associations across Canada, as well as the other self-governing associations under the Professions and Occupations arm of our Ministry of Human Services, have requirements for mandatory continuing education or mandatory professional development. If we are to truly protect the public and raise the professional profile of this Association and its members, I believe we need to move toward such a requirement of our members. This is a big undertaking and one that needs to have the proper attention given to it in order to create a program that will complement our continuing competency and one that will provide the public the assurance that we are keeping our members up-to-date.

As we work toward laying the groundwork for these two programs, I encourage all of you to foster your relationships with other members, to share your knowledge and experience and to continue to attend seminars and workshops that will enhance you both personally and professionally.

I am truly honoured for this opportunity to serve as your President for the coming year. It is your individual contributions, accomplishments, and achievements that make this Association so successful. I am proud of what we stand for, how we work together and how we lead.

Thank you.

President Petersen announced that the meeting would enter into new business. She advised that new business resolutions are not binding on Council but Council is obliged to consider the matter, if passed by the membership.

WHEREAS the Manual of Standard Practice is an all-encompassing record of supplementary information relevant to conducting surveys, preparation of plans and reference information and;

Motion #1:
The Role of the Manual of Standard Practice

New Business
WHEREAS the Manual of Standard Practice has been and is being misinterpreted by Alberta Land Surveyors, approving authorities and the public;

THEREFORE it was MOVED by Mr. Baker, seconded by Mr. Penner, that Council be directed to review the role and content of the Manual of Standard Practice with the intent of:

• Determining the impact the MSP has on limiting Alberta Land Surveyors’ professional judgment.
• Formulating a workable plan that will allow Alberta Land Surveyors to retain their professional status and dignity in light of the requirements of the MSP.
• Carefully considering the relevance, necessity and benefit of any future additions to the MSP.

Motion Carried

Mr. Baker spoke to the motion by suggesting that it was generated along with a number of other individuals who are very concerned about the direction the Manual of Standard Practice (MSP) is leading the Association. He indicated that the motion is very generic and is put forward to get the members thinking about what may happen. Mr. Baker stated that he went back to the first edition of the ALSA Instructions for Surveys in Alberta, published in 1944, which consisted of excerpts of various acts, some survey procedures and a few other things. He advised that there were second and third editions in 1954 and 1960 but it wasn’t until the late 50s that they came in with the good practice resolutions. Mr. Baker added that the extraneous information in the MSP started to develop from there on. He continued by advising that in 1959, there were fourteen good practice resolutions and from 1959 to 1988, more information was put in because of the rewrite of the Surveys Act. In the 1980s, much of the procedural information was dropped from the Surveys Act because it was felt that land surveyors had enough professional intelligence that they could survey and put in block corners with their own intelligence and professional opinion.

Mr. Baker added that the Manual of Good Practice started out as the Manual of Good Practice and evolved into the Manual of Standard Practice in 1995. He further advised that there are now two manuals; one is called the ALS Manual and one is called the Manual of Standard Practice and both are referred to as manuals on the ALSA website. In the introduction in the MSP, it is referred to as legislation. Mr. Baker expressed concern that it started out to be guidelines and felt that it has gone to a different level of accountability. He added that he would not want to be held accountable for some things that...
are in the MSP. Mr. Baker felt that the Association needs to consider what goes in the MSP very carefully. He added that he has an uncomfortable feeling that the profession’s well-being is being threatened by being held accountable at the same level for all sections of the MSP. Mr. Baker went on to say that entries in the MSP that fall under the scope of practice for land surveyors are referenced and utilized by more and more non-professionals. He added that there have been occasions where members of the Law Society, realtors, municipalities and clients have questioned the validity of land surveyors’ products, referring to information extracted from the MSP.

Mr. Baker suggested that the MSP does not give details on how to become a land surveyor but it does provide detailed instructions on how to survey. He expressed concern that the profession is “selling the farm” along with the instructions to run it and suggested that some land surveyors may appreciate the detailed information in the MSP as it provides a standard to follow, but they may not realize that there will always be exceptions and there will always be discussions and that is where professional opinion comes in. Mr. Baker advised that he has heard comments that the MSP is written at a technical level and does not require professional input from the land surveyor. He suggested that the MSP be redesigned so that the land surveyor is accountable for some areas but not all.

Mr. Larsen felt that a redesign and rework of the MSP would be of benefit so that some of the old concepts could be revisited and to ascertain whether or not there is too much detail included in the MSP.

It was MOVED by Mr. Wallace, seconded by Mr. Smith, that Council enter into discussions with the Government of Alberta to change the existing legislation to give the ALSA Boundary Panel the legislative authority to:
- Approve solutions for boundary uncertainties;
- Repost areas deficient in survey pins;
- Register plans at Land Titles where necessary;
- Authorize re-surveys under Section 9 of the Surveys Act.

Motion Carried

Mr. Wallace felt that the Boundary Panel lacks the ability to follow through on its decisions. He advised that Association does not have the mechanism to solve problems that are brought before the Panel and felt that a disservice was being done to the public. Mr. Wallace suggested that the members approve giving some authority to the Panel. He felt
that Council should approach the Government of Alberta to change the legislation to give authority to the Boundary Panel to follow through on actions such as re-posting areas that are deficient in survey posts, to solidify solutions for boundary uncertainties and to actually enact the solutions by registered plans. He further suggested that legislation be changed so that the Boundary Panel could authorize resurveys and somehow orchestrate funding and get the go-ahead for Section 9 surveys. Mr. Wallace commented that he has seen many instances where Section 9 would be a very effective solution to some of the issues.

Mr. Marquardt agreed with Mr. Wallace and suggested it was like doing a great survey job but only being able to invoice for half of it. He added that the type of legislation that Mr. Wallace suggested gives the Boundary Panel the authority to make the corrections and serve the public.

Mr. Baker suggested that the first question the government will ask is where is the money going to come from. He suggested that some discussion needs to take place as far as funding is concerned.

Mr. Engler suggested that more funds could be generated by discussing the post sale agreement with the government. He added that, as a profession, we need to solve the problems, not the general public.

Mr. Metcalfe advised that, through taking seminars as a member of the Boundary Panel, a judge would most likely rule in favour of a decision or recommendation by the Boundary Panel as a peer group. He supported the motion and commented that it is frustrating to sit as a member of Boundary Panel and be involved in coming up with a decision or recommendation knowing that in most circumstances, there was nothing to force the boundary uncertainty to be taken care of.

Mr. Kocher indicated that he was under the impression that a portion of the money that comes from post sales goes to the Boundary Panel and that money needs to be spent to avoid a claw-back from the Government of Alberta.

It was MOVED by Mr. Jamieson, seconded by Mr. McKenna, that Council select an ad hoc committee to adopt an alternative chainsaw safety certification standard specific for the members of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. This would include an attempt to gain recognition and
Mr. Jamieson spoke to the motion by advising that an alternative needed to be found to the BC faller’s certification. He suggested that this could be done outside of the umbrella of the ALSA but it would get more validity if it could be done through the Association. Mr. Jamieson suggested that the ALSA approach CAPP and the Enform Chainsaw Safety Certification Committee to discuss the issue.

Mr. Adair commented that there was no doubt that the Enform Chainsaw Certificate Program is expensive and time-consuming and it is not easy to work through the different levels. He spoke against the motion and indicated that, at the Association level, the Safety Committee has been granted a voting seat on Enform’s Chainsaw Committee recently. Mr. Adair advised that issues are discussed at the ALSA Safety Committee and there are one or two representatives who are able to vote with the land surveyor’s interests in mind at the Enform Chainsaw Committee meetings. He suggested using that as a forum for change rather than circumventing what the Safety Committee has achieved. Mr. Adair also commented that if there are two standards, should an incident occur to an individual who is trained on one standard, an investigation would take place that will question why something is included in one standard and not in the other. He concluded that the chainsaw certification program that he went through gave him a lot of skills that he felt were integral to doing the job safely.

Mr. Engler commented that he appreciated the comments of Mr. Adair but suggested that it is very difficult to get people trained and even more difficult to retain them because they do not get enough work in the field. He felt that a sufficient standard for what is involved in the surveying field would be better than to enforce a standard that is meant for fallers of “real” trees that make the trees in Alberta look like sticks.

It was MOVED by Lyall Pratt, seconded by Don George, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association review the wording under Part C, Section 5.8 of the Manual of Standard Practice to ensure it matches the Surveys Act. 

Motion Carried
Mr. Pratt spoke to the motion by advising that the MSP and the *Surveys Act* differ with respect to the wording of Part C, Section 5.8 of the MSP. The MSP denotes “originally surveyed” between the dates of February 16, 1912 and June 9, 1988 whereas the Act denotes “plan registered” between those dates. Mr. Pratt felt that there was contradictory language in the MSP that should be rectified to change it to what the Act states.

Mr. Rick Beaumont, President of the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors, was called upon to give a short presentation on Dave Thomson’s past year as president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

President Connie Petersen called the 103rd Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association closed.
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REVIEW ENGAGEMENT REPORT

To the Members of
Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association

We have reviewed the statement of financial position of Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association as at April 30, 2011 and the statements of operations, changes in net assets and cash flows for the year then ended. Our review was made in accordance with Canadian generally accepted standards for review engagements and accordingly consisted primarily of enquiry, analytical procedures and discussion related to information supplied to us by the Association.

