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### 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. Youngs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>E.J. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>G.C. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>R.A.F. Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>T. Okamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>M.L. Sexauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>J.W. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>R.J. Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>J. Deyholos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>R.A. Bassil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>J.E. Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>B.R. Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>W.R. Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>R. McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>A.D. Hosford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>R.E.D. McCuaig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>L.W. Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>G.E. Olsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>I.C. Maltais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>S.M. Loeppky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>G.L. Haggerty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>R.F. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>H.E. Impey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>L.H. Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>J.H. Holmlund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>W.R. Dabbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>S.J. Longson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>D.R. Jaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>L.M. Pals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>G.K. Allred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>D.R. McWilliam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>J.G. Halliday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>A.W. Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>S.C. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>D.H. VandenBrink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>R.M. Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>R.O. Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>D.R. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>B.D. Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>D.R. Thomson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>C.R. Petersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>R.W.M. Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>D.A. Jamieson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>G.A. Boggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>F.S. Cheng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fred Cheng, ALS  
President 2016-2017
### Attendance

Based on members who were registered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE MEMBERS</th>
<th>Haagsma, Bob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adair, Jeffrey</td>
<td>Hagen, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akehurst, William</td>
<td>Haggerty, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td>Gudim, Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longson, Stan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RETIRED MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td>Hagen, Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lantz, Donald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McArthur, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARTICLED PUPILS</strong></td>
<td>Dolan, Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geba, Jaroslav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hickaway, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horneman, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, Danielle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krawchuk, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Le, Duong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machon, Bradly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFFILIATE MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td>Bruce, Doug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simmonds, Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSOCIATE MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td>Erick, Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heilman, Raymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HONORARY MEMBERS</strong></td>
<td>Ballantyne, Brian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>Active Members...........................................198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary Life Members ..................................2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired Member ...........................................7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articled Pupils .........................................22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affiliate Member .........................................2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Members .......................................3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary ....................................................1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong> ..................................................235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESIDENT
Mike Fretwell

VICE PRESIDENT
W. Bruce Clark

PAST PRESIDENT
Fred Cheng

SECRETARY TREASURER
Bruce Drake (2016-2019)

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL
Sandy Davies (2016-2019)
Colin Keir (2016-2019)
Carl Larsen (2015-2018)
John Lohnes (2016-2018)
Michael Louie (2017-2020)
Ryan Pals (2017-2020)

PUBLIC MEMBER
Russel Barnes (Council)

REGISTRAR
Rosalind Broderick

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Brian Munday

DIRECTOR OF PRACTICE REVIEW
Scott Westlund

OFFICE STAFF
Kerry Barrett ........................................... Administrative Assistant
Kathy Dicks ........................................................ Accountant
Dawn Phelan ........................................... Executive Assistant
Michelle Woywitka ........................ Administrative Assistant
Committees—2017-2018

STATUTORY COMMITTEES

**Discipline Committee**
- Chairman Fred Cheng, ALS
- Council Liaison n/a

**Practice Review Board**
- Chairman Dwayne Edmundson, ALS
- Council Liaison Colin Keir, ALS

**Registration Committee**
- Chairman Robyn Graham, ALS
- Council Liaison Sandy Davies, ALS

STANDING COMMITTEES

**Boundary Panel**
- Chairman Dirk VandenBrink, ALS
- Council Liaison Carl Larsen, ALS

**Communications & Public Relations**
- Chairman Gayle Noonan, Pupil/ALSA
- Council Liaison Mike Fretwell, ALS
- Council Liaison Bruce Clark, ALS

**Executive Committee**
- Chairman Mike Fretwell, ALS
- Council Liaison n/a

**Legislation Committee**
- Chairman Steven Van Berkel, ALS
- Council Liaison Bruce Drake, ALS

**Nominating Committee**
- Chairman Fred Cheng, ALS

**Professional Development Committee**
- Chairman Scott Westlund, ALS
- Council Liaison Michael Louie, ALS

**Standards Committee**
- Chairman Nicholas Madarash, ALS
- Council Liaison John Lohnes, ALS

WORKING GROUP

**RPR Working Group**
- Chairman Ryan Pals, ALS
- Council Liaison John Lohnes, ALS
Proceedings

of the 108th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association held at the Jasper Park Lodge on April 21st and 22nd, 2017

President Fred Cheng welcomed everyone to the 108th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. He asked the membership to rise for the national anthem.

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

President Fred Cheng announced that the parliamentarian for the 108th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association would be past-president Larry Pals and Robert’s Rules of Order would be followed.

President Fred Cheng advised that active and honorary life members may propose motions and resolutions and vote on all issues. Honorary members cannot propose motions or resolutions and cannot vote. However, they may engage in the discussions relative to the motions and resolutions before the assembly. Retired members may propose motions and resolutions and vote on all matters except those that affect professional legislation. Articled students, affiliate members, and associate members may not propose motions or resolutions but may discuss and vote on all matters except the elections and issues pertaining to professional legislation and standards of practice. Everyone was encouraged to participate in the discussion – including the new members, students and visiting delegates representing their respective associations.

Council and the public member on Council were introduced and thanked for their support and effort over the past year.

Rudy Palovcik, who served as the public member on the Practice Review Board for nine years until his term ended in December, was thanked for his valuable contributions.
Eric Quesnel, Director of Operations at the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge was introduced and brought greetings to the assembly.

Guests and visiting delegates were introduced as follows:  
**Brian Brown, President**  
Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors  
**Robert G. King, President**  
Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association  
**Gary Fraser, President**  
Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors  
**Russ Hogan, President**  
Association of Ontario Land Surveyors  
**David Parkhill, President**  
Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors  
**Kevin Brown, President**  
Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors  
**John Berghuis, President**  
Association of Newfoundland Surveyors  
**Rob Pinkerton, Council Member**  
Association of Canada Lands Surveyors  
**Wilson Phillips, Chair**  
Professional Surveyors Canada  
**Hal Janes, Alberta Director**  
Professional Surveyors Canada  

The following individuals were also introduced:  
**Steve Dixon, President and Darryl Larson, Past-President**  
Alberta Society of Surveying & Mapping Technologies  
**Steve Hrudy, President**  
Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta  
**Derek Lichti and Mike Barry**  
University of Calgary Department of Geomatics Engineering  
**Allan Theriault**  
NAIT  
**Rob Scott**  
BCIT  
**Ravi Shrivastava, ALS**  
Director of Surveys  
**Reid Egger, ALS**  
Director of Surveys Office  
**Richard Schlachter, Executive Director**  
Service Alberta Land Titles and Surveys  
**Nada Belhadfa and Marc St-Jacques**  
Notarius  
**David Jardine, Association legal counsel**  
Shores Jardine
Mark Hatcher, Alberta Regional Manager  
Natural Resources Canada  
Andrew Brebner, Client Service Unit Manager  
Surveyor General’s Office

President Fred Cheng also welcomed honorary life members Bruce Gudim and Stan Longson, retired members Jack Hagen, Don Lantz, David McArthur, Mike Michaud, George Moore, Rob Scott and Allan Theriault, affiliate members Doug Bruce and Terry Simmonds and associate members Kelly Erick, Ray Heilman and Greg Martin.

The assembly rose to observe a moment of silence in memory of the following:
Ed Scovill, ALS #328, who passed away May 27, 2016
Jim Berry, ALS #450, who passed away August 10, 2016
Honorary Life Member, Bill Turner, ALS #193, who passed away November 20, 2016
Murray Ingalls, ALS #275, who passed away December 3, 2016
Don Sandham, ALS #312, who passed away December 15, 2016

President Fred Cheng pointed out that on page 100 HIS plans should read IHS plans, on page 113 Thouria Chamoun’s name was spelled incorrectly and on page 180 new member Alex Spivak’s name was spelled incorrectly.

It was MOVED by Mr. Larry Pals, seconded by Mr. Ross Woolgar, that the 2016 Report of Proceedings be adopted as amended.

Motion Carried

President Fred Cheng delivered the following address to the assembly:

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the 108th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. It has been a full and demanding year. Council, committees and working groups have worked hard and yet unfinished business and significant challenges continue to lay ahead. I am deeply grateful for the many volunteers who passionately contribute to this Association. My thanks to the Association staff, their hard work and dedication are also gratefully appreciated. My sincere gratitude to all of you.

I had the privilege and honour to represent our Association while working with our members and professional peers.
across Canada. I enjoyed meeting and working with many members, affiliates, articling pupils and other Canadian land surveyors. The enthusiasm, the passion and the wisdom of professional surveyors is phenomenal. I cherish the memories and friendships built throughout my term as your president. I have been rewarded and I encourage others with a passion to serve to volunteer as well. There are volunteer forms inside the AGM recommendation package on page 71 and 72 and if you need information, please seek me out so I can provide a personal insight to each of the committee’s terms of reference to you.

The unpredictable political climate south of the border continues to “trump” our Canadian economy. The abolishing of the Trans-Pacific Partnership by the United States impacted all countries who ratified this partnership along the Pacific Rim, including Canada. Our Association is impacted by this and other global events, especially when demand and resource prices have taken their toll, which directly impacts Alberta’s economy and land surveying professionals.

The Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors (CBEPS) in conjunction with the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors (ACLS) proposed a foreign credential recognition initiative. I am not alone in rejecting the proposal. The proposal would enable one to enter into our profession with little understanding of our Canadian surveying practice. Individuals such as these find their way into decision-making offices and because of their lack of Canadian experience begin advocating impractical processes impacting our industry and deteriorating the public good. It concerns me that CBEPS continues to struggle under the applicant assessment workload, while Quebec and Ontario remain on the sidelines as observers. The 2016 revision to the accreditation process has resulted in Canadian applicants being turned away in spite of excellent lengthy Canadian land surveying experience. Applicants with local knowledge and experience should have precedence over international applicants with cartography or photogrammetry degrees and no Canadian experience.

We have several Canada-wide industry challenges, which deserve your attention. One is our aging demographic and declining membership within the land surveying profession in the Maritimes, which poses a lasting butterfly effect to this profession. There was significant talk about the merging of the Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors
with their provincial professional engineers. This merging is causing myself and other sister association presidents a great deal of concern. Had this idea not been rejected at their 2017 Annual General Meeting, would the other land surveyors associations still see themselves as a self-governing entity in the long term? I ask this question because the stage would have been set for others to follow suit with a domino effect. At the moment, the surveying profession across Canada consists of approximately 3,500 professional surveyors with few articling students to replenish the dwindling number due to attrition. I personally see the need for a proactive approach towards unifying all land surveyors across Canada into a national body. It is now time to think of unity, before regulators tell us what to do and where to join with which organization.

A second industry concern is the use of the word “geomatics.” Geomatics has become a popular term commonly used by professional land surveying companies across Canada but it is now being taken up by others such as construction surveyors, seismic surveyors and the like. The public could mistakenly contact unlicensed entities when requiring site plans, property line surveys or construction layouts relative to property boundaries. Black and white distinctions are easily blurred, making it necessary for each of us to seriously carry out our ethical duty to educate the public and other stakeholders on the distinction between legal surveying and geomatics services.

The Order/Association of Quebec Land Surveyors (L’ordre des Arpenteurs-Géomètres du Québec) is contemplating to change its association’s name from “arpenteurs-géomètres” (Association of Quebec land surveyor) to “géomètres expert” (Association of Quebec expert surveyor). One of the reasons is to avoid the public’s confusion between the term “arpenteur” (surveyor) which is being used by field technicians and construction workers handling survey instruments and “arpenteurs-géomètres” (the Quebec land surveyor). Their membership will vote on the name change this June.

Perhaps this coming year is a high time to make some changes to our Land Surveyors Act and our Association. Among other housekeeping chores, we could clean up our legislation. We need to have the term “geomatics” defined within our act. As well, we need a name for our Association that represents our expertise, for instance, by adding the word “professional” to our Association’s name. I expect our incoming president to take up this challenge and I expect all...
practitioners to provide their necessary support to move this forward.

My vision is for Alberta to have a province-wide, government-run, complete active control network, prior to contemplating any further co-ordinate cadastre concepts. Let’s “put the horse back in front of the cart.” In addition to the obvious cadastral fabric applications, complete active control coverage would put Alberta in a position to support technical innovations as they arise; such as, autonomous vehicles, smart cities and other scientific endeavours.

Albertans deserve to have their land rights protected with good boundaries. This province needs an effective and efficient venue to resolve boundary uncertainties as they arise. I have initiated and am proposing an alternate process in addition to the current Section 9 errors investigation provision within our Surveys Act. Once implemented, I am confident that this option for boundary adjudication will provide the public with a definitive and yet efficient way towards resolving their boundary issues that the public deserves.

As Gord Stark, Past President of the ACLS said, “Times are a-changin’, surveyors don’t you know it.” Over the past year, I have observed that operations of our Association have been stuck in our “traditional” ways. Fellow Alberta Land Surveyors, it is time to make changes to our legislation, bylaws, our policy manual and our standards of practice and bring this profession forward!

Provincial boundaries segregate our provinces, yet we all share similar issues, concerns and challenges. Through presidential travel, I saw first-hand how the Director/Controller of Surveys in Saskatchewan imposed stringent rules and policies on their membership without much consultation with their Association. I also observed that Newfoundland & Labrador has eliminated their Director of Surveys position, similarly Manitoba followed suit by abolishing their Director of Surveys position last year. Will other provinces follow suit? You can be certain there will be. There needs to be a serious and genuine paradigm shift, for me to believe the same outcome would not be in the public’s best interest in Alberta.

I am delighted to see so many familiar faces at this year’s AGM and I look forward to your usual vigorous and enlightened participation during our business meeting. At the same time, I look forward to your camaraderie during
the evening festivities. I hope many of you can join me in the hospitality suite this evening – where the real business happens.

Thank you.

President Fred Cheng presented Greg Hebb with his certificate since he was unable to attend the New Members Lunch.

President Fred Cheng invited the principals of articling students to introduce themselves and their pupils.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Dave Marquardt, seconded by Mr. Ross Woolgar, that the committee reports for 2016-2017 be received as circulated.*

**Motion Carried**

President Fred Cheng asked Registrar Rosalind Broderick to come to the podium to conduct the last call for nominations.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick 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 AGM committee reports and recommendations package.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick stated that the Nominating Committee put forward the name of Mike Fretwell for the position of President of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2017-2018.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick asked if there were any further nominations for the position of president for 2017-2018.

Mr. Ross Woolgar nominated Mr. Fred Cheng for the position of president. The nomination was seconded by Mr. Ryan Smith.

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

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

**Motion Carried**
Registrar Rosalind Broderick informed the assembly that Messrs. Fretwell and Cheng will have seven minutes to address the membership before the vote is held tomorrow.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick announced that the Nominating Committee had one nomination, Mr. Bruce Clark, for the position of vice-president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2017-2018.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick asked if there were any further nominations for the position of vice-president for 2017-2018.

It was MOVED by Mr. Bruce Gudim, seconded by Mr. Arlin Amundrud, that nominations for the position of vice-president cease.

Motion Carried

Registrar Rosalind Broderick congratulated Mr. Bruce Clark and informed the assembly that even though there is no election, Bruce will still have an opportunity to speak to the membership.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the names of Mr. Arlin Amundrud, Mr. Michael Louie and Mr. Ryan Pals for the two positions of councilor.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick asked if there were any further nominations for the position of councilor.

It was MOVED by Mr. Ross Woolgar, seconded by Mr. Bruce Gudim, that nominations for the position of councilor cease.

Motion Carried

Registrar Rosalind Broderick informed the assembly that each candidate will have three minutes to address the membership during the elections in the morning.

President Fred Cheng asked the exhibitors to introduce themselves and their firm.

Mr. Al Jamieson informed the assembly that he would like to speak to the recent nomination for president. He got the endorsement of twelve past-presidents that find the process disrespectful to the 107-year tradition. They would like to say that they endorse the process and they endorse the
individual. The existing vice-president has exhibited good character, is more than capable of carrying the flag for the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, they support him and as he said feel that it is disrespectful to the process and want to voice that support for Vice-President Mike Fretwell.