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

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

Edmonton, Alberta
August 3, 2011

CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS
## ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

**Statement of Financial Position**

**Year Ended April 30, 2011**

(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash--Note 3</td>
<td>$1,096,050</td>
<td>$1,151,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities--Note 3</td>
<td>2,517,610</td>
<td>1,870,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>253,928</td>
<td>231,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses--Note 4</td>
<td>38,534</td>
<td>24,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>3,906,122</td>
<td>3,278,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUIPMENT</strong>--Note 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,977</td>
<td>35,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>3,932,099</td>
<td>3,313,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>$ 244,512</td>
<td>$ 255,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>30,763</td>
<td>34,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions--Note 6</td>
<td>557,311</td>
<td>578,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>832,586</td>
<td>867,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT</strong>--Note 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,337</td>
<td>18,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in equipment</td>
<td>25,977</td>
<td>35,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally restricted</td>
<td>3,059,199</td>
<td>2,391,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>3,085,176</td>
<td>2,427,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEASE COMMITMENTS</strong>--Note 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approved by the Council**

![Signature]
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Alberta Land Surveyors' Association

Statement of Operations

Year Ended April 30, 2011

(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual 2011</th>
<th>Budget 2011</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNRESTRICTED--GENERAL FUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue—Schedule 1</td>
<td>$2,070,474</td>
<td>$1,630,260</td>
<td>$440,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and levies</td>
<td>621,960</td>
<td>535,450</td>
<td>86,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>18,514</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Alberta - Foreign Qualification Recognition Innovation Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized gain on marketable securities</td>
<td>114,016</td>
<td>92,340</td>
<td>21,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2,825,043</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,268,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>556,943</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,436,274</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of marketable securities</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and Committees—Schedule 2</td>
<td>108,022</td>
<td>162,500</td>
<td>(54,478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Competency review—Schedule 3</td>
<td>307,300</td>
<td>344,533</td>
<td>(37,233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses—Schedule 4</td>
<td>694,489</td>
<td>672,606</td>
<td>21,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses—Schedule 5</td>
<td>1,375,681</td>
<td>1,103,400</td>
<td>272,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Qualification Recognition Innovation Fund expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of equipment</td>
<td>18,89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2,493,496</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,283,039</strong></td>
<td><strong>210,457</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,282,687</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE (EXPENSES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary expenses</td>
<td>(13,637)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(13,637)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>(5,035)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5,035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>(4,140)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors Levy Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>(6,781)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(6,781)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Surveyors Canada Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>27,054</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>(32,720)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(32,720)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Their Mark Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>(1,278)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>(2,053)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(31,463)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,463</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,455</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>459,215</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>104,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>(101,209)</td>
<td>(340,000)</td>
<td>238,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>358,006</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>343,006</strong></td>
<td><strong>331,480</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE OVER EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 658,090</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 61</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 658,029</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

**Statement of Changes in Net Assets**

**Year Ended April 30, 2011**

(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Balance at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Revenue Over (Under) Expenses</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNRESTRICTED–GENERAL FUND</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$346,358</td>
<td>$(346,358)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTED IN EQUIPMENT</strong></td>
<td>35,453</td>
<td>(14,811)</td>
<td>5,335</td>
<td>25,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Balance at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Revenue Over (Under) Expenses</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNALLY RESTRICTED–Note 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>1,680,280</td>
<td>(2,053)</td>
<td>303,129</td>
<td>1,981,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(13,637)</td>
<td>13,637</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>46,260</td>
<td>(4,140)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>16,390</td>
<td>(5,035)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Presenter Revolving Fund</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>127,575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel Fund</td>
<td>466,468</td>
<td>358,006</td>
<td>(26,704)</td>
<td>797,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining and Enhancing Professional Practice Fund</td>
<td>(46,609)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,961</td>
<td>4,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Their Mark Fund</td>
<td>6,209</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Allowance Fund</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors Levy Fund</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>(1,681)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral Research Fund</td>
<td>29,964</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Surveyors Canada Fund</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>(5,666)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,391,633</td>
<td>326,543</td>
<td>341,023</td>
<td>3,059,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$2,427,086 $ 658,090 $ 0 $3,085,176
### Statement of Cash Flows

#### Year Ended April 30, 2011

(UNAUDITED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH PROVIDED BY (USED IN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue over expenses</td>
<td>$658,090</td>
<td>$422,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges (credits) not affecting cash:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>12,921</td>
<td>11,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>(4,527)</td>
<td>(4,527)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of equipment</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net changes in non-cash working capital items--Note 10</td>
<td>(718,506)</td>
<td>15,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50,133)</td>
<td>446,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investing activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of equipment</td>
<td>(5,335)</td>
<td>(5,271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in RPR Revolving Index Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,391)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5,335)</td>
<td>(6,662)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH (DECREASE) INCREASE</strong></td>
<td>(55,468)</td>
<td>439,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at beginning of year</td>
<td>1,151,518</td>
<td>712,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$1,096,050</td>
<td>$1,151,518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements

April 30, 2011

(Unaudited)

NOTE 1--PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION

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

NOTE 2--SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of Presentation
These financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles.

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

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

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

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

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

During the year, the Association changed from the declining balance method to the straight-line method of amortizing equipment.

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

Use of Estimates
The preparation of financial statements, in conformity with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles, requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the amounts reported in the financial statements. By their nature, these estimates are subject to measurement uncertainty and actual results could differ.
Alberta Land Surveyors' Association

Notes to Financial Statements

April 30, 2011

(Unaudited)

Note 3--Cash and Marketable Securities

Cash and marketable securities include $3,059,199 (2010--$2,391,633) which have been designated for specific programs that are described in Note 9.

Note 4--Prepaid Expenses

Prepaid expenses are comprised of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent deposit</td>
<td>$18,627</td>
<td>$18,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,534</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,799</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 5--Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>$50,082</td>
<td>$10,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>32,202</td>
<td>10,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>32,147</td>
<td>7,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114,431</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>3,101</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey equipment</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive equipment</td>
<td>40,826</td>
<td>3,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>17,786</td>
<td>1,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,323</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$182,459 $156,482 $25,977 $35,453
NOTE 6--DEFERRED CONTRIBUTIONS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at beginning of year</td>
<td>$578,039</td>
<td>$489,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions received during the year</td>
<td>557,311</td>
<td>578,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts recognized as revenue</td>
<td>(578,039)</td>
<td>(489,299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$557,311</td>
<td>$578,039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 7--DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT

The Association moved to its present office space in June of 2004 and received one year rent free as a lease inducement. The Association amortizes the tenant deferred lease inducement on the straight-line basis over the term of the lease which expires on June 30, 2014. The current year's amortization of $4,527 (2010--$4,527) was credited to rent expense.

NOTE 8--LEASE COMMITMENTS

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 / 2012</td>
<td>$62,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 / 2013</td>
<td>62,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 / 2014</td>
<td>62,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 / 2015</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$197,606</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE 9--INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS

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

Discipline Revolving Fund
This fund is used for expenses relating to discipline hearings, discipline related education seminars and administrative matters pertaining to the Discipline Committee. At the start of each year, Council sets the fund at $30,000.

Public Relations and Communications
This fund is used for special initiatives that promote the profession to the public.

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

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

Seminar Presenter Revolving Fund
This fund was established to reimburse members who develop and present Association approved seminars to the membership, other professional organizations or the general public. At the start of each fiscal year, Council sets the fund at $15,000.

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

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

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

Making Their Mark Fund
This fund was established to be used to manage the costs and expenses associated with the Made to Measure travelling museum exhibit.
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NOTE 9--INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS (continued)

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

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

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

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

NOTE 10--CASH FLOW INFORMATION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities</td>
<td>$(646,687)</td>
<td>$(121,547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>(22,853)</td>
<td>44,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>(13,735)</td>
<td>1,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>(10,887)</td>
<td>(10,018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>(3,616)</td>
<td>11,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions</td>
<td>(20,728)</td>
<td>88,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$(718,506)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,459</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 11--SCHEDULES

Schedules 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 compare actual revenue and expenses for the year to budgeted amounts. The budgets were prepared by management and approved by Council.
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NOTE 12--FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

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

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

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

NOTE 13--CAPITAL MANAGEMENT

The Association’s goal in managing capital is to safeguard its ability to continue as a going concern so that it can continue to provide services to the members. To accomplish this goal, policies have been established to preserve the financial condition of the Association and protect its assets by setting limitations on the expenditures of funds, incurrence of debt, use of long-term reserves and investment of funds. Over the year, the Council meets with staff to review the Association’s financial position.

NOTE 14--FUTURE ACCOUNTING CHANGES

In December of 2010, the Accounting Standards Board of the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants approved the adoption of new accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations to be effective for fiscal years commencing on or after January 1, 2012. Management and the Council will ensure the Association complies with the new standards.

NOTE 15--SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

Subsequent to the year end, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Alberta Sustainable Resource Development has asked the Association to remit $477,671 of unspent boundary panel funds for the period November 1, 2008 to April 30, 2010 under Ministerial Order 27/2008.

NOTE 16--INFORMATION REQUIRED BY MINISTERIAL ORDER

Ministerial Order 54/88A was amended by Ministerial Order 27/2008 effective November 1, 2008 setting the mark-up that the Association can charge on the sale of posts. The mark-up allowed has two components. The first component is for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing professional practice, education, public awareness and quality, and the technical capability of land surveyors in Alberta. The second component is for funding investigations of boundary uncertainties or alleged errors in surveys.
NOTE 16--INFORMATION REQUIRED BY MINISTERIAL ORDER (continued)

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

Component 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post sales</td>
<td>$1,744,914</td>
<td>$1,422,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post sale administration</td>
<td>1,020,210</td>
<td>819,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Competency</td>
<td>317,333</td>
<td>359,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>198,170</td>
<td>129,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing professional practice</td>
<td>80,158</td>
<td>39,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness</td>
<td>65,395</td>
<td>108,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 47 plan monitoring</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>5,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field note / dormant plan repository</td>
<td>6,197</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE OVER (UNDER) EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>50,961</td>
<td>(39,826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>(46,609)</td>
<td>(6,783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$4,352</td>
<td>$ (46,609)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post sales</td>
<td>$459,200</td>
<td>$364,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct boundary panel</td>
<td>101,193</td>
<td>32,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE OVER EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>358,007</td>
<td>331,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect boundary panel costs</td>
<td>(26,705)</td>
<td>(25,296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT BEGINNING OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>466,468</td>
<td>160,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$797,770</td>
<td>$ 466,468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

#### Schedule 1

**Operating Revenue**

**Year Ended April 30, 2011**

(Undaunted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual 2011</th>
<th>Budget 2011</th>
<th>Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts, net of Boundary Panel transfers</td>
<td>$1,206,745</td>
<td>$ 937,950</td>
<td>$ 268,795</td>
<td>$ 997,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts, net of Boundary Panel transfers</td>
<td>538,170</td>
<td>410,750</td>
<td>127,420</td>
<td>424,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>138,973</td>
<td>179,500</td>
<td>(40,527)</td>
<td>141,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>54,086</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54,036</td>
<td>37,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>43,975</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>13,975</td>
<td>31,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>37,275</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>32,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>20,173</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>17,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>15,539</td>
<td>10,260</td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>29,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>10,680</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>6,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>3,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                      $2,070,474   $1,630,260   $ 440,214             $1,722,726
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ended April 30, 2011</th>
<th>(Unaudited)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and examination</td>
<td>$ 26,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>21,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s travel</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Board</td>
<td>14,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>12,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>2,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and biographical</td>
<td>1,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of surveys</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomatics Engineering Liaison</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Tour within Alberta</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention and social</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$108,022   $162,500   $(54,478)   $114,875
## ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

### Schedule 3

#### Continuing Competency Review

**Year Ended April 30, 2011**

(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2011</th>
<th>Budget 2011</th>
<th>Budget Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>$239,570</td>
<td>$180,623</td>
<td>$ 58,947</td>
<td>$276,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fee</td>
<td>27,300</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>(92,700)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and transportation</td>
<td>23,198</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(6,802)</td>
<td>31,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>6,136</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>6,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>6,036</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>3,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(616)</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and plans</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(1,500)</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and dues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field supplies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$307,300  $344,533  $(37,233)  $324,804
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Schedule 4

Administration Expenses

Year Ended April 30, 2011

(UNAUDITED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2011</th>
<th>Budget 2011</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, benefits and contract staff</td>
<td>$432,960</td>
<td>$400,529</td>
<td>$32,431</td>
<td>$399,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building operations</td>
<td>147,556</td>
<td>143,432</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>134,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies and photocopying</td>
<td>21,956</td>
<td>29,146</td>
<td>(7,190)</td>
<td>28,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and donations</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>14,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, Internet and database</td>
<td>12,842</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>7,342</td>
<td>6,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and courier</td>
<td>10,567</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>(4,433)</td>
<td>10,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>5,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>7,139</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>2,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>6,987</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>(5,013)</td>
<td>12,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>6,886</td>
<td>10,879</td>
<td>(3,993)</td>
<td>8,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>5,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>5,919</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>(1,081)</td>
<td>6,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery</td>
<td>5,605</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>(895)</td>
<td>7,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and subscriptions</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(644)</td>
<td>1,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical file management</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>(521)</td>
<td>1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>(440)</td>
<td>1,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence and travel</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>(1,940)</td>
<td>1,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training and library</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(750)</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 47 monitoring</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(412)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(498)</td>
<td>1,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$694,489 $672,606 $21,883 $650,513
## ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION Schedule 5

### Operating Expenses

**Year Ended April 30, 2011**

(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2011</th>
<th>Budget 2011</th>
<th>Budget Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts</td>
<td>$634,236</td>
<td>$493,950</td>
<td>$140,286</td>
<td>$546,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts</td>
<td>373,329</td>
<td>286,750</td>
<td>86,579</td>
<td>301,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>198,628</td>
<td>179,500</td>
<td>19,128</td>
<td>175,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges and management fees</td>
<td>44,878</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>8,878</td>
<td>35,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>41,365</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>4,365</td>
<td>39,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>36,996</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>11,996</td>
<td>23,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>19,440</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>18,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>12,644</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>(1,556)</td>
<td>14,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>11,979</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>8,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(1,373)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$1,375,681 $1,103,400 $272,281 $1,165,560
When we look back on this past Association year, we will see that 2011/2012 was a pivotal year for the Association. I believe we will look back and see that this was the end of one era and the start of another. We will say that, prior to 2011/2012, the Association did things one way and that, after 2011/2012, the Association did things a new way.

This is not the first time that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association has seen things shift in such a way. The land surveyors who received their commissions shortly before World War II succeeded the founding members of the Association. They were eventually succeeded by the new breed of land surveyors who earned their commissions shortly after WWII and into the 1950s and 1960s as the economy of Alberta started to modernize. This generation of land surveyors eventually gave way to the group of young professionals who came in just before and just after the advent of the University of Calgary program. Some of that group is starting to retire and give way to the group of Alberta Land Surveyors who will provide leadership for the profession for the next number of years.

What makes me say that this has been a pivotal year for the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association? First and foremost, Sharon Armstrong is retiring after 32 years with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. For many years, Ken Allred and Sharon Armstrong were the only two employees this Association had. The two of them carried out all of the administrative work of the Association. When I first started with the ALSA, Sharon had responsibility for Council, the Registration Committee, ALS News, the JH Holloway Scholarship Foundation, the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee and I am sure there are some tasks and responsibilities that I am forgetting. Although she has been working a shorter week and only coming into the office a couple of times each week and, although she will come back on a contract basis to do some specific things for us, her presence at the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association office will be missed. Her contributions to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association cannot be overstated. We had intended for Tatianna Berezan to take over the Registration Committee administrative responsibilities from Sharon and Sharon had been mentoring Tatianna for the last year. However, Tatianna saw greener pastures on the other side of the fence and took another opportunity. We will be hiring a new person just before or just after the AGM and we will be shuffling staff responsibilities for the new Association year.
But staffing is not the only thing that has changed around the Association. There are a number of new and exciting initiatives which we have started to embark on—even if they are not readily visible to the membership. The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, on the recommendation of the Public Relations Committee, has retained a new consultant to help us develop a new plan. It is hoped that this consultant will be able to present their draft findings and recommendations to the membership at the upcoming annual general meeting. I believe that a new consultant with a new approach will bring new ideas which will give the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association a better profile than it has had in the past.

A new public relations campaign, though, is not enough. We need to get out and speak with people. To that end, the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association has retained a consultant to help us navigate the corridors of power at the Alberta Legislature. We have never used the services of a government relations consultant before as, years ago, a number of Alberta Land Surveyors were employed by government high up within the bureaucracy. That is not true anymore and, with the current Director of Surveys announcing his retirement, it has become apparent that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association needs to have ongoing communications with many government people across a number of different ministries at all levels of the civil service. Our experience with GPS Location Plans has proven this to be true. Council also realized that the Association must have ongoing and regular discussions with industry associations and organizations. There are many groups out there that work with land and geospatial data. We need to be able to work with all of them or, at the very least, understand their different roles and perspectives. I expect that Council will establish a new committee which will have an emphasis on Association members liaising with these industry groups and organizations.

In the same vein, the executive directors of the other Canadian self-governing land surveying associations and I have started to have regular meetings to share information. We hope to have three meetings per year with one of these meetings being held face-to-face. Our first meeting was held back in July 2011 in Toronto. We spent a full day sharing information on a number of administrative matters. Our goal is not to duplicate the work of the presidents who discuss policy issues. Our goal is to discuss administrative matters. For example, our next meeting will be focused on our respective annual general meetings and how we control costs, increase revenues, negotiate with hotels and other matters associated with organizing what is, for each of us, our biggest function each year.
Scott Westlund has been a positive addition to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association staff. Scott is based in Calgary and comes into the ALSA office in Edmonton for roughly two days per month. In spite of that, or perhaps because of it, Scott, along with Kerry Barrett, has been able to open a number of Continuing Competency Review files each month and send a large number to the Practice Review Board each month. Consequently, we anticipate being able to review each practitioner at least once every three years and this will help us protect the public whom we serve. Scott Westlund has also been instrumental in getting the Boundary Panel to take off. Prior to Scott coming on board, the Boundary Panel might get two or three cases per year. Now, we are probably averaging one to one and a half new cases per month. While some of these cases are taking much longer to complete than we had hoped, the Boundary Panel is moving in a positive direction and money is being spent to fix up age old issues.

I have also asked Scott to take on a new position which we are calling the Director of Education. The Director of Practice Review, the Practice Review Board and Continuing Competency Review are all interlinked with education. It makes sense that the Director of Practice Review also plays a significant role in the continuing professional development of the membership. It is our goal to have the membership help identify what seminars or educational topics they would like to see. A small group of Alberta Land Surveyors will then flesh out these priority topics to help identify specific learning outcomes. The Director of Education will then seek out people to present this material and oversee the development/presentation of this work. Starting now, seminars presented by the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association will be focused on the Alberta Land Surveyor and on subjects which are not available from other sources. We don’t want to present a seminar because it is a “hot topic” but because there is a need for this information.

In any other year, this would be a monumental change. However, I have not yet mentioned the work of the RST Ad Hoc Committee which looked at the relationship between the Alberta Land Surveyor and the survey technologist and the ALSA and ASSMT. There may be time on this year’s annual general meeting agenda for the RST Ad Hoc Committee to make a presentation to the membership. Nevertheless, there is the potential for their report to be the basis for a new relationship and an ability to get things done in a more cooperative fashion.

Still, I have not mentioned anything about the work of the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee which has spent a good part of the last year reviewing the comments of the mem-
bership from last year’s AGM and the polling last fall to help put forward six recommendations to this year’s annual general meeting. The Committee’s six recommendations are designed to get feedback from the membership about the extent of any changes they would like to see to the ownership structure of surveyor’s corporations. If any of the recommendations are approved, we won’t see any changes any time soon but it will be one more step down the path.

So there you have it. It’s the end of an era and the start of some new, exciting initiatives. I anticipate that, over the next twelve months, we will be spending our time within the ALSA office to implement those initiatives and recommendations that Council and the membership have approved. Change will continue and that is one of the reasons that those of us in the ALSA office enjoy working here.

B.E. (Brian) Munday
Executive Director
Practicing Alberta Land Surveyor Information

In 2011, the average number of years of experience of an active Alberta Land Surveyor was 15.3 years. Alberta Land Surveyors who received their commission in 2011 had articled for an average of 39.3 months.

Member Locations During 2011 (Calendar Year)

- Calgary: 187 Active, 58 Articled & Affiliate
- Edmonton: 99 Active, 33 Articled & Affiliate
- Grande Prairie: 21 Active, 6 Articled & Affiliate
- Other: 128 Active, 60 Articled & Affiliate

Educational Information


*Note: This only reflects the data available on actively practicing Alberta Land Surveyors. *Up to February 6, 2012.

Committee Volunteers


*Up to February 6, 2012
Committee Reports

ASSMT/AAMIC
It has been a busy year for the ALSA-ASSMT MOU Implementation Committee. The Committee has been working on the education requirements for the Level 1 and 2 technicians. The Committee asked the ALSA to give its opinion on the role of the RST. The ALSA struck the RST Ad Hoc Committee. We reviewed the recommendations from this Committee at our January AAMIC meeting. It gives the Committee a starting point to look at the RST role. There is still much work to do on this item. I have sat in on several ASSMT Council meetings to give updates on what is going on with ALSA.

C.J. (Chris) Chiasson, ALS

BOUNDARY PANEL
This past year the Boundary Panel created the Boundary Panel handbook and it was approved by Council. The handbook includes the terms of reference for the Panel and also identifies who can bring a case forward to the Panel, outlines the Boundary Panel process and formalizes the reporting.