President Fred Cheng responded that at the 2014 AGM there was a motion that tried to put forward the vice-president straight into the president’s position. At that time there were many respected Alberta Land Surveyors who came up to a floor microphone and expressed their disapproval so, having said that, everything is in order.

Secretary-Treasurer Bruce Drake reminded the assembly that if there was a bottle of scotch on his desk the information would be presented by interpretive dance but it is incorrect that he will be doing it by interpretive dance. More accurately, the financials will be presented with the assistance of Nicole Koebel and the Jasper Dance Program. He invited them to come and kick off the 2017 AGM financial presentation. The Jasper Dance Program performed to “Money” from Cabaret by Alan Cumming.

Secretary-Treasurer Bruce Drake informed the assembly that the review engagement report was in the information package. It is an historical document at year end last year. Things have changed since. It is presented for information.

_It was MOVED by Mr. David Hagen, seconded by Mr. Larry Pals, that the 2015-2016 Review Engagement report be received._

**Motion Carried**

Secretary-Treasurer Bruce Drake informed the assembly that they were there for review and pointed out that they were a bit outdated as they were part of the AGM package that was issued over a month ago. The Association is doing okay.

Secretary-Treasurer Bruce Drake informed the assembly that he was going to speak to it in a bit more detail. It was his first budget with Council and as Secretary-Treasurer. It is a hold-the-line budget. There are no massive increases in fees. They did not undertake any large new programs in the budget. It is pretty much the status quo. A carry over of what was spent last year formed the budget for this year.
Changes in the budget include the 2016-2017 one-time dues abatement strategy for members who were unemployed and just between employment positions. The Council of the day adopted a strategy whereby a portion of the fees would be abated until such time as the member found employment or it was time for the next year’s fees. Because of that, the fee revenue dropped by about $20,000 that year. This year, Council has adopted a dues abatement policy whereby when members apply for dues abatement a fund has been established to cover the lost revenue that was budgeted for. The fund is going to be funded by an annual levy on the fees until the fund reaches $20,000, approximately one year’s abatement.

The operating revenue was budgeted to mirror last year’s. *ALS News* advertising is down to mirror last year’s actuals due to the economy and lost advertising. The convention levy is based upon projected membership numbers. Other things that have gone down in the budget are AGM revenue, which has been reduced to reflect actual numbers so there will be a corresponding change in AGM expenses. If less money is made at the AGM, less money is spent at the AGM. The budget for marker posts and iron posts has been reduced because fewer have been sold. Posts did very well this year, about 103 percent of the budgeted amount. Marker posts are down to about 70 to 73 percent. With the reduction in revenue is also the reduction in expense for purchasing those items. Exam fees are going to be down this year and that is a reflection of fewer students writing exams and moving from three to two exams. Fewer exams and fewer students means lower income from that. Regional meeting revenue translates to a regional meeting expense.

The budgeted investment revenue is outside of the Association’s direct control. The number is based upon information from Logan Wealth Management and Julie Brough who was amongst the exhibitors. They are trying to manage the investments very conservatively.

In previous years they have talked about things like new initiatives such as digital signature authentication through Land Titles. There is nothing in the budget to account for any proposed revenue from that. The program has not been implemented so they are not expecting to budget for any income from that.

Regarding administration, five years ago a new database system was implemented. At that time, a five-year zero-
dollar maintenance fee was agreed upon with the supplier. That five years is now over so they are spending more money on database management.

Contract work has gone up as the Association has changed from an employee bookkeeper to a contract bookkeeper but salaries have gone down.

The President’s expenses are going up this year because PEI will be holding its AGM and they only do it every two years.

In summary, some of the numbers are from his March presentation so they may be a little out of date. The Association budgets on a zero profit and loss basis. Any profit the Association makes goes into the stabilization fund. Any years with a deficit comes out of the financial stabilization fund.

They are budgeting on taking about $129,000 out of the fund. For comparison, in 2015 the Association put about $300,000 into the stabilization fund. In any given year there are always going to be pluses and minuses to the fund in incoming money to the fund and outgoing money from the fund based on how the Association is performing.

Last year he said during his speech that, as the only person running for secretary-treasurer, if there was no alternative funding in place there was only one place that he was going to get money from and that was the members’ pockets. At the time there is no alternate funding program that has been adopted. However, that will be part of some other presentations. There are no income or expenses in regards to alternative funding.

Mr. Westlund asked him to point out that the Boundary Panel is currently in a deficit position. When the report was made to government there was an approximate minus $57,000 in the Boundary Panel account. However, he is going to work very, very hard to keep doing the work that the Boundary Panel can do with its current funding and get the negative number into a zero position by the next reporting period.

Mr. Bruce Clark requested that Secretary-Treasurer Bruce Drake speaks to the line item for bank charges and management fees.
Secretary-Treasurer Bruce Drake replied that it is mostly credit card processing fees of about $20,000. There is a cost to the Association for processing those transactions. He would like to discuss with Council this year the possibility of having a credit card convenience fee. As an Association they should be looking to recover the costs for that convenience. The general membership should not be funding some members holidays.

Mr. David Marquardt commented that the ministerial order is very much tied to the financials. He asked what the status is of it right now. President Fred Cheng asked Mr. David Marquardt to hold his question until after Mr. Ravi Shrivastava has spoken.

Secretary-Treasurer Bruce Drake responded that the funding received from the ministerial order is important and it forms a significant portion of the budget. That is why having an alternative funding stream in place is something that they are seriously going to continue to work on.

Mr. Jason Paziuk requested clarification on the office lease. The expiry for the lease is in 2024. He wondered why the Association would lock in the lease for another ten years if they were not sure which way the economy was going in 2014. There is another $205,000 budgeted for lease and office costs. It looks like the lease payments are about $100,000 per year. He wondered if that was correct and what the reason would be for locking it in for a period of ten years.

Mr. Brian Munday responded that in 2014 the Association did renew its lease for a further ten-year period. At that time the Association was at a bit of a crossroads as there was a bit of a downturn but they were expecting that it would go up but obviously it did not and there is still the downturn. They looked at the potential costs of having to move to different premises versus staying where the Association is. They also looked at downsizing the existing premises and reducing the square footage by twenty to twenty five percent. The decision at that time was to keep things where they were. In retrospect, if they had known that 2016-2017 was going to be the way that it turned out they probably would have made a different decision. With the information they had at that time, the dynamic of office space in Edmonton was kind of odd at that time in that whether the Association was in an office space in downtown Edmonton versus the south side, versus the west end
the costs were all virtually going to be the same. That was the information that was presented to Council and that was the decision of Council at that time.

Mr. Jason Paziuk also wondered if there were any other alternatives than the ten-year lease at that time.

Mr. Brian Munday responded that yes, there were but the discount that they were prepared to offer at ten years was a better deal than what they were prepared to offer at five years. Based on that, the decision was made to go for the ten-year lease.

President Fred Cheng asked Mr. Wilson Phillips, chair of Professional Surveyors Canada to provide an update on some of the activities they are embarking on.

Mr. Wilson Phillips informed the assembly that they started issuing quarterly reports regarding what they are working on and the courses they are doing.

Especially from Alberta and British Columbia, there was an impetus for responding to the C-46 regulations and the Underground Infrastructure Safety Enhancement Act and other regulatory changes that were happening at the NEB. They did an immense amount of work on the underground infrastructure issues and they dealt with the NEB and ministers in responding to those matters. There were many volunteers in the audience and in British Columbia who also worked on those items.

There was also much discussion regarding advocacy and direct advocacy and how to go about it and what would be effective. The members wanted direct advocacy and part of that was advertising. They completely rebuilt the website and hired a marketing company so they could do marketing in both English and French. Five companies provided requests for proposals and they selected them based on the most experience working with associations and national organizations in English and in French and if they had experience in talking to government about professional associations. It is a very different thing than marketing Tide. It requires a specific knowledge set and access to and experience with federal departments and provincial departments.

There was a marketing campaign in the spring of 2016 that ran for four weeks. It was online, on CBC News, BBC News, Facebook and other social media and targeted a
certain demographic. The online ads do not require a massive budget and they have to be very strategic in how they spend their money. The marketing company said that they would want to hit home builders and people who are buying houses with that type of ad. They got feedback regarding it and in the Fall they ran ads targeted at homeowners and commercial builders. In the spring they received feedback regarding how many views there were, who saw it, what the demographics were and if it was effective. They tweaked it again in the Fall with the marketing company and ran the ads again and the numbers were even better. It is a cumulative effect. They got feedback to see if people saw it and went to the website and clicked through the information. PSC needs to do an even better job of creating content that directs them to a message that reflects each provincial association and its members. They will be producing videos in the coming year, once some funds are built up again. Hopefully then the ads could run on TV but certainly online.

Direct advocacy was paramount with Bill S-229, the C-46 regulations and the underground infrastructure mapping. He was recently in Ottawa talking to members of parliament and senators regarding it.

PSC joined the Canadian Common Ground Alliance as an association, which is about $2,500 per year. They will be in Calgary at the meetings next month as they need to have an open dialogue regarding underground infrastructure mapping.

Some may have heard about the professional surveyor push in terms of trademark application. There was a lot of support but there was also a lot of misunderstanding regarding it. They applied standards when they were trying to come up with a term for Canadian surveyors. They received a lot of support from young surveyors but others did not like the process as it was going to fast so they slowed it down. They have had two presidents’ forums to discuss it so at the association level there will be more discussion about it and how it is going to work. The professional surveyor term is unique in provinces like Ontario and Saskatchewan so there needs to be more discussion regarding. Perhaps they will not want to do it and that is fine.

In the future, they will still be discussing underground infrastructure mapping and the professional surveyor terminology. In 2017 they will also be doing ad runs and creating videos.
Regarding underground infrastructure, a few weeks ago he was in Ottawa speaking with senators, members of parliament and ministers. Most of it was organized by the staff in Ottawa. A Quebec land surveyor is volunteering his time to go and see members of parliament and senators to talk about underground infrastructure mapping and changes to regulations on behalf of Alberta. It is a very good news story and speaks of that land surveyor’s commitment to protecting the public interest.

Mr. David Hagen asked Mr. Wilson Phillips if he could provide a quick overview of what is happening regarding underground disturbance and if there has been any progress in the meetings with politicians. He supports the initiative and public safety is paramount so it is something that they should be doing.

Mr. Wilson Phillips replied that they are making a lot of headway and they are making points that are almost irrefutable. When he speaks with members of parliament and senators they say it is a no brainer. He tells them there is a burial standard where they cannot dig within a foot. In the case of Bill S-229, which used to be Bill S-233, which is the Underground Infrastructure Safety Enhancement Act, in federal regulation for federal lands, they want to say that you cannot dig more than a foot or a foot and a half. There is no corresponding fiducial responsibility on, for example, Telus to bury the fiber optic lower than that. The public is being asked to do one thing but there is not a corresponding regulation. There are CSA standards, which can be changed without notifying the government, which when he brought that to the attention of the minister, the minister had no idea. They had a number of issues that they were talking about and they have to try and explain it to them and why they cannot be as good as the Americans or Japan. It is putting things in perspective and what is in the best interest of the public. The best interest of the public is that if you bury something you should map it. The cost is a rounding error. It is in the sixth decimal place and the rate of return is four dollars for every dollar. That is the best advice they have had and it came out of a study in Ontario. They put it in terms of dollar figures for the minister or Member of Parliament who has no background in any of it as they have to put it in a context that they can understand. He had a teleconference with Peter Sullivan and the senior science advisor for the Minister of Natural Resources, who does not have a background in surveying or underground infrastructure or anything like that so for her to understand that concept it
needs to be put into a context that they can understand and that is what they try to do.

President Fred Cheng thanked Mr. Phillips for his presentation and encouraged any members with questions to ask Hal Janes or Wilson Phillips.

President Fred Cheng invited the Director of Surveys to let the membership know what he and his department are working on.

The Director of Surveys, Ravi Shrivastava informed the assembly of the following:

**Ongoing Initiatives**
Include plan distribution, cadastre and the new reality, the resurvey of Fort McMurray, Section 9 and the new content requirement for plan examination.

**Shifting Role and Responsibilities**
The role is changing with the times. He is responsible for the interprovincial boundary and supporting the crown in public land administration. This particular domain is changing because the role and responsibilities are changing. Historically there was never an issue because the earlier Director of Surveys used to be responsible for full administration of public lands, the survey component as well as the systems associated with it. Now there is fragmentation. Some responsibilities are taken care of by the Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) and some by Agriculture and Forestry. As a result, the Director’s role is more regarding survey related policies as opposed to implementation.

**Organization Update – DOS Office**
They have been pumping a lot of new energy into their muscle power. Last year, Al Flim and Reid Egger were hired and they have been busier than ever before.

This year they were able to get some additional funding for six months. It is not sufficient as it is just for six months but they hired someone for the database development. He is a University of Calgary geomatics program graduate of 1986 and is very experienced in project management, administration and development. They are basically focusing on the primitive database for the hybrid cadastre, which was one of his priorities in the previous two years.
They are also hiring three technologists. The postings closed on the eighteenth. They are currently screening the resumes and there will be two years of funding for the positions. They will be targeted at the Fort McMurray resurvey and a couple of Section 9s.

**Organization Structure**
There have been no major changes. They still have one vacant position for a technologist so they are not working with one hundred percent speed as there is a hiring restraint. Even with hiring the others the vacancy will remain unfilled.

**Outputs 2016-2017 – Land Surveys Unit**
Achievements in the last year include confirming two official settlements plans, registering three TLE plans and eleven Part 3 plans.

They continue to provide advisory services and 110 different projects have been reviewed. Currently, there are 288 open projects. He does not consider them a backlog though because some of the projects are small and they are just waiting for some input but others are major problems.

Regarding the Alberta-British Columbia Boundary his major push is to finish the survey for Elk Pass. Currently, his counterpart from British Columbia has committed to long-term funding, at least in principal. He is trying to match it but unfortunately he is not getting much traction and enough resources to really make the commitment for the long term. Ideally $15,000 to $20,000 per year should be committed for five to six years so they can strategically plan how they really want to maintain the provincial boundary.

**Outputs 2016-2017 – Geodetic Control Unit**
Three projects were done in Edmonton and two in Calgary and six projects with HPN.

They are trying to integrate base stations through the RTK service provider compliance agreements.

Hopefully they can do the vertical readjustment with the new geoid-based vertical datum implementation as currently, he is able to commit the resources.

They are also committed to readjustment of all ASCMs from April 2002 to 2010. It will also be linked to how it is
going to work for the hybrid world but it is something that needs to be explored further.

There is also ongoing maintenance for the MASCOT and SPIN systems.

**Water Boundaries**

There were lots of problems and discontentment regarding water boundaries as they were taking far too much time. Often it would take one year just to tell them that the application is not correct as they are missing some information. That was unacceptable. They came up with standards that will likely be published the first week of May regarding updated submission of plan requirements to change a natural boundary. They want to empower land surveyors to take on more responsibility so that it is sufficient enough for them to just do a review. They are trying to change the business process. So the moment an application comes in and they see that the requirements have not been met, they will be told to complete and submit the application.

There was a backlog of over one year but they were able to complete approximately forty percent through a triage process, where manpower was dedicated to work on it. They have increased their manpower from two people to four so that added horsepower is going to be useful and they are trying to eliminate the backlog issue in a couple of months. Hopefully by December they will be able to clear the backlog. The new process will be more efficient. He is aiming for less than three months’ time.

**Ongoing Initiatives: Plan Distribution Service – IHS Markit to Abacus Datagraphics Inc (BADGR)**

Right from his first AGM he was told that $15 was far too much and they wanted the price reduced and they have achieved it.

Plan distribution services has moved under the mapping data agreement with the Alberta data partnerships and periodically they will be reviewing it.

Abacus Datagraphics was the successful bidder for 2016 and it was done in September. Within three months’ time they had a new system up and running, with zero failures, no down time and no complaints at all. It is a big achievement and they have very successfully closed out the previous agreement. His colleague really worked hard
and achieved the results. The end result is that in the past they used to pay $15 per plan but now it is $3. The earlier revenue model for the last four to five years grossed about $1,000,000. Each year the survey industry is now saving $250,000 from this point forward. It is a real achievement but he has not heard any thank yous.

**Ongoing Initiatives: Hybrid Cadastre – A New Reality**
Everyone has admitted that hybrid is a reality. Before hybrid was introduced they started doing GPS location plans. In about three years’ time less than 500 plans were produced, about fourteen plans a month. A hybrid pilot was done for twenty months and they received just under 600 plans. Last year when it was discussed, there was a big issue with plan rejections. Reid did a wonderful job providing training to close to 300 participants, with a free lunch and again no thank yous. He applauds the hybrid community of practice who provided wonderful questions.

**Hybrid Standards – Way Forward**
In the short term, they have done what they wanted to achieve. For the intermediate term of six to eighteen months, the most important thing is going back to the other communities. The long term is one to five years. In general, they are on time and on track.

**Ongoing Initiatives – Resurvey of Fort McMurray**
Essentially there are 1700 parcels to be resurveyed. It is the minister’s prerogative to make a decision. They are hoping that 95 percent of the parcels will be resurveyed and the remaining five percent will be taken up in survey investigation. They are likely to use different monumentation. There are a couple of challenges, particularly because in the Fort McMurray community there are known survey errors so the fundamental question is, should he uphold the survey errors or fix the survey errors and move forward.

**Ongoing Initiatives – Section 9 Board**
They have been a little reluctant to use the Section 9 Boards but they are about to do two Section 9 Boards very soon. One is La Crete and the other one is St. Paul.

President Fred Cheng informed the assembly that Mr. Shrivastava will entertain questions in the afternoon.
It was MOVED by Mr. Hector Muniz, seconded by Mr. Steven Van Berkel, that Part D, Section 5.12 of the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

5.12 Statutory Declarations


Before signing a statutory declaration, an Alberta Land Surveyor shall confirm in the field that all the facilities were constructed entirely within the survey boundaries as represented on the disposition Plan of Survey on file with Alberta Environment and Parks, and shall ensure that the field verification is documented in accordance with Part C, Section 6 (Field Notes) on page 29.

In the event the pipeline activities subject to a PLA disposition, as described in Public Land Administration Regulation (PLAR) Table A2, were not constructed entirely within the survey boundaries as represented on the PLA disposition Plan of Survey on file, a Plan of Survey for the amendment of the PLA disposition should be prepared. The amended disposition boundaries need to cover all constructed pipeline activities under the PLA disposition.

Motion Carried

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Muniz informed the assembly that the genesis of the motion is that when a PLA disposition goes into a surface lease, it could be an MSL, PIL or MLL, it is not unusual to find pipelines built outside the surveyed PLA boundaries. In these situations, practitioners are handling renewals in different ways. They are either signing a statutory declaration that is not precise because the fact is that part of the pipeline is not within the PLA boundaries or they suggest to the client that they prepare a survey plan for amendment of the PLA disposition, which involves some extra costs. The goal of the proposed MSP revision is to clarify how to deal with these situations.
Mr. Engler wondered if the last sentence refers to the entire disposition or just to the part that is outside the boundaries.

Mr. Muniz replied that it refers to the entire disposition. What it is saying literally is that the pipeline was constructed within the boundaries of the PLA. There was some confusion when part of the pipeline is also covered by a lease, such as an MSL, MLL or PIL if that part of the pipeline is not within the PLA boundaries.

Mr. Engler responded that he understands that part but if they go around a beaver pond or something and now they are outside the right-of-way or the PLA, would they have to survey just that diversion or the whole thing.

Mr. Muniz replied that in that case an amendment should be done. It clearly says that the pipeline was built within the PLA boundaries so if there was a diversion that is not true.

Mr. Engler wondered if it was just untrue for the part that goes around or is it untrue for the entire pipeline, in which case they would have to resurvey the entire right-of-way because some of it goes outside.

Mr. Muniz replied that in this case it applies to disposition renewals, when something was built after it was surveyed. The current system does not allow for a partial survey of the portion to be amended. It is his understanding that the survey plan has to be submitted entirely again.

In speaking in favour of the motion, Mr. Egger wondered if it only applies to PLAs being applied for with AER or if it should also include DPLs being applied for with AEP.

Mr. Muniz replied that the other option for a pipeline disposition that is under AEP that is a DPL and it was not considered at the time but, according to that, it would apply to that kind of disposition as well.

Mr. Egger suggested that perhaps someone would like to make an amendment to include them. He pointed out that in talking with AER, they will in some cases accept an amendment to a PLA that does not completely resurvey the entire thing. It would be an itemized amendment of only the affected boundaries. It would have to be a small amendment and it would only affect PLAs greater than ten hectares, at a fifty-metre width it would be about four miles long. It may influence how they can do them going forward.
Mr. Larsen wondered if AER requires prior approval for it.

Mr. Egger responded that it would not hurt. With the regulators and the Director of Surveys Office, it is better to get permission than forgiveness as forgiveness can be expensive.

In speaking against the motion, Mr. ten Broek commented that they seem to include excerpts from pipeline regulations regarding pipelines built completely within the boundaries of the lease. They do not mention anything about pipelines coming onto a lease. As most surveyors are aware, almost no pipeline coming onto a lease is going to be built within the boundaries of that pipeline. They would be asking their clients to spend a lot of money revising all the PLAs that come onto a lease. It does not seem to have been discussed with AER to get a clear indication of once the buried pipe is on the lease whether it needs to be covered by that PLA boundary. It is premature to be voting on the recommendation until there are some clear instructions from AER as it may not be necessary.

Mr. Lohnes informed the assembly that the Standards Committee did consult with AER and the recommendation is based on the e-mail received. The pipeline has to be entirely within the boundaries shown originally or they cannot sign the statutory declaration, even on the lease. Everyone does not like what it is but it is AER’s position on it. He is not in favour of it.

Mr. Edwards wondered what Mr. Shrivastava meant when he said that there were “no surveyors” in Fort McMurray.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that if he said that, that is not what he implied as he knows that there are six surveyors and he has met with them. What he said was that there were “no survey errors” in Fort McMurray’s previous surveys.

Mr. Edwards commented that Mr. Shrivastava had said that they are making progress regarding water boundaries but it takes about a year for them to reply. He wondered what Mr. Shrivastava was doing about it and if there was some transparency.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that that was the reality and that it was completely unacceptable. The Water Boundaries Unit was taking a year or more and what was happening was that even after one year they were not getting an answer.
as they were being told that the information was not sufficient and that more information needed to be provided, which was unacceptable. With the current system they are trying to empower the surveyors. The surveyors are going to provide the information upfront and then they will tell the surveyor what they need. He believes in the mantra, “say what you do, do what you say and document what you are saying and doing.” That is what they are trying to do. They are trying to document what they need upfront so the surveyor is clear, his examiners are clear and it will be transparent. He thinks the problem will be mitigated for the future.

Mr. Edwards responded that the problem is that when they have subdivision approval they have one year so when water boundaries takes a year to decide surveyors are typically applying for a new subdivision.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that the way he reads Section 89 of the Land Titles Act dealing with water boundaries, is that the word recent is not defined within the Act. Recent means reasonably recent. In that case they should not be permitted to draw the bank from the previous satellite imagery because there would be a conflict. The one-year timeline is unacceptable to everyone so they are trying to bring it down. There are no one-year, eighteen months or two-year figures.

Mr. Edwards responded that if Mr. Shrivastava cannot change that, then he needs to change the Municipal Government Act as far as subdivisions go when it deals with water boundaries, because it is not acceptable to wait one year for a government response.

Mr. Shrivastava wondered what the Municipal Government Act is compelling surveyors to do within a particular time.

Mr. Edwards responded that when they apply for a subdivision they have one year from approval to finish it. If it takes water boundaries one year to reply then it has expired and it has happened. Either the government needs to fix it or they need change the act and it needs to be looked into.

Mr. Edwards wondered where the resurveys in Fort McMurray were at.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that the Fort McMurray resurveys recommendation has gone to the minister. The way the
"Surveys Act" is written, the minister has the discretion to direct the Director of Surveys. Until the minister exercises discretion, it is difficult for him to know what the minister is going to do. They have done the review and they have made some recommendations to the minister and they are waiting to hear what is decided.

Mr. Edwards suggested that perhaps there needs to be more pressure from the Association regarding the issue. By the time the minister replies it is going to be like water boundaries and two years from now they will have a decision but it will all be rebuilt. Perhaps there is something that Mr. Shrivastava or the Association can do to push it along.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that he does not think that the Association has a position on the issue but they can ask the minister to expedite it. He has been talking to other surveyors about it and he is working with the municipal staff constantly for the last three weeks. The topic is being pushed at full throttle but again, he does not have control of the government. Likely what will happen is that it will not come from the minister. The municipality is probably going to be doing it a week from now and they will be approaching the minister.

Mr. Ziegler commented that he also has a question regarding the water boundary determinations. In 2016 a committee was struck through AEP and involved ten professional associations, one of which was the ALSA. It was to establish a designation for a qualified wetlands science practitioner. He wondered what the status of the committee and the designation was. He also wondered if AEP and AER were working together on the designation.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that the committee is not to determine the boundaries. The boundary is the exclusive domain of the land surveyors. The committee is following their policy to find out the specific location of the wetlands whether or not the crown is claiming interest on it. Since the ALSA was working directly on it, he asked Mr. Brian Munday to respond regarding the status of the designation, who can certify and whether particular wetlands are having the crown claim it or not.

Mr. Munday responded that it deals specifically with wetlands and who has the authority to sign off on wetland applications. The ALSA, engineers, biologists, foresters, planners, chemists and anyone of the professional regula-
tory organizations who deal with natural resources came together. They have a draft MOU, which basically says that if you are a member of a professional regulatory organization, like land surveyors, they would have the authority to sign off on formal wetlands documents. It is being held up right now on the basis that some of the professional regulatory organizations are concerned about those who have non-mandatory registration as to what they are going to do and the minimum number of years required before they can call themselves a professional biologist and do that type of work. It is not specifically relating to land surveyors but quite soon there should be a formal document in place that everyone has signed off on that says that if you are a member of a professional regulatory organization, such as land surveyors, you can do wetlands documents and the formal wetlands sign off.

Mr. Hagen commented that he was part of a group of Edmonton land surveyors who had met regarding the ASCM network in Edmonton. There is a severe lack of ASCM monuments and control monuments, which is hampering the ability to do Section 47 plans because many of the monuments, especially in the outlying areas, have been destroyed or lost during construction or there just were not that many to begin with. There is a serious lack of monuments. In the act, one of the major things under the Director of Surveys’ duties is to maintain the survey control network. The meeting was held and they have voiced their concerns that there is no control. There has been no response that he is aware of from the Director of Surveys Office. It is his understanding that Mr. Shrivastava’s response is that the City of Edmonton is responsible. The City of Edmonton says that they have nothing in writing, no agreement and no document and that they are not responsible for it. The Director of Surveys is directly responsible under the act. Without the control networks it is impossible to do the Section 47 plans. He wondered if Mr. Shrivastava has plans to add more survey control in the Edmonton area.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that it is a very valid concern and he is aware that it is one of the strategic focuses of the Association. He has no hesitation in acknowledging what was just mentioned. It is his understanding in reading the act that the Director of Surveys is responsible for the coordination and maintenance so his role is as a coordinator. Within the province, there are different municipalities that follow different standards. For example, in Calgary they charge the mapping fee but they do not charge the surveyor for the mapping
fee. The builders pay the mapping fee and they have an agreement with the builders but they do not have the same for Edmonton. Within Edmonton they do not charge the mapping fee per say as they charge the mapping fee but then give it back to them. It is not very clear who should be doing it. It was discussed with the City of Edmonton and the City of Calgary. Mr. Geoff Banham is working on the project. He invited President Fred Cheng to comment.

Mr. Egger informed the assembly that in regards to Mr. Shrivastava’s speech, he would like to acknowledge that they did receive plenty of thank yous from the members regarding the hybrid cadastre workshops.

President Fred Cheng informed the assembly that they had met on Friday, February 3 with Mr. Shrivastava, Dr. Abdel-Salam from the City of Edmonton, Mr. Grover representing the ASCM working group, Mr. Westlake from the City of Calgary and Mr. Banham from the Director of Surveys Office. Dr. Abdel-Salam said it quite clearly and pleaded that the City of Edmonton is expanding very rapidly. It is almost an outcry to the Director of Surveys that Alberta Survey Control Markers are needed. Mr. Shrivastava had commented that the province has no budget for it. The direction was sent to Dr. Abdel-Salam to go somewhere else for funding. Again, he is hearing that there is concern about the lack of ASCMs. Perhaps it would not be needed to fulfill Section 47 plans if they had been sufficiently installed.

Mr. Hagen responded that it is his understanding that Mr. Shrivastava says that it is his job to coordinate it and the City of Edmonton says that it is not their job to do it. Everyone is saying that it is not their job but it has to be someone’s job. The city says that they have no mechanism that allows them to collect the fee. Perhaps it needs to be legislated. Someone is going to have to take it on instead of ducking and covering, which is what he thinks is going on.

Mr. Drake commented that “coordination” is an interesting word. In Section 5 regarding the Director’s duties, the first four things say that the Director shall coordinate this, that and the other thing. In Section 4, Item E it says that the Director shall maintain the network. It does not say anything about the coordination of the maintenance of the network. If it is one of the Director’s duties and the act says that he shall do it and he is not doing it, maybe he does not understand what the word shall means.
Mr. Shrivastava requested that Section 5.2 be displayed regarding the duties of the Director of Surveys. He is not saying that they do not need to do it as they need to do it and they need to figure it out but it is not going to happen tomorrow. He can see that there is a burning need for it and they will bring it back and try to figure out the best way to move forward on it. His recommendation is to let the committee work with his office and the City of Edmonton and maybe the City of Calgary to try to figure out the best way to move forward on it.

Mr. Dirk VandenBrink commented that with respect to water boundaries, he has heard whispers that the basis for requiring consents for riparian boundaries is going to be expanded and more consents may be required. He appreciates that Mr. Shrivastava and the department are fixing the timeline, which is a very good thing. He wondered if there was something going on regarding the whispers that they need to be involved in as land surveyors. He is hearing that water boundaries wants all plans that show a riparian boundary to have a consent. Currently, if he creates a subdivision that has a riparian boundary he does not require a consent from water boundaries. He can create the title and Land Titles has so far just accepted his plan and registered it. If he now has to get a consent for every time he creates a riparian boundary it will increase the workload on the consent side of things.

Mr. Egger responded that he has not heard any whispers regarding it but they can look into it.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that it could be a whisper but it could also be true. He is not dealing with water boundaries so essentially he cannot tell exactly what the rationale would be for requiring the consents. Consents are mentioned very clearly in Section 89 of the Land Titles Act. They are required for an affected boundary. For adjoining owners, consent is required. In a case where a land surveyor cannot obtain a consent a court order is required and that is his understanding of it. However, he cannot comment on it until such time as he sees the document or if the document is released but he and Mr. Egger have not heard anything so he is unable to comment.

Mr. Steven Van Berkel wondered what Mr. Shrivastava’s intentions were with the ministerial order regarding post sales.
Mr. Shrivastava replied that the ministerial order is under review. He is referring to the report that was submitted for the previous two years. He had some questions that he asked the Association before Christmas. Then he and the president talked about it. He and Mr. Brian Munday talked about it another time and he is waiting for the six questions to be answered and they will be part of his review. After that they can decide the status of the ministerial order.

Mr. Steven Van Berkel wondered if Mr. Shrivastava had any intentions going into the review or if it would be possible that the ministerial order would remain as it is.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that the review is long standing. The review is pending because the order is from 1988. The original MOU was agreed upon in 1988 and he believes that it was amended in 2007 or 2008. If the order is existing from 1988 and it is now 2017, it is 29 years old so the question about the relevancy of reopening it is required. This is where it has to be reviewed and that part is pretty clear. It is time for the full review.