There were thirty new cases referred to the Boundary Panel, two cases from 2009 were re-opened and six cases were carried forward from previous years. Ten cases were closed. Of the new cases, twenty-one were initiated by Alberta Land Surveyors, eight by the Director of Surveys office and one by a homeowner. Thirteen involved double monuments and five are from the Director of Surveys on unsurveyed baselines or baselines with monumentation problems. Six of the new cases resulted in panel meetings and five of the reports have been issued and responses received from all of the practitioners. Three cases did not require meetings, only preliminary reports. Seven cases are being acted upon by the affected Alberta Land Surveyors. There are nine cases in which further action will be determined once the preliminary report and the practitioners’ responses are reviewed.

The Association owes a big thank you to all the members of the Boundary Panel for their time commitments at panel meetings and on report preparation; as well as their dedication to improving the whole process as it evolves.

J.E. (Jerry) Rasmuson, ALS

Appendix “D”
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCERS
The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association has representation on the Geomatics Committee to represent the land survey profession with respect to applicable issues.

The Committee met five times during 2011. Topics of discussion included:
1. SRD
   —EAP Process
   —GPS Location Plans
2. BC Peace River Block
   —desire for consistent grid coordinates
3. ERCB Directive 077

D.A. (Al) Jamieson, ALS

CANADIAN BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS
CBEPS continues to be busy. We have now taken on the responsibility of accreditation of the university programs and are currently reviewing the UNB program. We understand BCIT is currently preparing its accreditation submission and an accreditation team must be put in place for a U of C accreditation.

Many exemptions have now expired for numerous educational institutions and we are reviewing many programs and courses.

The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors has left CBEPS and as a result, our annual levies to the associations have had to increase for 2012. We are also increasing the costs for exams and candidate applications.

At the request of seven associations, we have removed hydrography as an elective and placed it as a 12th core exam. We have suggested that our advanced surveying exam be restructured and that we have a surveying exam in the core and an advanced surveying exam as an elective. Most, if not all, survey programs should receive an exemption of the surveying exam in the core. We have sent this request out to all associations and await their response.

During 2011, 307 exams were written, 487 candidates are currently in the system, and 189 candidates received their certificate in Alberta in 2011.

After being involved with CBEPS for the past ten years, and the last four years as the Chairman, it is time for me to move on. I thank all of you, and as of May 31st, inform you that my term on CBEPS is complete.

L.M. (Larry) Pals, ALS
CONVENTION & SOCIAL
The Convention & Social Group is chaired by the executive director with the president and vice-president and others working to plan the AGM. Michelle Woywitka provides administrative support.

The Convention & Social Group worked on the following tasks this year:

1. Golfers enjoyed the sunny skies for the 47th annual golf tournament. Thanks to the generosity of the participants, the J.H. Holloway Scholarship Foundation raised $2,065 through the sale of mulligans and draw tickets. A special thank you to George Smith for his continued support in helping organize the tournament. Congratulations to Hardeep Dhillon, Brian Stecyk, Brian Rolph and Scott Westlund for their win!

2. The 103rd annual general meeting will be held at the Banff Springs Hotel from April 19-21, 2012. This is the Association’s first annual general meeting in Banff since the 100th in 2009.

3. The dates for future AGMs are as follows:
   - 2013: Jasper Park Lodge .........April 18-20
   - 2014: Banff Springs Hotel ......April 24-26
   - 2015: Chateau Lake Louise ....April 23-25

B.E. (Brian) Munday

DISCIPLINE
Between February 8, 2011 and the date of this report being written on February 2, 2012, there were two new complaints lodged with the Alberta Land Surveyors ‘Association.

One complaint, dated February 23, 2011, by a practitioner against another practitioner was withdrawn. The defendant provided a letter of undertaking to the Registrar and the complainant felt that the actions being taken addressed the complaint.

The other complaint, dated September 13, 2011, was also filed by a practitioner against another practitioner. As of the date of this report, the Chairman’s decision had been sent to the complainant and the defendant. The complainant has 30 days to appeal the Chairman’s decision to the Discipline Committee.

There were no complaints outstanding from the previous terms.

B.D. (Brian) Ross, ALS

EXECUTIVE

Chair:
Brian Ross

Vice-Chairs:
Ron Hall
Dirk VandenBrink
Bob Wallace

Members:
Blaine Benson
Paul Dixon
Bill Edgerton
Mike Fretwell
Ron Hall
Mark Kocher
Daniel Lachance
Roger Leeman
Tim Martin
William Mintz
Lee Morden
Floyd Strochinski
Dwight Wiberg
Bruce Winton
It is the role of the Executive Committee to ensure that recommendations from committees and other matters are ready to be presented to Council. This ensures that Council meetings are more efficient and effective and that Council is able to focus on critical issues. As such, most matters that came before the Executive Committee this year were dealt with by Council and Council’s decisions were published in Council Report.

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

The Executive Committee played an important role in prioritizing issues and streamlining matters for Council. At its first meeting of 2011-2012, the Executive Committee identified a number of issues to be dealt with by the Association in the upcoming year. Council assigned some issues to committees while others required more deliberation and debate. The Executive Committee helped Council investigate possible amendments to the ministerial order, the future of the Director of Surveys office and Land Titles, and priorities for public awareness, among other matters.

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

D.R. (David) Thomson, ALS

**HISTORICAL & BIOGRAPHICAL**

The Historical & Biographical Committee was kept busy this year with several commitments. The year started out by having several members of the Committee and other ALS volunteers participating in ceremonies at the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village east of Edmonton on the May long weekend. We were involved in commemorating the 120 years since the settlement of the first Ukrainian settlers in Alberta. The ALSA’s “Making Their Mark” historical exhibit was opened in the village as part of the ceremonies and was displayed there until the end of October 2011. The second ceremony involved the installation of a commemorative survey monument. The monument is a replica of the township monument placed by J.J. McArthur, DLS at the NE corner of township 56-19-W4M in 1883. Several dignitaries, descendants of the first Ukrainian families, and Alberta Land Surveyors took a turn pounding in the post a few inches. Thank you to the many volunteers that helped in this activity, especially those who were involved in digging the pits!
At the present time, we are actively pursuing venues which may be interested in displaying the “Making Their Mark” historical exhibit.

The restoration of the ALSA’s 1912 Driscoll & Knight Edmonton Map was completed and the map is now displayed in the ALSA office.

As mentioned in last year’s report, Claremount House, the home of A.O. Wheeler in Banff, Alberta was demolished. The Committee is participating with other organizations in establishing an interpretive plaque and monument near the site. The location of the site has been secured; however, the design of the monument is still ongoing. A.O. Wheeler was a distinguished land surveyor who, in addition to his many surveys in Western Canada, also served as the Alberta/British Columbia Boundary Commissioner from 1913 to 1925. He was also an avid mountaineer and founding member of the Alpine Club of Canada.

The Committee is in negotiations regarding our contribution to the “Gateway to the Rockies” exhibit at the Whyte Museum in Banff. We are looking to sponsor the “Surveying the Summits” exhibit area and plan on providing a number of artifacts and assistance with an audio-visual display. This ten-year exhibit highlighting the men and women who have contributed to the development of the Canadian Rockies is scheduled to open in May 2012.

During the next year, the Committee plans to conduct more personal interviews with retired and former Association members to ensure that those biographies, survey and other stories that are out there will be preserved. If you would like to be part of this process, please contact any member of our Committee.

The Collections Subcommittee welcomed a new member this past year—Past-President Don George. They are actively cataloguing the survey equipment and memorabilia added to the collection. We would like to thank all the practitioners and companies that have donated equipment and memorabilia to the Association over the years. Please contact the Committee if you’re considering donating any survey equipment to the Association. We’re always looking for more!

We would like to congratulate a member of our Committee, Monroe Kinloch, and the other Alberta Land Surveyors for their participation in the 2011 David Thompson Columbia River Canoe Brigade which started in Invermere, BC on June 3rd and finished in Astoria, Oregon on July 15, 2011, exactly 200 years to the day after David Thompson reached there. This route re-created David Thompson’s historic travels in the Pacific Northwest.

I would like to personally thank all the members of this
Committee and the Collections Subcommittee for their dedication and commitment during the past year and I look forward to working with them in the upcoming year.

L.J. (Les) Frederick, ALS

LEGISLATION AD HOC
During the year 2011-2012, the Committee reviewed the following issues which were requested by Council:

1. The matter of utilizing a digital permit stamp as the primary tool for all surveyor’s corporations and surveyor’s partnerships. Existing rubber stamps would only be issued upon request of the corporation or partnership.

   Following discussion at the Committee, a recommendation was forwarded to Council to proceed with requesting the membership to amend the bylaws to accommodate the proposed changes.

2. The Committee reviewed at length, the matter of changing our Professional Practice Regulation to include professional surveyors from other jurisdictions in Canada, professional engineers within Alberta, professional engineers from other jurisdictions within Canada and other professionals licensed in Canada.

   This very complex issue led the Committee to forward six recommendations to Council for discussion with the membership. The recommendations also included a proposal to require surveyor’s corporations and surveyor’s partnerships to have in place a Professional Practice Management Plan (“PPMP”) for purposes of governing the business and professional interaction of the corporation and the professional(s).

   During our deliberations in Committee, we consulted with the membership through a questionnaire which was responded to by many members.

   We have now forwarded our recommendations to Council for presentation to the membership at the 2012 Annual General Meeting in Banff.

3. Proposed revisions to Section 5 (3) of the Professional Practice Regulation were not completed by the Committee during the 2011-2012 year and will be considered pending the outcome of the six recommendations at the AGM.

4. The Committee spent considerable time reviewing the concept and provisions of a Professional Practice Management Plan (“PPMP”) for purposes of defining the interaction of a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership with a professional surveyor. The outcome of this term of reference will depend on the six recommendations at the AGM.
5. The Committee reviewed the concept of creating a category for non-practicing or inactive members which may be further discussed in Committee during 2012-2013.

6. The Committee was asked to discuss the matter of holding absentia Council elections which will be further discussed during 2012-2013.