Mr. Ross Metcalfe commented that in Mr. Shrivastava’s report he had mentioned the La Crete issue regarding a survey post that was going to Section 9. He was originally involved with it when the client came to him asking him to do a subdivision plan. He had a feeling that it was going to cause some problems when they found the post that was nowhere near where it was supposed to be. They did eventually, through his research and others, find that the post, which was in a recent subdivision, had been placed in error. The original field notes and some other information was found that proved it. It is now two years or more that this person has been waiting. He is not sure if the plan is registered as he turned it over to others because he did not expect to still be coming to meetings at this time and he would not be able to finish it. He had a feeling it would take this long. It was his code of ethics that said that they had to try to get it fixed because they had to accept the pin on the ground. It was the landowner who said where the pin was as they were looking somewhere else. It was the landowner who pointed out where the pin was and he thought it was in the wrong place too. If it had been a standard farming practice, that pin would have been destroyed in the original location through farming practices, such as clearing. They would have went in, done the survey, found no mark, put the quarter post in very close to the proper position and nothing would have ever happened. However, the landowner was honest and
showed them where the pin was. Otherwise, they probably never would have found it with it being that far away. Under the code of ethics, they are supposed to protect the public. If the landowner does not have their subdivision done by now, the next time it happens there will be a cat that goes over it and it is going to disappear and all the records are going to be gone. He wondered why they are taking so very long to get it fixed as there are common sense rules to fix it. They have the proof and they know that it was put in the wrong place and that it was an error. Now it is going to Section 9, which will be another year. He wondered what was going on and why it was taking so long.

Mr. Shrivastava replied that Section 9 is a statutory process. If the land surveyor chooses to ignore the pin and the pin gets destroyed they can just put the pin where they think but that is the land surveyor’s opinion. One surveyor’s opinion may not be acceptable to the surveying community or the public. He understands that land surveyors want to serve the clients but it is a legislated process and legislated processes take time. The minister has certain discretions. There is no guarantee even if it is in the wrong place as the minister has the right to say that they do not agree with it and then that is the end of the story. The monument governs where it was placed by the original surveyor in an undisturbed location and that is what they have learned and were taught in the profession. There are thousands of monuments in Canada that were wrongly placed and a surveyor will fix it. He has read Mr. Allred’s article and moving a monument or fixing a boundary is difficult and it should be difficult. The reason why it is difficult is because people rely on the work of land surveyors. Once they place the monument people trust it. Many say that as the Director of Surveys he has the power under Section 50 (3) and that he could give permission to remove the monument but that is not how it happens. Prior to giving permission to remove the monument, they go into the utmost depth to make sure that what they are doing is the right thing. Certainly, it is a convoluted process and a complex process takes time. Section 9 has existed in the Surveys Act from 1988, which is 29 years. There are only three or four times that Section 9 was involved.

Mr. Metcalfe agreed. He is not worrying about the decision. The pin was placed, it is on the ground and he agrees with that. He is more worried about the timeframe. He wondered why it was not said that they accept the pin and why that could not have been the position when it was first brought to their attention that that is where the pin is. That is where the
boundary is. They are trying to make decisions but it is not getting done.

Mr. Engler commented that regarding water boundaries, it is the only instance that he can think of where the owner is making the survey rules. He does not know how they would get anything done in any other situation where the owner of the land makes the survey rules. That is how he sees it. The owner of the land is making the rules and he will leave it up to Mr. Shrivastava to think about it.

Mr. Shrivastava informed the assembly that they can talk to him about any subject. They do not have to agree on everything and that is perfectly acceptable.

It was MOVED by Mr. Hector Muniz, seconded by Mr. Hugo Engler, that Part B, Section 2 of the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

2.1 Advertisements Marketing of Professional Services
Advertisements shall:
An Alberta Land Surveyor, Surveyor’s Corporation, or Surveyor’s Partnership may promote professional services, provided that the marketing:
• be in good taste;
• be in the best interest of the public;
• be factual, and contain no false or inaccurate information;
• not be self-laudatory;
• not harm the dignity, integrity, and honour of the profession;
• not be misleading by containing a misrepresentation of fact or creating unrealistic expectations; and
• make no reference to price or fees for professional services.

2.2 Advertising of Fees
An Alberta Land Surveyor, Surveyor’s Corporation, or Surveyor’s Partnership may advertise fees for their services provided that:
• The fees are reasonably precise for the professional services offered.
• The method of determining the fees shall be disclosed when requested.
• They clearly indicate any fees or costs that will be charged in addition to the advertised fee (ie. disbursements and applicable taxes).
• They do not create unrealistic expectations.

Motion as Amended Defeated
In speaking to the motion, Mr. Muniz informed the assembly that, the recommendation was based on a letter from a member who recommended the review of the MSP advertising guidelines because they appeared to be unenforceable. There is little that the Association could do to prevent a practitioner from advertising their prices. According to prior court rulings, professional bodies have a duty to adopt guidelines, which do not restrict the freedom of expression of their members. The recommendation creates two guidelines, one for the marketing of professional services and another for the advertising of fees. Section 2.1 has been slightly revised to update it and it refers to the marketing of professional services. Section 2.2 provides guidelines for the advertising of fees.

It was MOVED by Mr. Steven Van Berkel, seconded by Mr. John Lohnes, that the second bullet in 2.2 be revised to read, “The fees are reasonable for the professional services offered.”

Amendment Defeated

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Van Berkel commented that “reasonably” applies to “precise” rather than the fee and it should be clearer.

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Nedev commented that he generally likes the change but his only concern is with “reasonable” as reasonable and unrealistic are difficult to define. He struggles with the last bullet. It is difficult to say if something is realistic or unrealistic and others may have a different opinion of it. It is very vague. The first bullet is also conflicting and it should be removed entirely.

In speaking against the amendment, Mr. Andersen commented that “reasonable” is very vague. He thinks the intent was that “reasonably precise” means that if you are advertising that you are doing RPRs for $350 then the public is being charged $350. “Reasonable” leaves it wide open. If fees are reasonable there are no teeth to go after anyone. They could advertise $350 and charge $1,000 for RPRs. He thinks the intent is that when they say “reasonably precise” that means that whatever is put in the marketing campaign is accurate for the public.

In speaking to the main motion, Mr. Clark wondered why 2.2 is needed and why the advertising of fees was added as a subset. He completely agrees with the idea that the marketing of services is fine and that they should update it but he is wondering why they had to add the advertising of fees.
Mr. Muniz replied that the reason is the last bullet in 2.1 as it was preventing land surveyors from including a price or fees for professional services in their advertisement. According to what initiated this term of reference, it was not actually enforceable.

Mr. Clark responded that he completely agrees with what they are proposing. He wondered if it would preclude anyone from talking about fees if they did not include it in 2.2. He does not see anything in the amendment for 2.1, if the last two lines were removed, that would preclude the surveyor from talking about fees.

Mr. Muniz replied that the idea is to provide guidelines regarding how to advertise those fees.

Mr. Clark wondered if it was a requirement and if it really needed to be included.

Mr. Muniz replied that it is not a requirement. It is a guideline. It is allowing them explicitly to advertise the fees. It is providing guidelines on how to advertise those fees.

Mr. Clark responded that he is struggling with determining what is reasonable and what is realistic. Rather than trying to define them, they should remove Section 2.2 and make the amendments in 2.1.

Mr. Muniz replied that it could be an option.

Mr. Hagen wondered why they were deleting the second last bullet in 2.1 as he thought it would be a good thing to say.

Mr. Muniz replied that when the Committee was working on revising the section, it was felt that an update was needed. For that reason they removed the bullets. It was thought that the second last bullet in 2.1 was covered in the advertising fees section that was added. The idea was that they did not need that bullet in 2.1 as it was already being covered in Section 2.2. That was the reasoning of the Committee.

Mr. Hagen responded that he does not see where “not be misleading by containing a misrepresentation of fact” is included in 2.2. It has been left out. They are supposed to protect the public so advertising needs to be truthful and honest.
Mr. Lohnes wondered if the statement above it in the third bullet in 2.1 covers it.

*It was MOVED by Mr. James Durant, seconded by Mr. Bruce Clark, that 2.2 be removed.*

**Amendment Carried**

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Durant commented that it is a bit misleading and misrepresenting when they publish prices and fees on websites. Anyone who has done an RPR lately probably realizes that they are not reasonably priced for the professional services offered in creating an RPR. He wondered if it precludes himself from calling the competition and asking them to disclose to him how the fees are created. It creates an unfair advantage and it is the opposite of what they are trying to do.

In speaking in support of the amendment, Mr. Shrivastava indicated that he is speaking as a member and not as the Director of Surveys. When he reads the way 2.2 is written, it would be deemed that the practitioner shall follow all four bullets together. He is not sure how that would be possible in an advertising space and it is not practically possible to achieve it.

In speaking in opposition to the amendment, Mr. Gorelik commented that the purpose of 2.2 would be to let land surveyors know that they can actually advertise fees rather than make them advertise their fees. You do not have to advertise your fees but this allows you to. He does not agree 100 percent with the wording in 2.2 but he thinks that it is a fairly valuable addition.

In speaking in favour of the amendment, Mr. Larry Pals commented that he completely agrees with eliminating 2.2 in its entirety.

In speaking to the main motion as amended, Mr. Haggerty commented that even as amended the motion cheapens ALSs and he means it in the broadest sense of the word. They have been fighting for a long time as a small profession to maintain their professional image in the eyes of the public. One of the reasons why they are a profession is that the work they do is sufficiently complex and it has great public good. The public relies on their professional infrastructure, their personal ethics and on the market to ensure value so he does not see a problem. Posting rates on a billboard beside the freeway begs the question in the minds of
the public as to how complex and professional the services that are being offered are if they can be displayed in such a manner. He suggested that in the eyes of the public the motion would make them appear more like turnip vendors or used car salesmen than the professionals that they are.

**Group Photo**

President Fred Cheng informed the assembly that back in 2009, for the Association’s 100th AGM, they started taking a group photo of everyone present at the AGM to celebrate the occasion. He asked everyone to make their way to the front of the lodge for the group photo.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Hector Muniz, seconded by Mr. Mike Fretwell, that the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>TO BE REMOVED FROM THE MSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Part D, Section 1

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

3. Documentation Registration Request (DRR) Procedures:
7. Surface Rights Board: http://surfacerights.alberta.ca/

Part D, Section 1.2

For more information on NAD83 (Original) and NAD83 (CSRS), refer to the Geodetic Fact Sheets available at this site: http://aep.alberta.ca/lands-forests/director-of-surveys/geodetic-control-unit.aspx

Part D, Section 3

Consult these sections of the Land Titles Procedures Manual for specifications and guidelines regarding strata and condominium surveys:

1. Section Sur-2.1: Examination of Strata Space Plans
2. Section Sur-4: Examination of Condominium Plans
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Part D, Section 4 | 1. Section Sur-5: Examination of Road Plans and Other Public Works Plans  
| | For surveys on Métis Settlements Land, Alberta Land Surveyors should consult these sections of the Métis Settlements Land Registry Registrar’s Rules for direction:  
1. Section Sur-4: Examination of Road Plans and Other Public Works Plans  
| Part D, Section 5 | Information about public land dispositions, including a list of disposition types, is available in Alberta Environment and Parks’ document entitled PLAR (Public Lands Administration Regulation) Formal Disposition Directive:  
Information about plan types, monument requirements, plan formats, and content requirements is available in the Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) document entitled Disposition Plan Types/Formats and the Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) document entitled Content Requirements for All Disposition Plans:  
AEP Disposition Plan Types/Formats - September 2014  
AER Content Requirements for All Disposition Plans - March 2016 | |
<p>| Part D, Section 5.1 | R&amp;R/03-02 Siting an Upstream Oil and Gas Site in an Environmentally Sensitive Area on Private Land: Guidance for Private Land | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part D, Section 5.7.1</th>
<th>ALS Certification for Wellsites on Private Land (see Part E, Section 1, page 74) or ALS Statutory Declaration for Public Land Dispositions (see link below): <a href="http://aep.alberta.ca/lands-forests/director-of-surveys/documents/DirectorSurveysActPolicyFinal-Feb2011.pdf">http://aep.alberta.ca/lands-forests/director-of-surveys/documents/DirectorSurveysActPolicyFinal-Feb2011.pdf</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Part D, Section 5.8  | Information about plan types, monument requirements, plan formats, and content requirements is available in the Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP) document entitled *Disposition Plan Types/Formats* and the Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) document entitled *Content Requirements for All Disposition Plans: AEP Disposition Plan Types/Formats - September 2014*
AER Content Requirements for All Disposition Plans - March 2016 |
| Part D, Section 5.8.1 | 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 AEP document entitled *Disposition Plan Types/Formats* (see link above). |
| Part D, Section 5.8.11| Certify the plan in accordance with the ALS Statutory Declaration for Public Land Dispositions: http://aep.alberta.ca/lands-forests/director-of-surveys/documents/DirectorSurveysActPolicyFinal-Feb2011.pdf |
| Part D, Section 5.9.8 | Certify the plan in accordance with the ALS Certification for Wellsites on Private Land (see Part E, Section 1, page 74) or the ALS Statutory Declaration for Public Land Dispositions (see link below): http://aep.alberta.ca/lands-forests/director-of-surveys/documents/DirectorSurveysActPolicyFinal-Feb2011.pdf |
| Part D, Section 5.10.7 | Certify the plan in accordance with the ALS Statutory Declaration for Public Land Dispositions: http://aep.alberta.ca/lands-forests/director-of-surveys/documents/DirectorSurveysActPolicyFinal-Feb2011.pdf |
Part D, Section 7
This Section provides specifications and guidelines for the preparation of Descriptive Plans. Alberta Land Surveyors should also consult either the Land Titles Procedures Manual or the Métis Settlements Land Registry Registrar’s Rules for direction. Alberta Environment and Parks does not accept descriptive plans.

Part D, Section 12
Information on the Métis Settlements of Alberta is available at: http://www.mslr.gov.ab.ca/map.asp
Detailed plan requirements are available in Part 8, Division 6 of the Métis Settlements Land Registry Regulation: http://www.qp.alberta.ca/574.cfm?page=1991_361.cfm&leg_type=Regs&isbncln=9780779732197

Part E, Section 1
… regarding which of these are required for the type of plan being prepared and submitted for registration:

Part E, Section 2
This is an abbreviated, alphabetical list of references available on the ALSA website and other websites:
3. Alberta Land Surveyor’s Commitment to Property Damage Mitigation:
   a) For Rural Property: http://www.alsa.ab.ca/Portals/0/PDF/Member_Resources/Reference_Material/Entry_Onito_Property/mitigation_rural.pdf
4. ALS News: http://www.alsa.ab.ca/MemberResources/ALSNews.aspx


13. Disposition Plan Requirements: AEP Disposition Plan Types/Formats - September 2014
    AER Content Requirements for All Disposition Plans - March 2016


<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Strata and Condominium Surveys (ALSA Standards Committee): <a href="http://www.alsa.ab.ca/Portals/0/PDF/Member_Resources/Reference_Material/Other/201103Condominiums.pdf">http://www.alsa.ab.ca/Portals/0/PDF/Member_Resources/Reference_Material/Other/201103Condominiums.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In speaking to the motion, Mr. Muniz reminded the assembly that the members had voted in favour of removing the hyperlinks from the MSP at the 2016 AGM so it just puts that recommendation into practice. In some cases, instead of having the hyperlinks they are proposing having some key words in italics that could be used to help search for the information on the internet.

Mr. Horneman informed the assembly that he just wanted to provide some numbers. The MSP from last year has 79 links and there are only two that are not functioning as of March 15. He asked Ms. Phelan for some information regarding the last five MSPs and most of the links that are not working are from AER or ESRD. It is really the oil and gas information that is being updated, not necessarily the ALSA information or other websites as they are staying consistent. He just wanted to make everyone aware of it.

In speaking against the motion, Mr. Hagen commented that he does not see any harm in keeping the hyperlinks, especially when it was said that there are only two out of the 79 links that are not working. They are helpful and even if the link does not work, at least the search words are there. The hyperlinks are already there so he does not see the harm in leaving them.