L.R. (Len) Olson, ALS

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

For President: C.R. (Connie) Petersen
For Vice President: R.W.M. (Rob) Scott
For Council: M.S. (Mark) Kocher
K.T. (Kevin) Swabey
C.A. (Craig) White

Additional nominations may be made by two Alberta Land Surveyors, with the consent of the nominee in each case, up to February 25, 2012 and at the floor of the Annual General Meeting being held between the dates of April 19th to 21st, 2012 at The Fairmont Banff Springs Hotel

B.D. (Brian) Ross, ALS

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD
The Practice Review Board (PRB) dealt with and closed thirteen of the last fourteen files of Phase 3 of the Systematic Practice Review Program last year. One last SPR file remains open for completion of a follow-up review. Two hearings were held, where practitioners were summoned to appear before the Board to discuss their SPR Phase 3 files.

The CCR program commenced in June 2010 with the opening of fifteen files, and as of February 2012 (20 months into the program) 197 files have been opened and closed. We expect CCR Phase 1 will be substantially complete by the end of 2013. At this time we do not anticipate substantial changes between CCR Phase 1 and CCR Phase 2, although there will be a strong expectation that CCR Phase 2 reviewed practitioners will have completed activities identified in Phase 1. Similarly, in Phase 2 of CCR, there will be an expectation that practitioners will have eliminated or greatly reduced the number of their dormant plans and implemented corrective actions so as to prevent repeating deficiencies identified in Phase 1.

Meetings were held each month (except July) to conduct the Board’s regular business, with six of these meetings be-
ing held online. All practitioners are welcome to attend the Board meeting when their CCR file is reviewed.

The Practice Review Board is meeting its goals as outlined in the terms of reference. The Board’s day-to-day activities are dealt with by Kerry Barrett, Administrative Assistant, who is starting her fifth year with the Board in January 2012. The Director of Practice Review (DPR) has done an excellent job in his first year with the Board. Considerable effort is expended by the Administrative Assistant and Director of Practice Review in sanitizing each of the practitioner’s files before presenting them to the Board. The identities of the reviewed practitioners are successfully concealed through all steps of the CCR, even so far as to conceal the identity of the practitioner from the Chairman signing the final letter.

At his discretion, the DPR employs a contractor to carry out practitioner field inspections. In 2012, the Board will review field checklists utilized by the contract inspectors to ensure consistency and completeness.

Since June 2010, the Board has directed that 17 comprehensive reviews and one second comprehensive review be conducted. Seventeen field inspections have been conducted, and seven of the comprehensive reviews have been closed.

No complaints were forwarded to the Discipline Committee from the Practice Review Board in the 2011-2012 term.

**Common Areas of Non-compliance:**
The Board continues to identify areas of non-compliance that turn up during practitioner reviews, such as substandard field notes, number of dormant plans, lack of equipment calibrations, and number of errors on plans.

Twenty months into the CCR program, only 53% of the ALSs reviewed have an equipment calibration policy, 44% have poor field notes and of the last 75 products 23 of them lacked redundancy.

Analysis of the results of the questionnaire regarding dormant plans to-date indicates 48% have no dormant plans, 37% have 1-25, 12% have 26-100, 3% have 101-250 and 0.4% have 251-500.

Unlike the SPR program, the current CCR program is sustainable, but significant challenges remain for the Practice Review Board and the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. In addition to preserving the public interest, we are all faced with finding means to reduce the number of deficiencies in our products.

*B.W. (Bruce) Gudim, ALS*
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
The Professional Development Committee (PDC) had a fundamentally important year in 2011-2012. The Committee met a total of six times from June 21, 2011 to January 19, 2012. All meetings were held online except for the one on June 21st.

The PDC continued to work in subgroups with each subgroup assigned specific tasks. The subgroups consist of: seminars, Exam Preparation seminars, lunch session seminars, Getting It Right and regional meetings.

By the 103rd Annual General Meeting, the PDC will have held seven stand-alone seminars...

- Exam Preparation, September 17, 2011, Calgary
- Getting it Right, June 23, 24, 2011, Edmonton
- Getting It Right, March 22, 23, 2012, Calgary
- New Technologies, October 25, 2011, Grande Prairie
- Land Titles, February 21, 2012, Calgary
- Field Notes, January 25, 2012, Calgary

... and the AGM seminar in Banff consisting of one keynote speaker and nine one-hour presentations on various topics.

Eight regional meetings will have been held (two each for Lethbridge, Calgary, Edmonton and Grande Prairie).

At the beginning of this term, Council approved the hiring of a professional consultant to develop our strategic plan for the next five years. The consultant was present at the face-to-face kick-off meeting in Red Deer, and promised the Committee many deliverables but, in the end, failed to meet those commitments and the contract was terminated in August 2011.

The Committee did, however, get its own comprehensive report put together, reviewed it, and recommended to Council to create a Director of Education position. This was approved by Council in November 2011. In the future, the Professional Development Committee will meet only once per year as it will act as a focus group to identify priorities, develop learning outcomes and general course content and identify potential presenters. Scott Westlund, as the Director of Education, and Andrea Hafer, as ALSA administrative support, will then implement the professional development program for the Association for the next twelve to eighteen months. The program will be based on the questionnaire circulated to the membership at the AGM.

I would like to thank all the subgroup leads for their dedication to the Committee and Association. I would also like to thank all the members in general for their hard work this year, as we would not have been able to get through this wild year without them!

M.P. (Michael) Lee, ALS
PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS CANADA

So much has happened in 2011 with getting Professional Surveyors Canada up and running. We have many committees and projects under way. The following are some of the performance highlights of our first year.

The Advocacy Committee continues to monitor the LightSquared saga and the detrimental effects it will have on GPS technology. We continue to play a role in an international committee which is providing a unified approach to ensure our GPS is protected. The Advocacy Committee is also working on developing a municipalities’ “best practices” tool kit to be made available to our members in dealing with these clients.

We are rolling out our continuing professional development program across the country. We have run project management seminars in Newfoundland and Edmonton. We hope to have another in Calgary in the not too distant future. We also hope to design and implement new seminars to complement those of the ALSA.

The Professional Association Liaison Committee has been constituted and is very active in dealing with national issues affecting the eleven land surveying associations across Canada.

Our compensation census consultant has received your responses to the questionnaire and is busy compiling the results. This report will be made available to all surveying professionals.

Work continues on enhancing the functionalities of the Professional Surveyors Canada website. Special features include a national job bank, equipment exchange pages and links to interesting articles and news about our members. Be sure to check it out at www.psc-gpc.ca.

The Horizon e-newsletter has been circulating since November. This publication provides additional information and links to stories affecting the profession.

Certain title insurance companies are now promoting a product that they claim will replace a real property report. Professional Surveyors Canada is monitoring the development of this issue through its contacts across Canada and through NSPS in the US.

Our first elections are now behind us and the newly elected board is ready to go to work for you. Please feel free to contact myself or any other Board member to let us know what is on your mind. We will be holding our first annual general meeting in March of 2012. Stay tuned for details as they become available.

Professional Surveyors Canada continues its efforts in improving its new programs, and in communicating our
activities with our members. It will be vitally important to attract additional members in 2012 to support the relevancy of our profession and to be credible when addressing government with our issues. Influence and visibility is a priority initiative in the ALSA, and is also reflected in Professional Surveyors Canada’s broader strategies for advocacy and branding.

Professional Surveyors Canada has asked for a three-year commitment of support from its members to launch and enable the organization to ramp up in being fully operational. We have accomplished so much in the first year with the support we currently have. We are just shy of our membership goal of 300 in the first year. However, it’s going to require much more support to reach the intended goals for advocacy, career enhancement and branding of the profession.

If you add up the time committed by a few Professional Surveyors Canada volunteers and staff working diligently on behalf of its members and the profession, it is in excess of $500,000 annually. With the support you offer by becoming a member, you will have access to half a million dollars’ worth of services relevant to you as a professional surveyor. Higher membership numbers leads to even higher levels of services available to you.

 Barely a year old, Professional Surveyors Canada is already showing encouraging signs of growth and strength. As an organization that has as its primary mandate to serve its number one stakeholder, our members, it is the right organization for surveyors at the right time. With support from all our stakeholders, Professional Surveyors Canada will have a profound impact on the surveying profession in Canada. In case you haven’t noticed, our profession is changing rapidly. Professional Surveyors Canada will be your touchstone for keeping current.

Professional Surveyors Canada extends its sincere appreciation to all members in Alberta who have supported our new fledgling association. Now with a year completed and tangible results for your investment, we hope to retain your support. It is our goal to make the organization more relevant to you, the individual surveyor, and to increase the relevance of the surveying profession to all Canadians. We will need your help in accomplishing our collective goals.

Invest in yourself, the future of your business and the future of your profession. To those who have become charter members in 2011, it is vitally important that you renew your membership and ongoing support for next year. If you have not already taken the step towards membership, now is the time.

R.M. (Bob) Wallace, ALS
The Public Relations Committee had a unique year in 2011-2012, with a lot of changes in direction and scope during the term. Many items on the terms of reference were the same as years’ past but there were some big additions throughout the year.

The main item for the Committee this year was passed down after Council had a public relations brainstorming session with an outside facilitator in response to changes in government and public perception. Council gave the Committee the following objectives:

1. Develop a plan to create a good image of the land surveying profession/the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association in the public eye so that the public calls land surveyors/the ALSA first whenever they have a question about their land or their boundaries.
2. Develop a plan to promote land surveying as a career as a means to growing a strong and vibrant profession.

It was implied during the brainstorming session that an outside consultant may be required to create a plan to carry out these objectives. It had been several years since Rose Country Communication had done polling and created a five-year plan. The Committee was tasked with choosing a consultant that could best serve our needs. The Committee sent out a request for proposal in September to several public relations firms and received five proposals back. A sub-group was formed to narrow down the proposals to two finalists for face-to-face presentations to be made to the entire Committee. The firms were evaluated on cost, timeframe, scope, understanding of our organization, methodology, success evaluation and overall impression of the proposals. Presentations were made in November and Free Advertising really impressed the whole committee with their presentation and previous projects they had taken on. The Committee recommended to Council that Free Advertising do the research and develop a plan for the Association with further costs for implementation of the plan to be determined following establishment of the plan. Council has approved the recommendation to work on the first objective and Free Advertising is currently conducting the research required to create the plan. Council felt that promoting land surveying as a career should not be part of the consultant’s responsibilities and left that objective to the Committee. Council has removed several items from the terms of reference until the plan is established to ensure we are going in the right direction.
Our work with educational institutions was very similar to the previous terms. The University of Calgary Beef and Bun and Career Day were once again successful and had good turnouts. The investigation of the Made to Measure crates with Science Alberta has been put on the back-burner until the public relations plan is established.