Mr. Gorelik reminded the assembly that it was already passed at the last AGM. He wondered what would happen if the motion was defeated and if they would then go back to discussing the hyperlinks.

Mr. Gorelik responded that he does not want to hurt anyone’s feelings but let us be done with hyperlinks. He is sure that the Standards Committee has other things to do and talk about. He does not think that hyperlinks are that important that they should be talked about at two meetings in a row. He supports removing them, forgetting about it and moving on.

Mr. Lohnes reminded the assembly that they approved removing the hyperlinks last year and one of the biggest reasons was because the office was spending a good deal of administration time checking the hyperlinks and he does not think that they want to go back to that.

In speaking against the motion, Mr. Heffernan commented that the hyperlinks have value. There are not that many and it is easy to check them. There were only two changes a year so they should keep them.
It was MOVED by Mr. Bruce Drake, seconded by Mr. Larry Pals, that Sections 32(3) and 32(4) of the Association’s bylaws be deleted:

32 (3) Notwithstanding other provisions in this bylaw, the council vacancies at the 2015 AGM will be handled as follows:

(a) the candidate for council with the highest number of votes will be elected to Council for a three-year term;

(b) the two candidates with the second and third highest number of votes will be elected to Council for a two-year term.

(4) Notwithstanding other provisions in this bylaw, the council vacancies at the 2016 AGM will be handled as follows:

(a) the two candidates for council with the highest number of votes will be elected to Council for a three-year term;

(b) the candidate with the third highest number of votes will be elected to a two-year term.

Motion Carried

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Drake pointed out that the two items were the transitional provisions as they were moving from two-year elected terms for councilors to three-years. Now that the transition is complete having the sections in the bylaws serves no purpose.

It was MOVED by Mr. Brian Ball, seconded by Mr. Ivaylo Nedev, that Section 51(3)(b) of the Association’s bylaws be amended as follows:

(3) Honorary Member

(a) Council may confer honorary membership in the Association upon any person who, through their own initiative and leadership, has rendered eminent service relating to the profession of surveying.

(b) There shall at no time be more than 7 honorary members of the Association.

(c) An honorary member is not required to pay an annual fee or any levy payable to the Association.

(d) Unless Council otherwise directs, an honorary member is entitled to receive all publications, reports, and notices that are available to Alberta land surveyors generally.
(e) An honorary member may attend an annual general meeting or special meeting of the Association and is entitled to discuss any motion or resolution before the meeting, but no honorary member may propose a motion or resolution or vote at a meeting of the Association.

(f) An honorary member is not entitled to be registered as an Alberta land surveyor.

(g) Membership may be cancelled by Council.

Motion as Amended Carried

In speaking to the motion, President Fred Cheng informed the assembly that he had put forward the recommendation as there is a limit on the number of honorary members that the Association can have. Currently, it is a maximum of five. The honorary members are former public members Kurt Gesell, Lawrence Kluthe, the author of the *Laying Down the Lines* book Judy Lamour, former long time staff member Sharon Armstrong and author and educator Dr. Brian Ballantyne. Capping the number of honourary members at five may have been appropriate thirty years ago but with the increased population in the province of Alberta and the size of the Association the cap might need to be considered and appropriately increased. He proposed a random number for the membership to consider to increase it to seven.

Mr. Hagen wondered why there would be a cap at all as there are really no resources going into it that cost the Association. They probably have not even been to a meeting for years so it is just an honour that they give out. He wondered why they cannot just give an honorary membership to someone who deserves it.

President Fred Cheng replied that the cap of five was way before his time. Perhaps some of the more senior members in the audience might have an explanation for it. The idea is to provide individuals with signal and emanate service to the land surveying profession to be recognized.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Arlin Amundrud, seconded by Mr. Jeremy Zettel, that (b) be removed.*

Amendment Carried

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Engler wondered if removing the number might cheapen the honour and how many honorary members it would take to make them not so honourable.
Mr. Marquardt commented that it is an honour to be named an honorary member of the Association and he trusts Council’s discretion in that regard. He does not think that the number should be an issue. It is something that should be decided by Council and he trusts Council in that regard.

Mr. Egger commented that he agreed with Mr. Marquardt as (a) covers it. It should be based on merit rather than the number of people still alive.

President Fred Cheng informed the assembly that the motion was sent out to the membership on April 11 as a special notice to the membership.

It is not in the recommendations package. In discussions with the parliamentarian, it is going to be treated as unfinished business.

As this motion deals with direction to change the regulations, only Alberta Land Surveyors and honorary life members may vote and propose motions and amendments.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Ravi Shrivastava, seconded by Mr. Larry Pals, that the membership approve making the wording of the regulations under the Land Surveyors Act gender neutral.*

**Motion Carried**

In 2013, the membership approved proposed amendments to the *Professional Practice Regulation* under the *Land Surveyors Act* and, in 2014, the membership approved proposed amendments to the *Examination & Training Regulation* and the *Discipline Regulation* under the *Land Surveyors Act*.

The government has just now rejected the proposed amendments to the regulations because the language is not gender neutral.

The intent of the proposed motion is to give Council the authority to ask the government’s legislative drafters to make the regulations gender neutral.

The specific wording for each of the regulations will come back to the membership for a final vote at the 2018 AGM or a special general meeting or as a mail-in vote, which is permitted by the bylaws.
The gender neutral language affects the Code of Ethics Regulation, the Discipline Regulation and the Professional Practice Regulation. The Examination & Training Regulation is already gender neutral but the proposed changes to this regulation may not go forward unless all of the regulations are gender neutral.

There are 35 instances in the regulations where the language is not gender neutral.

It is unfortunate that this concern came up at the last minute as the regulations were going forward to cabinet for approval and not raised last summer when the legislative drafters were working on it. The ALSA has raised this concern with government.

President Fred Cheng asked Mr. Richard Schlachter, executive director of Land Titles and Surveys and Ms. Nada Belhadfa, director of business development at Notarius to provide some details on what is happening.

Mr. Schlachter informed the assembly that:

The Land Titles branch of Service Alberta, as everyone knows, is the official registry for privately-owned land in Alberta. Public lands and Crown owned lands fall under the administration of Alberta Environment and Mr. Shrivastava represents that organization as the director. He recognized his colleagues who had also joined him.

Land Titles has been around for a long time. Since the Dominion of Canada there has been the ability to transfer patent land. When the Hudson’s Bay Company surrendered Rupert’s Land to Canada, the Northwest Territories was the land that Alberta was on. The DLS survey in 1881 began the system of surveys that proceeded from the prime meridian in Manitoba, through Saskatchewan and into Alberta, the fourth meridian. By 1887, a Torrens system had begun in Alberta. By 1893, the first Land Titles building in Edmonton replaced the Dominion Land Titles building. In 1905, the Province of Alberta was formed. By 1930, Alberta Land Titles had full rights to transfer, manage and record surface and mineral rights. From those early changes, all of the records that were kept were on large title books.

The technological change of that day was the typewriter. Typewriters were used to transfer the information on
certificates of title to loose-leafs and this was seen to be an advancement in technology. The loose-leafs were filed in file cabinets. From there, technology went to telex and telex was used to search for titles and to fax. By 1988 it was time to enter the computer age. An IBM mainframe system was programmed and that system, ALTA as they know it, was created to record and efficiently access, search and register land interests in Alberta. In 2002, the first SPIN system was developed and delivered. By 2006, it was the second version of SPIN, SPIN II, which everyone uses today. By 2009, ALTA renewal plans had begun. There were some starts and stops over a number of years and some changes to government’s approach but by 2012 ALTA II had been initiated. ALTA II represented the renewal and modernization of the original main frame ALTA system. Their vision is that by 2020, not only will they be submitting all documents and registration requests online but that Land Titles itself will be nearly paperless.

Land surveyors were an important part of the township surveys system as we know it. DLS surveyors in 1871 worked westward from the prime meridian. In Alberta by 1881 they had laid out the fourth meridian and then worked on the baselines heading west from there and into BC. He welcomed anyone to critique his timelines and the factual information as it was definitely challenging to put together.

All registered documents submitted now are in paper form and are entered electronically by SPIN. The originals are all sent to the Alberta records centre. They have about 32,000,000 titles and instrument records in the ALTA database. In total there are about five million transactions, including searches, a year through Land Titles; about one million of them are registrations. They currently have about 100 Land Titles employees, which is about a fifty-fifty split between Edmonton and Calgary. They rarely access the original records that are in the vaults but they have every original record from the 1800s that has been transferred from Regina at the Northwest Territories administration building to the Edmonton and Calgary offices when Alberta was formed.

The transformation of digital from paper continues. ALTO, Alberta Land Titles Online, is under the ALTA II program. The program is a funded program with many projects and ALTO being an important one. It is a complete end-to-end electronic document creation and submission process. He showed pictures of the title books from the vault. At Land
Titles under the current program they are working hard to reduce their footprint. Currently, Land Titles & Surveys processes from 50 to 150 feet of paper submissions each month and combined with Calgary it doubles so 100 to 300 feet of paper in total. He showed a photo from a month ago of what that stack of paper looks like on a daily basis. Eliminating the paper process and the paper chase is a serious goal of theirs. The benefits are to reduce processing errors, examiner rejections and the notices and communications in getting back to land surveyors when a rejection happens and how it can be alleviated. It will save time, the costs of couriers and paper handling and the data entry and processing. The old ALTA main frame IBM system can then be retired as it is an annual cost as well.

Regarding how ALTA will work, the first part is much the same as today. If there is a subdivision survey or a road survey, land surveyors are submitting a plan. Along with that plan comes documents. If it is a homeowner or someone who wants to purchase a home they will employ a land surveyor and a lawyer to complete the process to actually buy the home. Staff will likely search SPIN II as they have done before. In the new system, the ALTO system, it will be used to prepare digital documents instead of the paper ones that are done currently. It will be done through an online validation against the data in their databases. They will be validating against current and existing Land Titles business rules and the registered records that they have.

ALTO then creates a PDF for each form created and staff can download that PDF and fill it out. The land surveyor or the lawyer then apply their digital signature to the document package, which is where the Notarius system comes in. They will be signing some documents and e-forms themselves. The lawyer or surveyor then uses ALTO to submit the package into the ALTA II electronic work queue. The queue is currently a paper queue. It is a file folder system and they keep everything in order, careful not to get things out of order. It will instead become an electronic queue. Last is the final registration of the documents. The registration will be through ALTA II and ALTO will update all databases, including SPIN II and other things like financials and reporting and then a notice will be sent to the owner. It is a high level overview of the process that they have been developing over the last five years.

As of January, they had seven law firm pilot participants who have been using ALTO and by using it in a pilot form...
it has helped them improve the forms, the process, the screens and make everything within the system flow as smooth as possible at the pilot stage. By February ALTO had generated the first-ever recorded end-to-end electronic title transfer in their history and it used a Notarius digital signature. It proved that it can go through the entire process, produce the billing at the end of it and actually do a land transfer.

Last month and this month they were able to have a successful launch of release 5.1. They have eight releases but they are at 5.1 right now. It was important to them because it enabled all of their examiners, within the 100 staff that they have, to be able to examine all submissions, documents and registration requests online with a system that is more intuitive, has more drop downs and has more validation checks on screen. It allows them to do their work differently. He would not say that it is faster than the main frame green screen system that they currently have but it opens the window for other participants in the process, mainly lawyers and surveyors, to enter directly into the system. As of yesterday, about eighty percent of Land Titles registration requests are now being internally examined every day through ALTA II. Others cannot see it yet but internally they are using the system. The system does not provide extra speed for them but it opens the window for them to be able to allow ALTO to let others submit their documents directly.

Over the last three weeks they have gone from about ten percent internal use of ALTA II to over seventy percent, in the past week as their training happens. They have about fifty staff in each Land Titles office to train and they still have to keep the wheels rolling so they are training ten to fifteen a week. As long as the trainees and the examiners are satisfied and they understand the system enough, they move to the system the next day and begin using it. They have been very pleased with the results and progress internally.

They need to complete Release 6. Release 6 gives all the functionality to ALTO, which is the online external system that they would like everyone to try to use and benefit from. The lawyers have been on the pilots for well over a year. Land surveyors’ turn is next. Phase 1 will be a test of the paperless process for the four survey firm pilots. The focus will be on not using a courier, entering the data into the system directly themselves online using a universal e-form and then applying their digital signature.
Phase 2 of the pilots for the four survey firms will involve a more elaborate set of e-forms that are more customized towards what surveyor submissions look like or should look like as well as online validations. The first phase will not have online validations but the second phase will include drop-down menus that ensure that they are in the right township, range and meridian. If there are any registered owners or anything in their database it should pop up as they would expect so that they are not subject to the key entry error that they will be in the first phase of the pilot.

By summer, they plan to increase the pilot testing from seven lawyers to fifty as they represent most of the volume of documents on the documents side. Land surveyors are already submitting their survey plans digitally and lawyers need to catch up. They represent most of the volume that they receive at Land Titles and they would like them to prove what the initial pilot for them has done. Then they will introduce land surveyors to understand their business requirements for the survey firms that have joined the pilot.

By winter, ALTO enrollment will begin and it will start with account holders. If someone is currently an active ALTA account holder they will start first. Next will be getting a Notarius digital certificate and training and information packages will be available through the Association as well as through the lawyer’s Legal Education Society of Alberta. Links will also be available on the new ALTO portal, which has not been launched yet.

Enrollment will require them to get an ALTA account, if they do not have one already, for billing purposes and an ALTO user ID, which will be issued so that they can create documents online and submit them online. They will need a digital signature and it will be issued to them by the Association. The Association has selected Notarius to represent the certificate authority. Enrollment fact sheets are available and he encouraged everyone to pick one up.

Their website will be launched in the coming month or two and it will be announced and available through the Association. As far as timing, ALTO enrollment starts now but they will not be processing requests until the fall. ALTO is targeted for wide release by year end.

They want to focus a bit on the digital signatures. He has provided a bit of background and context for ALTA II and the modernization that is happening at Land Titles. Digital
signatures are one of the precursors to allow them to gain significant efficiencies. Right now their rejections hover around twenty to thirty percent. In some of the survey plans it is even higher, condo plans for instance and they want to reduce them. They have watched other jurisdictions gain from online submissions by reducing the errors of entry. The errors of entry are sometimes them, sometimes land surveyors and sometimes lawyers. Other jurisdictions have brought the rejection rate to less than seven percent, some as low as three percent in certain cases. They want to enjoy the same benefit but it does represent a bit more load for land surveyors as they are doing the key entry but also saving themselves time hopefully by not having as many rejections.

Digital signatures are a secure way to confirm the integrity of a document. The ALSA and LSA have partnered with Notarius to provide digital signature services. He asked Mr. Marc St-Jacques and Ms. Nada Belhadfa to come up and speak about Notarius’s process.

Mr. St-Jacques informed the assembly that he has been involved with providing digital signatures for the last eight years. He was involved with many of the associations that they work with, including the land surveyors in Quebec who went fully digital in 2011, so he has a pretty good understanding of the road ahead and hopefully they can help everyone out during that exercise.

Ms. Belhadfa informed the assembly that she combines a background in law and e-commerce and she is a member of Quebec’s Bar Association. She oversees the partnership with associations and the modernization of the Land Titles system.

Mr. St-Jacques informed the assembly that they would like to talk about who they are, how they got to where they are and about digital signatures as to how they work, the mechanics behind them and the legal reliability of the documents as well as how to sign up. They would like to provide a better understanding of what the process is going to look like. He confirmed that ten percent of those in the room have a digital signature.

Notarius has been around since 1996. They began as a provider of complete digital services for the Quebec Board of Notaries. They put together the first public key infrastructure and the first certificate authority recognized by
government in 1998 so they have been doing digital signatures for quite a while. Currently, they service over 16,000 professionals from coast to coast with 26 different associations who actually use their certificate authority to be able to issue trusted digital certificates to their members. There were close to two million, if not more, official documents signed last year with their digital certificates so they have a good understanding of all of the mechanics behind digital signatures and document reliability.