As always, members of the Committee are writing public relations articles in ALS News, as well as keeping up with progress being made by our sister associations’ public relations policies. The administration has been busy with updating career websites, sending out and reprinting brochures, distributing the Boundaries newsletter and liaising with Free Advertising during the creation of the public relations plan.

I would like to thank the members of the Committee and the ALSA staff for their time and energy. I think the work that the Committee has done throughout the year will have a lasting impact of the way our Association is perceived by the public for years to come.

N.R. (Nicholas) Ronkso, ALS

REGISTRATION
The Registration Committee, in the 2011-2012 term, had 35 committee members with all different areas of expertise.

The Registration Committee had another busy year fulfilling all statutory duties. Some of those duties are:
• approving articles;
• approving transfer of articles;
• reviewing and approving affidavits of service;
• conducting qualifying examinations;
• assembling and marking written professional examinations;
• reviewing and marking projects reports.

Two annual group interviews were conducted; one in Calgary and one in Edmonton. Both sessions were very well attended and both received very positive reviews from pupils as well as from principals. For those participants from remote locations who have to come to Calgary and Edmonton, just a reminder that annual interview is a mandatory requirement under the Examination & Training Regulation. Pupils and their principals can still request a face-to-face interview if they feel it is needed.

The examination sub-group had a lot of work preparing two sets of professional exams. They did a tremendous job. There were many new questions added to our questions data bank. Marking the exams is a very time-consuming task. Members of the examination sub-group have spent numerous hours ensuring that candidates receive fair results.
Project reports are another responsibility for Registration Committee members. The process has been streamlined during the last few years and both pupils and committee members are doing a better job. The reports are now being submitted electronically which provides some time and cost savings. Some candidates have to submit a request for approval of the topic of their third project report. This duty is usually handled by the chair and vice-chair. The Registration Committee is looking to appoint a committee member who will be a supervisor of the project report subgroup and will be handling those requests.

Generally, the quality of the reports has improved but there are still a few pupils who struggle. The project report guideline should be their resource. The principal’s role during the process is also very important.

The qualifying examination is a very important task for the Committee. We want to make sure all candidates from the entire province are treated in an equal way. The Committee is looking at some ways to improve qualifying exams to ensure it is a fair process to all candidates. Some steps have already been taken. Thank you to all qualifying exam volunteers for attending the exams and thank you to those who became full Committee members.

The Committee conducted a few face-to-face interviews with the pupils and their principals who were falling behind the schedule in their articling process.

The Registration Committee is also responsible for preparing questions for exams for labour mobility candidates. Implementation of online exams is another item on the Committee’s agenda.

During the last term, the Committee discussed many tasks under its terms of reference, particularly the review of the entire articling process. There are some complex issues and the Committee will go back for some more discussions before presenting the proposed changes to the membership.

On behalf of the entire Committee, I would like to thank all ALSA staff for their support and their tremendous effort in supporting Registration Committee during the last year.

Special thanks to Vice-Chair Allan Main for being always on top of all the issues, his great effort in all areas and attendance in all meetings and many qualifying exams.

I would like to thank all members of the Registration Committee for sacrificing many hours of their professional and private life.

Congratulations to all new members who received their commission during the last year and see you all at the AGM in Banff.

P. (Piotr) Strozyk, ALS
RST AD HOC
The RST Ad Hoc Committee was charged with developing two concept documents. The first concept document dealt with outlining what the different roles and responsibilities of Alberta Land Surveyor and survey technologists (whether ASSMT members or not, and whether employed by an Alberta Land Surveyor or not) should be. The second concept document was to outline a model and framework for a partnership between the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and the Alberta Society of Surveying & Mapping Technologies.

The RST Ad Hoc Committee had four online meetings, the first meeting in September and the last meeting in December at which time the two concept documents were finalized and ready to be presented to Council at its January 2012 meeting.

R.W.M. (Rob) Scott, ALS

SAFETY
The Safety Committee continues to be a forum for Alberta Land Surveyors and surveyor’s corporation safety representatives to meet, share information, and research survey specific safety concerns. The main items of note from this year were:

1. New Terms of Reference
Council directed the Committee to develop fresh, survey specific terms of reference for 2011-2012. These terms were drafted at our first Committee meeting and presented to Council.

2. CSA Standard S250
This standard was published in September of 2011 and specifies requirements for mapping of buried utilities. The Committee (namely Hector!) extensively researched, discussed, and published some key points of this standard to the membership. The Committee also purchased this standard from the CSA and the hard copy will be kept in the library for the Association’s use.

3. Enform Chainsaw Committee
The Safety Committee’s participation with Enform has paid off in spades this year as their Chainsaw Committee offered the Association a voting seat. The Safety Committee accepted and has maintained a presence at all of their Chainsaw Committee’s meetings. The Safety Committee held a number of conference calls to discuss proposed motions from Enform and determine a course of action that best represents the Association. While the Association only has a single vote, this can be considered a huge step forward.
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4. Friday Emails and ALS News Articles

The Committee continues to be committed to publishing safety incidents and bulletins for the benefit of the Association. The general structure has been to publish information monthly, whether that be a special safety bulletin (via email), an alert in the Friday E-mail, or an ALS News article.

The safety web page on the Association’s website continues to be active and provides reference information to the membership. The structure still exists for the membership to report safety incidents/near misses. However, the Committee has not seen any reports submitted from the membership at large. We would encourage the membership to do so, all incidents will be strictly confidential and any information published would be purely for the benefit of the membership as a whole.

I would like to thank the volunteers of the Safety Committee for their commitment, honesty and hard work, and would encourage members to volunteer for this committee for 2012 – 2013. I would also like to thank Andrea and Brian for their support, patience, and direction over the past year.

J.A. (Jeff) Adair, ALS

STANDARDS

I am pleased to report we accomplished a lot this year. The terms of reference for the Standards Committee were fairly long. Of the thirteen terms of reference assigned, eight recommendations were completed and submitted to Council for review.

In 2011-2012, the Standards Committee consisted of 29 members from the Association, the Director of Surveys Office, Land Titles and ASSMT, which divided into subgroups to review and discuss the terms of reference assigned by Council.

I would like to thank the Committee members for all their hard work this year.

1. **Address the restoration of witness monuments in trenches in the Manual of Standard Practice.**

A recommendation was forwarded to Council and Council approved the change as a housekeeping matter.

2. **Investigate developing a definition of ‘block’ within the Manual of Standard Practice and then consider clarifying in the MSP the significance of monuments between block corners for plans registered between February 16, 1912 and June 9, 1988.**

A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.
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3. Investigate the possibility of an alternative post for urban subdivisions and the possibility of an alternative post for areas in muskeg or otherwise unsuited to establishing an iron post.

This issue has been carried over in the last two year’s terms of reference of the Standards Committee. There was some discussion, based on manufacturing costs, that maybe we should recommend this item be removed from the terms of reference.

It was decided near the end of the 2011 year that we should poll the membership on their feelings on this issue in the form of a questionnaire. This item will be carried over to the 2012-2013 terms of reference.

4. Review the RPR requirements within the Manual of Standard Practice.

A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

5. Investigate revising Part D, Section 5.2.2 and Part D, Section 5.8.4 of the Manual of Standard Practice to allow for the use of monuments (iron posts, which are shown only on Public Land Disposition plans filed with ASRD).

A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.


This term of reference was a consequence of changing the definition of well at the 2011 AGM. The Committee sent a recommendation to Council that this become a housekeeping item within the Manual of Standard Practice. This recommendation was approved by Council at their December meeting.

7. Develop a document explaining the important changes and dates for Alberta Land Surveyors as a result of the new Enhanced Approval Process and any other related documents.

It was noted that our subcommittee lead met with Sustainable Resource Development to review the EAP working document in November. This item will be carried over to the 2012-2013 terms of reference.

8. Investigate adding oil & gas related information, such as abandoned well site locations, to the subdivision process in the Manual of Standard Practice.

Early in the year, it was reported that several councillors met with the ERCB and were advised that the ERCB is devel-
oping a new process. Our Council liaison commented that consideration will have to be given to possibly amending the Manual of Standard Practice depending on what the process ends up being.

In November, it was reported that the ERCB will be issuing a new directive shortly and that once it has been released the Manual of Standard Practice can be amended. We have yet to see the said directive, so this will be carried over to the 2012-2013 terms of reference.

9. Investigate current standards and practices relating to monumenting intersections, specifically on PLAs, and address any changes.
   A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

10. Investigate if there is a conflict between Part D, Section 7.2 of the Manual of Standard Practice and SUR-3 Section 5 of the Land Titles Procedures Manual in relation to the use of photos with no field inspection to determine natural boundaries.
    There was not much debate on this subject. We felt the concern of the Director of Surveys was probably a unique incident and not a representation of the practices of the general membership. We recommended to Council they remove this from our terms of reference. Council approved removal from terms of reference at their January 26, 2012 meeting.

11. Review the CCOG Proposed Certification of RTK Base Stations Proposal and provide recommendations to Council.
    This term of reference was assigned to the Committee at the January 2012 Council meeting and will be carried over into the 2012-2013 terms of reference. This topic promises to cause much discussion and debate by the new Committee.

12. Investigate how integration is being handled by other provincial associations and make recommendations to Council.
    This term of reference was assigned to the Committee at the January 2012 Council meeting and will be carried over into the 2012-2013 terms of reference.

13. Investigate tracking restorations in the Corner Recordation Index and any possible conflicts with the Manual of Standard Practice, particularly Part C, Section 3.9, and address any issues.
    A recommendation was forwarded to Council for approval for consideration at the AGM.

   J. (John) Lohnes, ALS
1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation?**
   This recommendation arose while discussing the Standards Committee term of reference during the 2010/2011 term to clarify the significance of monuments between block corners. The subgroup, Council, and Director of Surveys all felt that a definition for “block” should be developed before proceeding with the original term of reference. Council added “investigate developing a definition of block within the Manual of Standard Practice” to the term of reference which was carried over to the 2011/2012 term.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
   The word “block” is used in Section 45(5) of the Surveys Act but is not clearly defined in the legislation or the MSP. During the period after February 16, 1912 and before June 9, 1988 the size and shape of a block underwent considerable change. Further problems were created by instances of deficient labeling on registered subdivision plans. This recommendation provides a set of criteria for members to use when interpreting those subdivision plans.