People often say that it is a Notarius digital signature but in reality the fact is that they do not actually issue digital signatures themselves. They are always done through a third-party partner such as the ALSA. They provide that service to 26 different associations in Alberta centred around real estate and physical space from a Land Titles perspective. The land surveyors, lawyers, engineers, architects and technologists are all part of the partnership associations in Alberta.

There are three types of signatures including a wet signature, which is what they do right now in most cases, an electronic signature, which is more of a visual representation of their identity in a digital format usually involving copying and pasting an image onto a PDF and a digital signature, which is usually issued by a certificate authority as a digital certificate. It meets the four requirements, from a legal perspective, required for a digital signature to be recognized and that is that it is unique to the person using it, it is capable of verification that they are a member in good standing and includes their designation and member number so they will have all of that information with them. It is under their sole control because that certificate will be issued specifically to them by the Association and it has to guarantee the integrity of the digital file. A digital signature is designed from a crypto-graphical perspective to seal any document that is digitally signed.

Ms. Belhadfa informed the assembly that an official document in a paper form or an electronic format is a document that by its very nature and function requires a high degree of reliability. Document reliability can be broken down into four categories including origin, integrity, authenticity and longevity.

When you look at any official document the first thing you do is ascertain its origin, who it is from, who signed it and if the person was a professional such as a land surveyor,
lawyer or engineer. The date and time is part of the origin as well. Official documents require the reader to trust its origin. Integrity means that you need to be sure that the document has not been tampered with since it was finalized or signed. Authenticity is everything required to prove the origin and integrity of the document and it is in the document and travels with the document. The document carries its own proof. In the physical world, it is what is called an original. Longevity is a requirement that is not always present. Some documents have a long life and need to be trusted over their entire life cycle. Engineering documents for a bridge or structure will need to be kept beyond the lifetime of the structure. Those documents need to be opened, read, verified and authenticated over a long period of time. The same goes for the files that are kept for the purpose of land registry.

Mr. St-Jacques commented that the continuum of electronic and digital signatures goes from an image of a signature to an e-mail signature block which then moves on to an Adobe self-sign certificate. For those who have a self-sign certificate from Adobe, the challenge that they have with that is that it really is self-issued so anyone can be anyone they want to be. Essentially, it is a blank card that you can put any name on and use as a badge or credit card. From there, there are also electronic signatures and DocuSign is a perfect example of that. There is also another online platform called ConsignO Cloud, which is in the same realm as an electronic digital certificate which has a signature, which has a standard digital certificate. Then there are high level of trust digital identities. Practitioners will need to confirm that they are a member in good standing and in exchange the badge that will be given to them is going to be issued confirming that they are a land surveyor in good standing with the authority to submit those documents to ALTO and that is what ALTO will be verifying.

They have created a page on their website, which is called notorious.com/alto where they can find the basic information about the migration from their perspective and to be able to assist with the information that actually replicates much of the information that is on the ALTO documentation with regards to the modernization of the Land Titles registry. There will also be a specific webpage, which is not active yet, where they will be able to sign up. There will also be links on the ALSA website that will redirect them so they can fill out the online forms on the Notarius website. From a training perspective, they offer live webinars on a
weekly basis on how to use the software. They also have user guides, frequently asked questions and access to real customer service with real people answering the telephones and the training videos are quite good.

Ms. Belhadfa informed the assembly that in order for members to obtain their digital signature there are four simple steps. Enrollment by an online application form, identity vetting done by Notarius followed by ALSA review and approval of the application. Once the request is accepted they can download and activate the digital signature. She walked everyone through the entire process.

They are working on the creation of a specific ALSA landing page on their website where a member will be able to sign-up for their digital signature. The link will be displayed on their website, the ALSA website and in ALTO documentation. The service should be available before the end of the year for the ALTO system.

First they will have to fill out an application form, including personal information and information relating to their ALSA membership. They will have to choose three secret questions and answers and they will require them to activate their digital signature. The form cannot be completed by a third party, an assistant or a junior, which is critical from two perspectives. From a policy perspective, if they share their password and get caught they are effectively in breach of the terms and conditions of their license agreement and their digital signature can be revoked. They are the sole owner of their digital identity. The three questions and answers helps them identify them if they lose their digital signature. One of the qualities of Notarius is that they implemented a simple way to reissue their digital identity if they lose it.

An e-mail will be received in order to confirm their e-mail address. They will also be reminded to prepare everything that they will need to proceed to their identity vetting, which includes presenting the two pieces of government issued identification. Once their address is confirmed, they will be redirected to a page to proceed with payment, which can be made with a credit card or an account if five or more digital signatures are required. They will be asked again to agree to terms and conditions.

Mr. St-Jacques informed the assembly that currently the price is broken down into two components. There is a one-
time fee that includes the identity vetting and proofing of the individual and it is $140. The yearly subscription fee, which includes all of the other licenses that they have access to and the signing tool is $185 a year. There is likely going to be a promotion period when they first launch the service of $100 off so instead of $140 for the vetting and proofing to open the account, there will be a reduced rate of $40 for the first three-month period following the launch of the service so those who are interested in getting a digital signature should do it in the first three months.

Ms. Belhadfa commented that the identity vetting with Notarius is done using a face-to-face session with one of their identity verification agents. It can be done by downloading a video conference app on their smart phone. There will be an e-mail link on their smart phone that they click to start a video session. For those who do not have a smart phone they can also do the ID vetting with a laptop with a camera but the app is the easiest way to do it.

Once they are satisfied with the verification of their identity they will send a request to the ALSA. An ALSA employee will proceed with the review of the application. That person will confirm that all of the information provided matches the ALSA membership database. The ALSA employee can either accept the application or accept it with modification. The land surveyor will then be notified and their digital signature will be ready. An e-mail will be received once their application is accepted. It will include an activation code and they would then follow the link provided in the e-mail. They will have to enter their secret question and proceed to the download of the CertifiO suite, which includes the software ConsignO used to prepare and sign documents. They would then be redirected to the final page where they will enter the activation code received in the previous e-mail and answer their secret question. When they enter the activation code and click the activate button, Notarius will prepare their digital signature. Once they have their digital signature and their CertifiO suite and ConsignO they are ready to start signing documents.

The first time they use ConsignO they will be asked to create their signature appearance. They just need to download the PDF template, apply their signature and initial and scan it. If they break down the steps to digitally sign a document, first they will have to download the documents from ALTO, digitally sign it and then submit it back electronically.
A PDF document would likely be downloaded on the ALTO platform and opened with the ConsignO software. There are three things to notice. The first thing is that the document has already been signed. The green ribbon on the screen means that the Land Titles Office has applied their own digital signature on the document. The document is PDFA compliant. There is a blue box at the bottom of the screen that is the signature zone. It indicates where to apply their digital signature. If they open the signature validation panel they will see a few details on the digital certificate including who it has been issued to, the Alberta Land Titles Office, that the integrity of the document has been maintained and the date and time. To apply the digital signature they either double click in the blue signature zone or select the sign button in the software. There is a signature wizard, which will have their digital certificate and signature appearance.

If they go into the signature validation panel, they will be able to check everything they need on the document to see the certificate details. There are two signatures on the document. The first one is from the Land Titles Office and the second one is the land surveyor’s.

The recipient of a digital document can be certain of its origin and integrity. There is a signature panel where the certificate details used to sign can be checked. It shows that the signature is valid in green, that the document has not been modified since it was signed and the date and time. If they click on certificate detail on the signature panel, it has all of the information about the certificate that was used.

If someone decides to change the document, in the signature panel it will show that the signature is no longer valid as the document has been modified. They will even be able to see the modification if they click on the signature field. At the bottom of the screen they can click to see the original document as it was when it was signed. Even if someone alters the document, the original is always embedded in the document. They can always go back to the original version as it was when it was signed.

Mr. Clark informed the assembly that from the moment that they apply a digital signature the original is always there no matter what someone tries to do to it because of the cryptography behind the actual certificate and the way it works it protects the integrity. It is like a PDF, that once it is digitally signed, that has a layer of plastic or acetate applied to it, you can make modifications and notations on top of
the sheet of plastic but you cannot alter the original as it is always there somewhere. That is why that type of cyber security has been put in place for the last twenty-some years now to assist in securing the data.

Mr. Amundrud wondered when the sign-up period was beginning.

Mr. Clark responded that it is still under discussion but it will likely be in the fall and they will be made aware of it.

Mr. Shrivastava commented that at the national level Service Canada is moving to digital identity and in Alberta, Service Alberta is moving to MyAlberta digital identity. He understands that from this point forward, including car registration, the digital signature can be used. He wondered where the digital signatures supported by the Government of Canada and the Government of Alberta would fit on the security matrix.

Mr. Schlachter commented that he does not know much about the MyAlberta initiative and the initiatives that they have regarding identity but it is his understanding that their focus is on identity management, not specifically the digital signature aspect of it.

Ms. Belhadfa responded that the MyAlberta ID is made to interact with the government. They are talking about professionals interacting with other professionals and the government so it is different and restricted to certain services.

Mr. Clark informed the assembly that the key thing to remember is the authenticity of their identity and the authorization and right to apply that digital signature. They, as an individual, will have a digital certificate that is issued to them as a civilian to interact with government as a citizen. However, the digital signature that is issued in this case is issued by the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, which confirms their authorization of a professional designation to submit documents to government for professional purposes. That is the key difference. In the case of a digital signature from the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association it confirms the authorization that they are allowed to submit as a member of the Association.

Mr. Ryan Pals commented that many land surveyors are using Adobe and Bluebeam. He wondered if they have to
use ConsignO to sign the documents or if it interacts with some of the other PDF software out there.

Mr. Clark responded that they are issuing them a digital certificate and it can be used with Adobe and Bluebeam or any other software tool that they already have, if they choose to but ConsignO was designed and built as a PDF processing tool and signing tool for professionals that are doing either drawings or the types of documents that they are signing. From an efficiency standpoint and since it is free, he recommends that they download it and try it. It will show up in the list of available certificates. Adobe Pro or even Adobe Reader now have the ability to use a digital certificate so Adobe will work fine.

Mr. Gudim wondered if they have to be online to authenticate a signature or to apply a digital signature.

Mr. Clark responded yes and no. The short answer is that they do not have to be connected online to apply a digital certificate to a document. However, if they are, the way a digital signature works is that they actually embed the list of all of the certificates inside the PDF. The idea is that they embed the proof. At the moment of signature, the proof is embedded in the file that at that moment they were a member in good standing at the moment that they signed. It is always verifiable. However, he suggested that if they have the ability to sign while they are connected online they should do that but both will work.

Mr. Gudim wondered how they would get their clients to sign digitally.

Mr. Clark responded that they talked about the continuum of digital signatures. One of the alternatives that is out there is DocuSign but they also have a tool called ConsignO Cloud that uses e-signatures. It allows them to have a PDF document that has a digital signature on it, submit it to their customer and then they would be able to digitally sign it with the signing platform without having to buy a digital signature. They could even approve it with their phone. The two-factor authentication that is used to sign that document is actually their e-mail and their phone number as they will be submitting a link to them via their e-mail and sending them an SMS message to access the document and prove their identity. The end result is that the certificate that gets embedded in the file actually has their e-mail address and their phone number embedded into the certificate that is custom produced for them.
There are tools out there. The DocuSign tool will also allow them to get their customer to digitally sign without them having to invest in a digital signature.

Mr. Gudim commented that one of the things that the Association is examining is funding. Whether he signs it online or offline is irrelevant as Land Titles when they check the document are going to be online and confirm the authenticity of it. He wondered if when they do that if they would connect to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association website to confirm the authenticity and if so, could they tag on a fee every time a digital signature is used.

Mr. Munday responded that the process is going to be that when someone signs up, Ms. Phelan will verify that the member is a member in good standing. If they apply for retirement status or are suspended they would go to the website and uncheck the box to say that the person is no longer a member in good standing. It would be their responsibility to keep it up to date. There is the possibility of some type of a per unit fee for it and that is some of the discussion that they have been having with Notarius and it is a discussion that Council is going to have to have fairly quickly in terms of what and how it would work.

Mr. Shrivastava commented that there are two statutory documents, one being the affidavit and the other being the statutory declaration. In the case of the statutory declaration, which is being signed in front of a commissioner of oaths/notary, there are two signatures required, the person signing and the commissioner of oaths. The commissioner of oaths is certifying that the land surveyor signed it in front of them. He wondered how in the digital environment the commissioner of oaths would certify that the practitioner signed in front of them.

Mr. Jack Bowering commented that he has been working on the project for a few years now. The important thing about the digital certificate from Land Titles’ point of view is the way that the legislation has been set. What the digital certificate says is that when they apply their digital certificate they are saying that what they are digitally submitting is accurate. Basically what they are saying is that what they are submitting electronically is what they have received in good faith from their clients or third parties so that is an important distinction. From Land Titles’ point of view, it is kind of a special use of a signature saying that I as a professional land surveyor am submitting to you what I received and I verify that.
Mr. Shrivastava responded that they are signing a statutory declaration and a commission of oaths needs to say that this particular signature has been done in their presence. He is trying to understand how that stage will be circumvented as the commissioner of oaths is certifying that they signed in their presence. He is struggling with the same question regarding today’s digital plans. He wondered how it is going to work with both signatures needing to meet the requirement.

Mr. Bowering responded that about 120 different types of documents can be submitted to Land Titles but there are four that provide the bulk of submissions. They include a transfer of land, a mortgage caveat, a discharge and common survey documents that are about ten percent of the overall. They have started with electronic forms for the four main documents and then there is also a universal form. Many times that will be what they are using. It is basically a cover sheet with a bit of information that allows them to check and verify things. They will then scan in a document as a PDF and that is what they sign so they would actually scan in the documents that have all of the wet ink signatures. They have been piloting the application and they have been working with lawyers and land surveyors to test it. It is something that they need to see to really understand it.

Mr. Schlachter commented that their digital signature will be applied and represents a bundle of documents that they are submitting. Within that bundle, there can be documents that include a commissioner of oaths’ signature. They are not at the stage where commissioners of oaths will have a digital signature but it may be coming in a future release.

Mr. Wallace wondered about consents to register a plan from some of their older clients who do not have e-mail and if they could still submit scanned paper copies.

Mr. Bowering responded that from Land Titles’ point of view all of those types of situations will use the universal form. They will scan it in and put their signature on it.

Mr. Ng commented that some of their clients are corporations so they sign and seal the forms and they send in the originals. He wondered if seals would be an option for the digital version.
Mr. Clark responded that the digital certificate itself is embedded into a PDF. The image that is associated with it is up to them, whether it be an initial, a seal or a signature. It is up to them to choose which image they want to apply with the digital certificate. It then becomes an internal question as to whether they use the image of a seal or not.

Mr. Ng responded that most seals are actually imprinted into the form. He wondered how they would validate it if it was digital.

Mr. Clark responded that at this point they would probably consider the embossed seal the equivalent of an image. The engineers have an image of their seal rather than an imprint. They actually require that the image of their seal, their signature and the date be applied on a digital file just like in the paper world, even if it is to be used with a digital signature. It comes down to how they reproduce the seal, whether it be embossed or with a rubber stamp or a visual image that is produced electronically. The example of the engineers is the best one as they have taken the whole paper world and applied it electronically.

Mr. Engler commented that from what he has seen they would do everything the usual way including collecting all the paper, getting it all signed just like before, sign the document under oath the same as before, scan all of the information, attach the digital signature and send it in electronically.

Mr. Metcalfè pointed out that they have witness affidavits for owners where the witness signs in front of a commissioner. They also have consent documents for registrations on titles that are signed and sealed by the utility companies. If they can get them, scan them and put them under their digital signature that will work. However, they would be the original documents that they are keeping in their possession and they would be copies that are going to Land Titles. He wondered if that question had been answered.