   The recommendation will also facilitate discussion on the original term of reference. Having a clear definition of a block will help determine if further clarification is required to define block corners and the significance of monuments between them.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
   The overall intent of this recommendation is to provide a clear definition for the word “block” to address interpreting Section 45(5) of the Surveys Act.

4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**
   No one outside of the Association membership was consulted for this recommendation.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**
   This recommendation will benefit the public interest by ensuring consistency in how the membership interprets...
subdivision plans registered after February 16, 1912 and before June 9, 1988.

6. What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
No financial costs will be incurred by the ALSA other than updating the MSP.

RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the amendment of Part D, Section 8.5 and Part D, Section 8.8 of the Manual of Standard Practice (Real Property Reports).

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)
The Registrar had expressed concerns with RPR standards that arose with problems voiced to him by various users.

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
The issue of portable sheds was causing users concerns due to different interpretations with what constituted a permanent shed. The recommendation solves the problem by expressly specifying what sheds need to be shown and thus make the RPRs less subject to interpretation.

Regarding revision to Part D, Section 8.5:
The subgroup discussed returning to old standards (pre 2001) of showing all sheds but felt that ignoring stakeholder concerns without consultation was not the way to go. The compromise of showing sheds over a certain size tries to address the concerns of both stakeholders. For municipalities sheds greater than 9.3 square metres require permits (most municipalities) while smaller sheds that are easy to move are not shown unless encroaching which address the main concern for the lawyers and realtors. This also solves the problem that was brought up by the registrar were substantial structures (bunkhouses) are not shown because they are not considered permanent.

Regarding revision to Part D, Section 8.8:
This was changed to agree with the Certification on Page 71 of the MSP and to allow for the possibility of digital stamps and signatures
3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
   The overall intent is to standardize RPRs with respect to sheds.

4. Was anyone outside of the Association consulted? What was their reaction?
   No

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**
   
   **Pro:** This will give the public and profession certainty with respect to sheds.
   
   **Con:** Lawyers, realtors and mortgage lenders may be upset that moveable sheds considered chattel, may be shown and cause problems with the closing.

6. **What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?**
   There is no financial cost to the ALSA and no ongoing financial commitment.

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT** for the motion pertaining to the amendment of Part D, Section 5.2.2 (Reference Boundary) and Part D, Section 5.8.4 (Public Land Dispositions except License of Occupation) in the Manual of Standard Practice.

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation?**
   This recommendation came from a member’s suggestion. The Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association referred this item to the Standards Committee.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
   In the past, plans showing monuments placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act were registered at either the Land Titles Office or the Metis Settlements Land Registry. Since August 1, 2009 some of these plans have been registered at Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (ASRD).

   The Manual of Standard Practice presently does not allow for the use of monuments (statutory iron posts) shown only on plans registered at ASRD for surveys in Unsurveyed Territory that require the relationship to the theoretical township fabric.

   The recommendation allows for this and also helps to bring the Manual of Standard Practice in line with the Director of Surveys’ Dual Plan Registration Policy.
Recommendation #4

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
The intent is allow for the use of monuments (statutory iron posts) shown only on plans registered at ASRD for surveys in Unsurveyed Territory that require the relationship to the theoretical township fabric.

4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted?**
The Director of Surveys provided input but no one outside the membership was consulted.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**
There is no direct effect on the public. However, providing consistent direction to the membership and avoiding the perception of waste improves public confidence in the industry as a whole.

6. **What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta land surveyors’ Association and Alberta land surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?**
The only financial cost is to update the Manual of Standard Practice. There are no ongoing costs associated with this recommendation.

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the amendment of Part C, Section 3.4 (Intersection) and Part D, Section 5.8 (Public Land Dispositions Except License of Occupation) in the Manual of Standard Practice.**

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation?**
A concern was expressed by the Director of Surveys that there may be a perception that intersections do not need to be done or that they can be marked with iron bars now that dual plan registration has been implemented. He commented that there appears to be some members who believe that they only have to post on plans that are registered at the Land Titles Office. As a result, this topic was added to the Standards Committee’s terms of reference by Council.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
The problem we are trying to avoid is having members not monument intersecting boundaries that are defined by statutory iron posts. This recommendation sets a standard of practice which can be used by the membership during their daily practice.
3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   The overall intent of this recommendation is to set a guideline for all Alberta Land Surveyors to use.

4. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
   No, there was no one outside of the Association membership consulted on this recommendation.

5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
   There is no benefit or adverse affect on the public with this recommendation.

6. What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
   The financial costs associated to the ALSA will be the cost to update the Manual of Standard Practice. There will be no costs to the Alberta Land Surveyors as the statutory iron post costs are billed back to the client.

RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the amendment of Part C, Section 5.10 (Restoration of Monuments) in the Manual of Standard Practice.

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)
   This recommendation was a result of a question raised by the Director of Surveys at the January Council meeting.

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
   There could be confusion over the requirements to register an Establishment of Monuments plan when a new statutory monument (Part C Section 3.9) is placed during a restoration of a monument and the information is only recorded in the Corner Recordation Index. Since Part C Section 3 is dealing with Boundaries and Monumentation this is not the correct section to be dealing with the restoration of monuments that are recorded in the Corner Recordation Index. Instead, restorations fall under Part C Section 5: Retracement, Restoration, and Re-Establishment. By adding references to the Corner Recordation Index to Part C Section 5.10, the issue will be clarified.

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   This recommendation clarifies not only the intent of the Corner Recordation Index to provide a free option for sur-
veyors to record restored monuments without the need to register an Establishment of Monuments plan, but also the requirement to record all restorations thru either the Corner Recordation Index or a registered plan of survey.

4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**
   No one outside the Association was contacted.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**
   This recommendation has no affect on the public interest, as it just clarifies a process that is already in place.

6. **What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?**
   There are no financial costs to the Association or its members

---

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT** for the motion pertaining to amending Section 61 of the ALSA bylaws with respect to permit stamps.

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)**
   Council asked the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee to investigate amending the bylaws so that the Association issues a digital permit stamp to all surveyor’s corporations and surveyor’s partnerships and a rubber permit stamp only to those surveyor’s corporations and surveyor’s partnerships who request it.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
   Today, many surveyor’s corporations only use a digital permit stamp. When the surveyor’s corporation is cancelled, the rubber permit stamp is returned to the ALSA office obviously unused. Why does the ALSA go to the time and expense of preparing a rubber permit stamp if they are not always going to be used?

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
   The intent of the recommendation is to make the digital permit stamp the default type of permit stamp. Under Section 25 of the Land Surveyors Act, “…the Registrar shall issue to that corporation or partnership… a stamp engraved as prescribed in the bylaws.”
The ALSA will still issue a permit stamp but it will be an image of the information instead of a rubber permit stamp.

A traditional rubber permit stamp will be provided by the ALSA only if requested. Today, the rubber permit stamp is the default type of permit stamp and a digital permit stamp is approved if requested. The surveyor’s corporation would pay the Association’s cost of ordering the rubber permit stamp and couriering it out.

A surveyor’s corporation would submit their digital permit stamp to the Registrar for approval as is done now. The ALSA would not provide the digital permit stamp to the practitioners because of the different types of CAD programs and formats each practitioner might use.

It would be the practitioner’s choice whether they want to have a rubber permit stamp or a digital permit stamp or both.

4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**
   The Association’s lawyer, David Jardine, was consulted.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**
   The public interest is not affected. It simply codifies the typical practice of many surveyor’s corporations.

6. **What are the financial costs of the recommendation to both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and Alberta Land Surveyors? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?**
   The ALSA office will save time administratively by not being required to order a rubber permit stamp and courier it out to surveyor’s corporations who will never use it. The office time associated with administering the rubber permit stamps may seem like a small item but, over the course of a year, it adds up.

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to revisions to the Professional Practice Regulation.**

The Legislation Ad Hoc Committee is bringing forward a series of motions regarding possible changes to the Professional Practice Regulation.

The membership is being asked to consider the scope of the potential changes. When the membership has provided the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee with the magnitude of the changes it is prepared to consider, then the Committee will go back and work on specific amendments to the regulation.
which will be brought forward to the membership at a future AGM for a vote.

**The Process**

Beginning with Recommendation #2, the membership is asked to consider whether it would be prepared to amend the voting share and director requirements to include different groups of people.

The Legislation Ad Hoc Committee felt that breaking down the issue into several parts would keep the debate focused and manageable.

**Background**

- A member requested that the ALSA review the ownership requirements in the Professional Practice Regulation.
- The membership directed Council to look at the matter at the 2010 AGM under new business.
- The provincial government has expressed concerns regarding the ownership provisions and whether it meets the investment requirements of TILMA.
- A member of the public that employs a land surveyor petitions the ALSA for a permit to practice without resorting to establishing a separate survey company. They requested that the ALSA review the regulation’s ownership requirements.

**Why?**

Not every new business motion gets reviewed by a committee. Not every person who petitions the ALSA gets their request granted. So why is this review being done and why is it coming to the membership at the AGM?

The current provisions of the Professional Practice Regulation have been in place since 1982. They are 30 years old. It is time to determine if they are still in the public interest. Is there a better way to protect the public interest that reflects modern business practices?

The current regulation was designed, first and foremost, to allow surveyor’s corporations to exist and, second, to ensure that Alberta Land Surveyors had some form of control over the practice of land surveying within the corporation. For 30 years, this regulatory structure has worked well.

However, today, a number of things have changed which have created the need for the ALSA to look at and consider whether there is a different way of doing things while still protecting the public. What has changed?

1. More surveyor’s corporations are practicing in multiple jurisdictions.
2. More Alberta Land Surveyors are practicing in multiple jurisdictions.
3. More Alberta Land Surveyors and surveyor’s corporations have formal working relationships with other professionals.
4. More engineering and other companies (Canadian and foreign) have contacted the ALSA about establishing a land surveying practice in Alberta.
5. While some companies establish a separate surveyor’s corporation to meet the current requirements of the Professional Practice Regulation, their online presence may not distinguish between the two entities leading to confusion by the public.

The Existing Professional Practice Regulation
A corporation must meet four criteria in order for it to be registered as a surveyor’s corporation. They are:

1. The name must be appropriate
2. An Alberta Land Surveyor must be designated to take responsibility for the supervision, direction and control of the practice at all material times.
3. It must meet the ownership requirements of the regulation.
4. A majority of the directors must be Alberta Land Surveyors unless there are only two directors in which case one must be an Alberta Land Surveyor.

There is nothing in any of the recommendations that would change points one or two.

The requirements for surveyor’s partnerships are somewhat different but are not dealt with here.