Mr. Schlachter responded that from the Land Titles’ perspective, the legislation that was changed two years ago now recognizes the official record as the record in ALTA II. The documents a land surveyor has in their possession are a representation of the official record so the word “original” gets twisted a bit. The current legislation and statute that is governing right now in Land Titles is that what is in their electronic databases rules. What land surveyors have, such as a wet ink document, is actually a representation just like
a copy would be. What land surveyors submit to them, once they accept it, it becomes the original with the land surveyor’s digital signature. Things change a bit with the new process. However, those documents are still valuable as there is still some debate by the legal society, the CBA and others in the legal profession as to how those documents might be used for instance forensically, if fraud is involved in a case or in a judicial case that requires evidence and what kind of weight they would give to the digital documents in their database versus what land surveyors would have in their files. Land Titles’ perspective is that, once they have accepted it with the land surveyor’s signature on it, what they have recorded in their database is the official record.

Mr. Metcalfe responded that many of the documents are signed and sealed, not in front of him and then he is going to submit the package. It could look to him to be original and he would submit it under his digital signature. He wondered how much responsibility he would have if there was something wrong with the documents. He would not intentionally be committing fraud but someone else could be trying to and they would be doing it under his name, which he does not like.

Mr. Schlachter responded that it is under discussion and debate right now within the Association as to perhaps the use of an affidavit or a statement on the documents. It would essentially set their responsibility for what they are submitting. They are considering it under the identity regulation under the *Land Titles Act*. If the amendments go through, they will more clearly lay out what they are signing and accounting for. Either that they are not taking any responsibility for the documents and the signatures on the documents that they are submitting and they are only taking responsibility for, in their good knowledge, the package that they are submitting or more than that. They are working on a regulation amendment right now that would consider how much responsibility land surveyors should be taking on and they are actively seeking feedback so they would appreciate comments as they discuss it further and craft the new regulation.

Mr. Chen commented that when they talk about a digital signature they are pretty much talking about PDF files. He wondered if for SPIN III there was a timeline for switching from TIFF files to PDF files or digital plans so they could use something friendly in the office and the field and for their clients. He wondered if there was a timeline or plan to switch to the PDF format.
Mr. Schlachter responded that they do not have any current plans, at least at Land Titles, to consider any other file formats going forward. They are completely focused this year on getting ALTA implemented successfully and getting through a piloting process with the Association to be sure that ALTO is able to accept this level of documentation and restoration.

Mr. Thompson wondered if multiple digitally signed documents could be submitted in a single package, such as a package from a lawyer and a package from a surveyor. He also wondered if one submission could include multiple ALTA accounts, such as a surveyor sending in a subdivision plan that has a DRR from Alberta Transportation for a service road caveat.

Mr. Jack Bowering responded that it is his understanding that the way the application is set up currently, when they are checking the validity of the document submitted to them, they are looking for Land Titles putting the signature on when the document was being created and that the land surveyor has put their signature on it and each document that is signed is verified individually. They do not verify the collection and the big reason for that is that often if they send in fifteen documents, if they are all signed in one signature, when that gets into SPIN and years later someone wants to search it, some of the documents might refer to various titles and there is no way to know if they are actually signed or if they had been signed as a group. In order to maintain the continuity and validity of the registry, they have to have one document and one signature because it will end up being that way in the registry so it could be searched that way. Regarding the multiple accounts, he does not think that they have that capability right now but he will take it back and ask about it. However, it may be part of the same thing. The land surveyor’s signature would go to their account and anyone else’s signature would go to that person’s account. He is not aware of how the ones with someone like Alberta Transportation would work. He will take it back and get an answer to Mr. Munday.

Mr. Clark commented that, back in January 2012, the Association was invited by the former Alberta Registries executive director Les Speakman to join the Registries Liaison Committee, along with representatives from the Law Society of Alberta and the Real Estate Council of Alberta. The goal at that time was to re-establish communications between Alberta Registries and critical stakeholders. The idea was to
provide input on business development and changes and the redevelopment of the registries application systems, specifically the ALTA II project. Earlier agenda items also included projected Land Titles volumes, turnaround times and how many errors result in bounced registrations. In 2014, when Land Titles chose Notarius as the service-based solution, they were involved in that discussion. Since that time the Association has also been working with Notarius regarding how land surveyors do things and how the Association can adopt a solution for ALSA certification and a vetting process. The ALSA has been an active participant and observer in the development at Alberta Registries since 2012 and has been aware of Land Titles direction and privy to internal discussion and directly involved in service delivery upgrade development. He thanked Mr. Richard Schlachter, Mr. Jack Bowering, Ms. Nada Belhadfa and Mr. Marc St-Jacques and Mr. Patrick Cormier, who it not in attendance, for including the Association in that discussion.

President Fred Cheng thanked Mr. Richard Schlachter and Notarius for speaking to the assembly.

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

Registrar Rosalind Broderick appointed new members Ben d’Eon, Michelle Hua, Michelle Merrick and Chad Vanden-Brink as scrutineers.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick advised that yesterday was the final call for nominations for Council.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick stated that there were two nominations for the position of President of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2017-2018: Mr. Mike Fretwell and Mr. Fred Cheng.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick invited Mr. Fred Cheng and Mr. Mike Fretwell to the podium to address the assembly.

Mr. Fred Cheng informed the assembly that he had decided to opt out and not accept Mr. Ross Woolgar’s nomination. Registrar Rosalind Broderick invited Mr. Mike Fretwell to the podium to address the assembly.
Registrar Rosalind Broderick congratulated Mr. Mike Fretwell on becoming President of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2017-2018.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick announced that Mr. Bruce Clark was acclaimed as vice-president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2017-2018.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick invited Mr. Bruce Clark to the podium to address the assembly.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick announced that there were three nominations for the two positions councillor: Mr. Arlin Amundrud, Mr. Michael Louie and Mr. Ryan Pals. The candidates for councillor were invited to make a short presentation to the assembly.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick informed the membership that, since there are three candidates for the position of councillor, they may vote for one or two Council members but for no more than two.

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

President Fred Cheng asked Council to return to the stage.

President Fred Cheng asked Mr. Darryl Larson, past, past-president of the Alberta Society of Surveying and Mapping Technologies, to come forward and provide an update on their activities. ASSMT is holding its annual meeting here this weekend as well.

Mr. Darryl Larson thanked Council for their cooperation over the past several years. The RST process and working together on it started in 2007 with a joint council meeting and the MOU commenced a year later.

Mr. Darryl Larson informed the assembly that Mr. Steve Dixon, who was president, had indicated that it was a tough year in Alberta. Mr. Larson addressed the assembly as follows:

Our traditional markets are changing and technology is also changing in leaps and bounds. However, ASSMT is well positioned to handle the data and technology boom.
The inventors of drones did not create photogrammetry. They took a tried and true process and added a bit of automation to it. The makers of Building Information Modeling (BIM) only added to the well-established geographic information system. Every one of the disciplines is intertwined with the technology and as such they have sparked plenty of interest in certified people. Employers need to have confidence in their employee’s abilities and the ASSMT is crucial to that confidence.

Continuing professional development (CPD) has been at the top of their agenda and it is time to make it a mandatory part of their accreditation process. It will require a significant amount of change and membership involvement but they believe they will be better for it.

The RST Ad Hoc Committee was one of the most active committees. It is now at the point of waiting on others, as the ALSA is as well.

In 2016, they had 263 members and 201 certified. However, they lost about ten percent of their membership in the past year. The membership includes 82 in the cadastre fields, 64 in civil, about 49 in drafting and 7 in the remote sensing category. There are many others working in the field.

The RST Ad Hoc Committee was mandated to prepare the processes required to implement the RST designation. Once the Government of Alberta adopts the legislation, the regulation changes into the *Land Surveyors Act*. It was acknowledged, even at the outset, that the work could not be finalized under the current review.

They managed to do a markup of the current ASSMT bylaws and presented numerous housekeeping changes, as well as specific drafts associated with the registry of an RST designation, including the completed code of ethics that was written into their bylaws. Flowcharts were also completed with the draft bylaws to provide greater certainty regarding the processes relating to the registration of RST, maintenance of RST and removal from the RST register. ASSMT gave direction that continuing education requirements would be developed for all members, including the certified levels.

CPD will be mandatory participation with exemption criteria with additional suggestions pertaining to periodic review adoption and suspensions for non-compliance.
However, they ran out of time regarding dotting the “I”s and crossing the “T”s on the language but they are two to three meetings away from completing it. He hoped that the future Council would allow them to complete the work for posterity, if for no other reason. ASSMT is probably at a position where they would have to take any of the changes to their own membership for reconciliation and possibly adoption at ASSMT’s next AGM and perhaps they could start living under the revised bylaws.

It has been very rewarding working with RST and ASSMT. There are very strong committee members and they got plenty done. He applauded everyone over the years for the effort as it was really appreciated and well deserved.

President Fred Cheng thanked Mr. Darryl Larson for speaking to the assembly.

President Fred Cheng informed the assembly that this time last year, we opened up the floor to the membership for an open discussion on alternate funding models.

We said then, and it is true today, that one of our primary sources of funding, the sale of iron posts and marker posts through our ministerial order agreement with the government, is producing less and less revenue for us. Like any other government agreement, it is subject to scrutiny and potential changes.

Last year, you, along with the members of the former Association Finances Ad Hoc Committee came up with twenty alternate funding ideas. In June, Council whittled the ideas down to ten.

In November, Council took the ten ideas, did some preliminary research and investigation, and selected the top three that appeared to be the most viable in the short-term. Potential longer-term funding models were forwarded to the Future Committee for investigation.

Council hired the consulting firm MNP to prepare a business plan for the ALSA.

I am pleased to introduce Todd Nash and Stephen Rogers of MNP today to speak to us about the different funding models they were asked to investigate, to talk about their recommendations and a plan for moving forward.
Todd Nash is a partner with MNP in the Consulting Services practice. Todd’s background includes a range of projects and assignments that relate to strategic/business planning, alternative service delivery and designing and implementing funding programs and models.

Stephen Rogers is a consultant primarily in the public and not for profit sectors in Alberta. His specialty areas include strategic planning, business process improvement, stakeholder facilitation, organizational reviews and business feasibility studies.

President Fred Cheng welcomed Todd Nash and Stephen Rogers to the podium.

Mr. Stephen Rogers addressed the assembly as follow:

MNP was asked to analyze three alternative funding options that had been narrowed down by Council over the past year. They are all really variations on a theme as they would be applied to a final product and as they are applied a fee would be assessed to the member who authored the product. The three options being examined include digital signatures, digital permit stamps or professional product codes.

The three funding options were analyzed based on a number of criteria. They included the ability to generate a secure revenue stream to replace declining revenues from iron post and marker post sales. Next they looked at the logistical details and how each one would work. The possible costs of designing and setting up the system and delivering it on an ongoing basis were also examined. They also considered any impacts on the bylaws, regulations, legislation and potential liabilities for the ALSA and tax implications for the not for profit status of the Association.

After their research and working closely with the executive director, they came to the recommendation that the digital permit stamp is the best of the three options. It offers the most secure, safe and user friendly method of replacing the declining revenue from the sale of iron posts and marker posts. There may also be the possibility of combining options two and three because the professional product code, which is like a serial number that would be associated with a product, may be able to be associated with the individual surveyor who authored the product more effectively than a permit stamp, which may be more at a corporate level. It could also be helpful in terms of the Continuing Competency Review program.
Post sales have declined to their lowest level in twenty years. From 2014 to 2016 the net revenues have dropped from about $700,000 to about $450,000. If the downward trend were to continue or the ministerial order is revoked or altered in any way, the Association needs to consider alternate sources of revenue. It is about finding a secure stream of revenue replacement that will fluctuate with the market and economic activity, not about adding revenue to the books.

Their research included a number of different steps including examining leading practices, talking to other associations across the country, web-based research and a member survey regarding the volume of products created every year so they would have a good sense of what the volumes were. It was important because there is a high degree of variation in the model that they built, especially in terms of economic activity. They wanted to provide the Association with something that would reflect a good year, an average year and a below average year. The information provided helped them do that and he thanked the membership for their input.

For each of the options they arrived at a single service provider option to simplify the modeling process. The most logical, realistic and reasonable provider for the digital signature option from their research is Notarius. The Land Titles/Law Society pilot project involved Notarius as the digital signature provider. It is very good technology for ensuring the authenticity and origin of the signature and it is a fairly rigorous process in terms of how the technology tracks the detail. For the member, using the digital signature technology would require an upfront fee to become a digital signer and there would be an annual fee, which would be in the range of $150 to $200. There would also be a per signature fee of $2.25 to $2.50. Notarius would handle all of the billing.

For the permit stamp and the professional product code, the most practical solution would be to use the existing MyMember portal. The IT service provider for it is Euclid and it was discussed with them. Hopefully, it would make it easier for members to adopt the technology. Exactly how the security and identity is associated with each stamp or code would still need to be worked out with Euclid. The Association would be responsible for the billing. The current system for annul fees would need to be adapted to a monthly basis for the product fees. Their assumption is that
it would not require additional staffing resources. There would likely be a bit of a project at the start in terms of designing it and getting it up and running but then it would be as automated as possible so the billing would be a smooth process.

In terms of income generation, there is a stronger score for the permit stamp option. Digital signatures would score higher regarding reliability, with the digital signature ensuring authenticity and origin of the document. Usability adoption would likely be a bit easier with the digital permit stamp as the MyMember portal could be used, the cost to the members would be less and the implications for the CCR program could be a benefit to the Association in terms of tracking the products being produced by the members.

The model was completed with three cases, including a base case, a best case and a worst case so the model is quite flexible and it can be used with the three options of the digital signature, the digital permit stamp or the product code.

The membership was asked to estimate what kind of volume they would do in an average year, a below average year and an above average year, based on where their products are filed. Sixty-five percent of the membership responded to the survey, which was great.

Other key assumptions included that regular revenue and expenditures are projected on a five-year historical average. There is the assumption that no additional staffing would be required. The rate for design and delivery was $275 per hour based on an estimate from Euclid, which is a reasonable estimate. They also assumed that membership levels and survey volumes rates of change would remain relatively flat but the model is very flexible.

In the base case scenario, using the digital permit stamp option, post sales would decline at twenty to thirty three percent per year. If that case were to evolve and continue for the next five years, the following fees per survey would be required to reach a slightly better than breakeven level. The fees for each final product registered or filed would be $11.50 for AER and AEP, $6.50 for Land Titles and Metis Settlements and $5 for all other products. It projects revenues at an average of $140,000 to $150,000 higher than expenses over the five-year period.
In the fiscal year ending in April of 2019 the survey fee revenue would begin to come in at about $477,000 based on the average volumes and the average survey fee levels. The costs would come in a year earlier at an estimate of $11,000 for 2018 to get the system designed and implemented but on a yearly basis the expenses would decline as people become familiar with it and any kinks are worked out, if there are any. The expenses are estimated to go from $7,000 in 2019 to $2,000 per year. In 2022 the Association would be back at the same level with the replacement revenue coming in based on the per survey fee.

It is a flexible model and the survey fees, just like post sales are tied directly to the economic health and strength of the industry. As post sales could change at any time they also wanted to be able to use the model for that type of scenario. If the revenue from post sales dropped to zero in 2019, using the survey fee level of $11.50, $6.50 and $5 it would result in a loss on a yearly basis of between $150,000 to $315,000 per year. To break even in that scenario the suggested fees would need to be about sixty percent higher to reach a break-even level.

If the economy was strong and healthy and post sales remained relatively stable, the Association at those levels could net about $600,000 to $615,000 per year. That would mean building up the reserves and making sure that there was a bit of a contingency for when the economy does go the other direction.

As far as legal and tax implications go, the Legislation Committee would need to consult with legal counsel regarding the bylaws to make sure that whatever option is being pursued works with the bylaws and any adjustments that have to be made would need to worked through. After getting an opinion from the tax accountants at MNP, there is no expected change to the Association’s non-profit status as the revenue generated for this purpose would still fit and meet the mandate of the Association, which is to regulate the profession and protect the public so it would not be expected to change at all. It would be revenue replacement, not a new source of revenue to add to existing revenue.

An implementation plan would need to be put into place and there may be a need for some additional research feedback, in particular working with whichever service provider is determined to be appropriate for the proposed technology. A member engagement awareness campaign
would need to be part of it and additional member engagement around the plan would be prudent. The necessary changes would need to be made to the bylaws. The design and implementation phase would take some time, probably a year or so. Then the implementation could start the following year so the Association is still a year away at the earliest from putting anything into place regarding it.