There are two aspects to the ownership requirements within the Professional Practice Regulation. They are:

1. If the corporation has an APEGGA permit to practice, Alberta Land Surveyors and professional engineers must hold a majority of the voting shares of the corporation and Alberta Land Surveyors must hold at least 10% of the voting shares of the corporation.
2. If the corporation does not have an APEGGA permit to practice, Alberta Land Surveyors must hold a majority of the voting shares of the corporation.

What do others do?
Some jurisdictions, like British Columbia, have stricter requirements for surveyor’s corporations. Others, like Manitoba, do not expressly allow surveyor’s corporations to exist.

The engineering profession does not have ownership requirements in order for an engineering corporation to have
an APEGA permit to practice; instead the corporation must have in place a document called a professional practice management plan which outlines how the professional and the corporation intend to interact.

The Alberta Legal Profession Act strictly limits ownership of corporate shares to lawyers and their families.

In the pharmacist profession, there is the proprietor, who may or may not be a pharmacist, and is responsible for the business portion of the pharmacy. Then there is a licensee who must be a pharmacist and is responsible for the day-to-day operation of the pharmacy.

As you see, professional corporations are dealt with in a variety of ways within professions and across Canada.

What has the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee done?

The Legislation Ad Hoc Committee was asked to review the Professional Practice Regulation in 2010. It spent a considerable amount of time researching the issue and debating different options.

In 2011, the Committee put forward a recommendation to the membership that proposed replacing the ownership and director requirements under the Professional Practice Regulation with a governing document between the Alberta Land Surveyor and the surveyor’s corporation called a professional practice management plan.

At the 2011 AGM, the membership referred the recommendation back to Council and committee for involvement and discussion with all stakeholders.

The Committee made presentations to each of the four regional meetings in 2011. The Committee also sent a questionnaire to the membership in fall 2011 asking for its feedback. There were 185 responses. Some of the key results were:

- 56.1% supported the concept of a professional practice management plan.
- 53.2% of decided responders felt that all surveyor’s corporations should be required to have a professional practice management plan.
- The membership was evenly split as to whether the best way to regulate a surveyor’s corporation was through voting shares only, a professional practice management plan only, or voting shares and a professional practice management plan.

With all of the feedback received, the Committee decided to break down the recommendation into different components to make the discussion more focused and manageable.
New Members 2011-2012

R.J. (Rheal) Bourgouin, ALS
R. (Ron) Bridges, ALS
I.D.R. (Ian) Cleland, ALS
J.A. (Joel) Corcoran, ALS
A.A. (Tony) de Bruyne, ALS

R. (Ryan) Dobson, ALS
M.A. (Michal) Dudek, ALS
C.M. (Christopher) Fox, ALS
J.A. (Andrew) King, ALS

M.A. (Mackenzie) Lee, ALS
P. (Peter) Lund, ALS
C.B. (Cody) Moser, ALS
H.L. (Hector) Muniz, ALS
R.M. (Ryan) Pals, ALS

D.S. (Davinder) Parmar, ALS
N.L. (Nathan) Prins, ALS
T.R. (Tyler) Robinson, ALS
J. (Jennifer) Rosenkranz, ALS
Charge to New Members
by Larry Pals, ALS

I now ask all the new members to look around the room. As each of you look around, I would like you to observe a number of different things.

First, about half of the faces that you are looking at are fellow land surveyors, some of whom are from other provinces and other countries. These fellow land surveyors are your mentors and your peers. As you proceed through your career, make sure that you contribute to these peers by actively participating in the Association and by being an excellent land surveyor. Do not be afraid to ask questions of any one of them.

Second, I want you to recognize your family, your friends, your classmates, your articling surveyors and your study partners. They were all very instrumental in assisting you in receiving your ALS commission here today.

Third, as you look around, you will see past and present Council members and also members of the Association staff. Remember that the Council and staff are here to assist you in your career. Call one of them if you have a question or would like to express an opinion. It is your future participation that will help to keep our Association strong.

Finally, as you look around, I would like you to see a society. The faces in this room represent the society that you serve and the one that has empowered you to be an Alberta Land Surveyor. As you perform your duties throughout your career, remember that your role is not just to crunch numbers and apply mathematical solutions to problems. Your role is to use the appropriate tools to gather and assess evidence with the end result being to reconstruct a boundary in the best location of the original that the nature of the case permits. That is your responsibility to society.

Don’t feel intimidated; this is your Association; get involved.

Congratulations on becoming newly commissioned Alberta Land Surveyors. A wonderful and rewarding career awaits all of you.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to publicly recognize this excellent class of new land surveyors. I feel extremely honoured.
### 25 Year Pin Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>ALS/Ret.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.L. (Bill) Edgerton</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.J. (Bernie) McKenna</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.S. (Les) Meher</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.W.M. (Rob) Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.D. (John) Stephens</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.C. (Paul) Stoliker</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.W. (Dave) Strachan</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.E. (Bruce) Winton</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Messrs. Mark Prevost, John Wallace and Jim Woods were not able to attend the past-president’s breakfast to receive their 25 year pins.

### 50 Year Pin Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>ALS/Ret.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.J. (Hans) Nederveen</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALS (Ret.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Messrs. Bill Dabbs, John Horn and Stephen Nagy-Gyorgy were not able to attend the past-president’s breakfast to receive their 50 year pins.
Council may award honorary life membership to any Alberta Land Surveyor or retired member who has rendered signal service to the Association and the betterment of society.

This year, Council decided to present an honorary life membership to one very deserving candidate.

Our newest honorary life member has been a member of the ALSA staff and, just when we thought he was going to retire, he decided to run for vice-president and president of the Association.

Don George began his surveying career in 1966 and received his survey technology diploma from NAIT in 1969.

He articled to Hugo Engler and received ALS commission #397 in 1975. He was manager at W.D. Usher & Associates in Camrose and started Cam-Alta Surveys Ltd. in 1984. In 1994, he joined the ALSA as Assistant to the Director of Practice Review and became Acting Director of Practice Review in November 2007.

Don George served on the ALSA Council from 1988 to 1990 and, again as vice-president, president and past-president from 2008 to 2011. Over the years, he has been a member of various committees and sub-committees of the ALSA (Standards and Legislation Ad Hoc to name a few). He is currently on the Historical & Biographical Committee.
In June 1980, Sharon Armstrong began work with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. In ten days’ time, after 32 years with the Association, she will begin her retirement.

Now just to put that in perspective, 32 years with the ALSA means 391 newly licensed Alberta Land Surveyors, 32 presidents, 110 Council members, three executive directors, countless staff, and 128 issues of ALS News. Many of you first met or heard from her when you were articled pupils. You particularly heard from her if you didn’t get a report in on time and, if you were on the Registration Committee, you really heard from her if you didn’t get the report marked on time!

There is not one member of this Association who has not served on a committee with Sharon, written an ALS News article for an issue she was preparing, or called to ask her for help with that unusual question that no one else could answer.

Sharon has been so dedicated and loyal to the Association over the years that she even named her second daughter so she had the initials ALS.

Former Executive Director Ken Allred offered the following comment:

In accepting a position with the ALSA, Sharon stated that she preferred a small busy office to the large corporate firms she had worked with previously. Certainly her experience with those larger firms paid off for the Association but it was Sharon’s ability to work independently and accept new challenges that achieved the greatest rewards.

The early 1980s were the times of computerization and modern typesetting for ALS News and Sharon picked up those new skills without hesitation. As an example, it is worthwhile to go through the volumes of ALS News from the late 1970s to the present as a testament to Sharon’s talent. Likewise with all of the Association’s publications—brochures, the annual report, membership directory—they all bear her fingerprint as their primary designer and publisher.

When Sharon started, the ALSA office was located just off of 149 Street, and was only 1,000 square feet, consisting of a reception area, board room, one executive office and a mailing/work room. With the arrival of Sharon’s second daughter Amy, her job was split into two half-time positions and soon evolved into one full-time position and a half-time position. From there it has grown to its present size, which has allowed Sharon to specialize in the publication field which she has perfected for the ALSA over 30 years.

Sharon also developed fantastic skills as a conference organizer, planning all the details of the annual ALSA convention, as well as numerous seminars, luncheons, regional meetings and the annual golf tournament. For many years she worked closely with the Convention Committee, making all of the arrangements and looking after all the details to ensure that our annual meetings went off without a hitch.

Sharon has a great memory, and an ability to track down the most obscure files from years ago based on the faintest clues as to approximate date and subject matter. Despite a few changes in filing systems and the occasional culling of files, she had an uncanny sense of locating those hidden gems from long ago.

It would not be right to let Sharon retire without a proper send-off and recognition so, David Marquardt, Al Nelson, Don George and Jim Halliday got together to nominate Sharon for honorary membership in the Association—a motion unanimously approved by Council.
List of Exhibitors and Sponsors

EXHIBITORS:
Abacus Datagraphics Ltd
Airborne Imaging Inc.
Bench-Mark.ca GNSS Equipment
Brandt Tractor
Butler Survey Supplies Ltd.
Cansel Survey Equipment
Carlson Software
Choice Survey & Construction Supplies
Corpro Canada Inc.
D.W. Technologies Ltd.
Fuji Tecom Inc. Fuji Locators Ltd.
Gemini Positioning Systems Ltd.
Hilti Canada Inc.
IHS Canada
Jardine Lloyd Thompson Canada Inc./ENCON
Jones Brown Inc.
Microsurvey Software Inc.
Mountainview Systems Ltd.
Oce-Canada Inc.
Phoenix Imaging Calgary
Pioneer Offroad Rentals
Russel Metals Inc.
Spatial Technologies Partnership Group
SPONSORS:

**Diamond—$2,000+**
Can-Am Geomatics Corp.

**Platinum—$1,500+**
Butler Survey Supplies Ltd.
Can-Am Geomatics Corp.
Midwest Surveys Inc.
Trimble Navigation Limited
Universal Surveys Inc.

**Gold—$1,000+**
Challenger Geomatics
Focus Corporation
Valtus Imagery Services

**Silver—$500+**
Abacus Datagraphics Ltd.
Airborne Imaging Inc./CLHB Exploration Services
ATCO Electric
Caltech Surveys Ltd.
Fairmont Banff Springs Hotel
Longhorn Geomatics Limited
Menzies Printers Ltd.
Russel Metals Inc.
Quest Geomatics Inc.

**Bronze—$100+**
Alberta Geomatics Inc.