President Fred Cheng thanked Mr. Stephen Rogers for his presentation. He informed the assembly that it will be Council’s responsibility over the next year to take MNP’s report and have the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee see what bylaws may need to be changed to come to the membership for a vote. Council will also need to get the right people in place to refine and resolve the technical and financial issues and questions. It is apparent that there is still a great deal more work to be accomplished before any sort of final go/no-go decision is made.

Mr. David Marquardt thanked Council for all their work on it and Mr. Stephen Rogers for making it easy to understand. It appears that the Association’s future will be okay financially.

Mr. Reid Egger wondered if the model regarding AER and AEP submissions were strictly signed products or any product submitted.

Mr. Stephen Rogers replied that it was based on the volumes indicated in the survey. The assumption is that they would be final products but what a final product is would require a bit more research and final determination.

Mr. Vince Ziegler wondered if there was any discussion with government regarding the models in regards to the ministerial order and the price for posts.

Mr. Stephen Rogers responded that it was not part of their research.

Mr. Vince Ziegler wondered if, when the economy does progress back and post sales go up and the Association hits $600,000 in net income, the minister would look at the price and say that the Association is making a good deal of money on the posts. The government could cut the price on the posts and then ALSs would be more inclined to use the alternate pricing. The future needs to be considered and they should not drop the post price.
Mr. Bob Haagsma suggested that some of the numbers might be a bit skewed as the numbers he submitted were per job and for some jobs there can be six plans but others only require one before it is final. However, it may be a moot point as they are only suggesting $6.50 for a legal plan. They would be paying the same for a $1,000 descriptive plan as a $250,000 pipeline plan. Once again the little guy will be hosed but lots of it will come out in the wash once they start working on it and he will be watching it closely.

Mr. Brian Munday informed the assembly that when Mr. Stephen Rogers had made a presentation to Council in March, they realized that as much as they thought that the questionnaire made sense when they were devising it, the numbers were skewed and there were lots of issues with them. Council has said that if they are going to go ahead and do it they need to do more research and create a better questionnaire that is still relatively easy but more comprehensive to get more reliable numbers. The Association had tried to come up with something that was reasonable. The funding model is basically an Excel spreadsheet on steroids. One of the things that Council asked MNP to look at is the idea that there is potentially different pricing depending on the type of product. A lower-priced product may have a lower markup but a higher-priced product may have a higher mark up. None of the numbers are final yet but they will try to keep the markup to something reasonable given the type of product so hopefully they will not be creating any undue hardship for anyone.

Mr. David Hagen commented that he prefers that it be based on registerable products as it would then be a firm number. Sometimes multiple copies are provided for inexpensive jobs. They need to be careful as things could be booming in two years. They are still putting posts in the ground and will be for the seeable future until the act is changed. It is not as big a crisis as some think and the implementation of the plan is overly ambitious for now. The membership has not yet even been asked if they think that it is the proper way to go and before moving forward it would be a good thing to ask instead of spending a bunch of money on something that the membership does not think is the way to go. Then they could move on to other things and they should not put the cart before the horse.
Mr. Bruce Drake commented that the presentation was great. However, it does speak to the flip side of the coin. Council and the Association approached it as a possible way to replace the funding if the ministerial order disappeared but they did not talk about where the funding goes. The funding goes to pay for programs like the Boundary Panel and the CCR program that the membership has asked the Association to put in place. If the Association loses funding, then they need some direction from the membership regarding which programs need to be reevaluated. One thing that he maybe did not clearly talk about the day before in the budget presentation was regarding things like at the end of the reporting period the Boundary Panel was in a deficit position. If they continue to run the Boundary Panel at a deficit under its current mandate and the Boundary Panel is great but if they continue to run programs that are supposed to be funded by the ministerial order at a deficit that deficit is then funded by the membership. If there is a year with a tremendous amount of post sales, those are opportunities for the membership to come back and say to maybe decrease the price of digital products or maybe expand the mandate of the Boundary Panel and the CCR program. They want to make sure that there is stable funding in place to run the programs and services that the membership has asked the Association to run for them.

Mr. Carl Larsen commented that one of the things that was discussed in the Council meetings was that the digital signature stamp it is like a brand on their products and it may be a way to differentiate land surveyors or make a statement that land surveyors produce quality products. It is the way of the future as posts are a legacy that will eventually die out and it is something to consider.

President Fred Cheng thanked Mr. Stephen Rogers for his presentation and research.

President Fred Cheng asked Registrar Rosalind Broderick to announce the election results.

Registrar Rosalind Broderick announced that Mr. Michael Louie and Mr. Ryan Pals were elected as councillors.

It was MOVED by Ms. Michelle Hua, seconded by Mr. Chad VandenBrink, that the ballots be destroyed.

Motion Carried
President Fred Cheng congratulated everyone. He thanked everyone who put their name forward and thanked them for agreeing to volunteer to play a very important role with the ALSA.

President Fred Cheng encouraged others to run for Council next year when the Nominating Committee comes calling. He informed the assembly that members can also let the Nominating Committee know they are interested in running for Council by filling out the committee volunteer form in the recommendations package.

President Fred Cheng called upon Dr. Derek Lichti, head of the Department of Geomatics Engineering at the University of Calgary, and Dr. Mike Barry, the John Holmlund Cadastral Chair, to provide an update on their academic achievements and activities within their department.

Dr. Derek Lichti addressed the assembly as follows:

There are nineteen faculty members, including the president and five administrative staff. Those steering the department include himself, as head of the department since 2013 and two associate heads of the department’s undergraduate and graduate studies. They hired three instructors, who have more of a teaching mandate than a research mandate. Two are in the surveying area and one is in the engineering entrepreneurship.

He showed the history of the number of students enrolled in the department broken down by year. Until 2015 the numbers were more or less constant but it has dropped in the last two years due to factors outside of their control. In the last two years the number of students admitted to engineering first year has been lower than the number of places they have to place into second year and they are decisions from the registrar’s office. It means there is a smaller number of students to place in second year but right now it may not be such a bad thing. In the fall of 2017 there will be 804 engineering first-year students to be placed into second-year programs so they will have a full complement of second-year students and the numbers will go back up again. The graduate students are in a bit of a rebuilding phase because they have had four relatively senior people leave the department in the last few years. However, they have now been replaced so they are in a bit of a rebuilding phase in terms of student numbers.
They have revitalized and increased the equipment.

A couple of years ago they received a number of new Trimble instruments, total stations, GNSS receivers and a V10 imaging rover, which gets used quite a bit during the surveying courses and at camp. Last year they were able to get a new gravimeter that gets used in their undergraduate programs. In 2017 they were able to realize another endowment grant, which is an internal funding mechanism, to acquire some imaging systems, including a thermal multispectral and optical camera and they will be used in their undergraduate programs.

There were some program changes to the Bachelor of Science in Geomatics Engineering. The fourth year design project is a two-semester course that all engineering students must take where they undertake a significant design experience. They have added more content regarding project management and deliverables. They have also formalized a mechanism whereby they can have industry, government or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) involvement in the projects. It is optional but it can happen.

They are introducing a new course this fall called Geomatics Design and Communication, which will have more content added to it. There will be survey components but there will also be design and communication aspects, including written and graphical communications such as CAD. There is also a new option of a combined degree in engineering and a Bachelor of Commerce and it is open to all engineering students. A couple of years ago they replaced an electrical engineering course with one that has a geomatics focus.

There is now formal recognition, at a university level, of the courses required by their students for their CBEPs certificate of completion. Students apply for it and they help them remember that they need to apply for it if they want it and it gets recognized on their transcript. If you go to the CBEPs website they now appear on equal footing with the University of New Brunswick.

The main computer facility was upgraded last summer so they now have 58 new PCs that they force their students to work on a great deal to complete their courses. They have also renovated the survey stores. It used to be on the third floor of the engineering building but now it is part of the newly-renovated engineering complex on the ground floor so there is direct access outside.
They have an annual process whereby they have to report to CBEPS that they have maintained their accreditation status as a result of the report that they submitted last year. This year will be a busy year as they have two accreditation processes to go through, including for Engineers Canada, which is a full accreditation and includes a site visit in the fall. They have the five-year CBEPS partial accreditation, which requires them to collect all of the information and do all of the work but there is no site visit.

They have a couple of committees that they meet with regularly, including the Geomatics Advisory Committee. They have changed the frequency of meetings from one to two per year. They use the September meeting as an opportunity to meet with their industry and government partners to plan their outreach activities. They also have the annual Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee which meets in January with members of the land surveying profession.

There is a new initiative born out of the University of New Brunswick Students Society and it is the national geomatics competition for undergraduate students. Their students will be participating next February in Fredericton and they may be making contact seeking sponsorship.

Dr. Mike Barry addressed the assembly as follows.

It is wonderful to meet some of my former students.

Mr. John Holmlund donated $500,000 to the chair in land tenure and cadastral systems in 2008, which ran until 2013. It was a very generous donation and I could not have survived and continued his work without it. The profession followed up and there were offers of donations of $50,000 to $55,000 a year until 2018. However, due to the economy a few of the donors have had to withdraw. It averaged $153,000 and he has spent $116,000 and there have been some hiccups with the contracts associated with it. The chair has been extended until 2020. There is a further about $40,000 that is expected to come in and then another $20,000 for the next two years following that until 2020.

The foundation for the chair, when Mr. John Holmlund provided the funding, was that it was extremely difficult to get funding for disciplinary research in Canada and it was something that surprised me when I arrived. I managed to get a National Science and Engineering Council grant for a couple of years, which is very much hard science and tech-
nology based. It took me three or four attempts to get a Social Science and Humanities Research Council grant. I do not believe that anyone who filled the role before me had actually managed to get either of the grants for a variety of reasons. It is also one of the reasons why Mr. Andrew Hunter left the university and went back to New Zealand. He and Bill Teskey have been replaced by instructors, which leaves me as the only person doing research in cadastral systems and land tenure. There are weaknesses associated with that because they were developing an area of strength in it internationally. Originally I was supposed to get one PhD and one MSc student funded by the research project but with a bit of juggling and the fact that I managed to get another grant, I have managed to get six students funded by the chair and donations from the profession and I have another MSc student coming on board in September for a total of seven students funded to various degrees. The university was also affected by budget cuts so it has been a bit of a challenge but he has managed to get what I believes the profession would like to get out of the chair, apart from having someone in the position that I am in.

A Nigerian Canadian received some funding and she completed an MSc in 2015. The first fully funded student, who is a Palestinian settled in Canada, looked at land tenure information systems in post conflict situations. Another is defending in a couple of weeks and he is one of four students who have come through the program. He is looking at 3D boundaries, cadastral laser scanning and how to calibrate a 3D scanner as the law and best practices says that you should calibrate but no one seems to do it.

If you do a survey that is challengeable, the first thing that the lawyer is going to ask in court is how the instrument was calibrated and how they know that it is going to work so there is a gap that needs to be examined. Another student who started a couple of years ago is looking at prairie urban land administration in Kenya. Another student is looking at coordinates as evidence of boundaries in Alberta and given the hybrid cadastre it is quite important. He is looking at examples from Alberta and South Africa and possibly New Zealand and Switzerland.
offer to a student who is looking at 3D cadastres in Alberta and probably data models for it.

The research that I have done includes looking at calibrating the 3D laser scanner. I have practiced for some twenty years but joined academia after eleven years in industry, private practice and government. We go into settlements and use models and say, if someone knocks on the door and says this is not your house what would happen. You ask that tactfully; otherwise, you have to start running in certain situations. Or they ask, if someone builds a fence across your boundary, what is going to happen? I have seen the arguments that we had in South Africa during transformation. They need general boundaries because they are better.

Poor people cannot afford to defend themselves in court. If someone moves a fence, what sort of boundary do they need? He has seen it in development projects. About seventy percent of people around the world do not have documented property rights so it is a challenge. Using the conventional models that they have used in the past does not fit in many situations so we go into people’s houses and bother them while they are doing their washing. We ask them all sorts of questions rather than showing up with a laptop and saying this is what you need. We are one of the few research groups around the world that actually does that.

One of the tools that I developed back in the 1990s is called a talking title system. We use videos, multimedia and different forms of evidence in determining boundaries rather than saying here is a title certificate. I worked on the project for a few years but CIDA did not have too much money so they stopped the funding and it turned into a research project. We do a great deal of data modeling and looking at alternatives, social analysis and network analysis as evidence.

We filmed a boundary dispute in Nigeria where there are two customary societies, similar to aboriginal communities in some ways. There are challenges over the boundaries and people get killed over such things as overlapping frontiers, customary units and challenges to that. I was using it to document the evidence of how the boundary dispute was formed so that if people challenged what happened or they did not understand, they would have evidence saying that this is what was said in your language. We also look at how they are going to use that evidence, how people store it and how they negotiate their way into doing it. It involves
dealing with secret police and all sorts of other people as the outsider.

I also worked in Ghana, looking at a land conflict area where chiefs abuse the titling system. They use the titles to grab land that is not theirs and they get it registered in their name. The customary leaders abused their position and the customary rules, grabbed the land and had it registered. The people fortunately were able to get enough court evidence to stop the project but he was not even the chief. It is a major problem when they say that they need to use the titling system, let alone the Torrens system, in such places. Paper documents are important but not necessarily in the way that land surveyors, western countries and developing countries understand it. He gets quite a bit of resistance from land surveyors in developing countries saying that these are alternatives to consider as it threatens their livelihoods in some ways.

I did some post conflict work in Somaliland and South Africa, twenty to twenty five years after the conflict had finished. The local land registry office had been bombed so all the records were gone. What should they do in those situations as they get fraudulent documents and people get paid $30 a month to run the land tenure administration? They cannot show up with fancy computerized systems that are just not going to work. What are the strategies that can be used in those situations? They need to go from tactical to practical when looking at all of the technology that can be used for boundaries these days, including laser scanners and drones. An economist in Somalia needs to walk around with at least two guards. An AK47 is their measuring rod with different units of measurement for each one that they have so they go from tactical to practical but it took a while to go from tactical to practical and it could still be used as a weapon of distraction.

There needs to be succession planning as he has five years until my planned retirement. It is important for the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and for Canada to have people doing the type of work that he does. There is not much going on in New Brunswick, which was a centre for excellent work in cadastral studies. They had some very good people in Calgary before me and at the same time as me but they have had to replace people with instructors because of the lack of funding. The major funding that has assisted his research, apart from the research consulting, has been through the John Holmlund chair and through the ALSA
It takes a long time and it is extremely difficult to work across disciplinary areas.

I have shown one innovation but the gee-whiz technologies are appealing to many in the World Bank and the United Nations. Those people are not necessarily surveyors but if they are running around getting people to measure property boundaries with AK47s they are doing survey work. It is important that surveyors maintain and continue to be engaged in those situations. I look at getting people from the program, which I have managed to do through the chair for the first time with four students, who will be engaged in Alberta but some of them will go back to their countries of origin, many as academics.

There are very few academics who do the type of work that we do. There is a good deal of design without explaining how the design is going to work. Very few people explain the situations and then design them. There were people working in Melbourne and New Brunswick but there is very little of that type of work continuing now. There are some in the Netherlands and Germany and a few in Florida and South Africa so it is important to maintain at least one person in the position that I am in.

He thanked everyone who has contributed to the chair over the years. In turn, he hoped that they can contribute to the capacity of the surveying profession in Alberta.

President Fred Cheng thanked Dr. Derek Lichti and Dr. Mike Barry for their presentations.

President Fred Cheng encouraged Mr. Rob Scott from BCIT and Mr. Allan Theriault from NAIT to submit articles for ALS News regarding their achievements and accomplishments.

President Fred Cheng informed the assembly that he had asked honorary member, Dr. Brian Ballantyne, to speak on the Ontario Boundaries Act and other statutory boundary tribunals and adjudication processes across the country.

He became aware that the Ontario Boundaries Act provides the legislative authority and teeth that we have been missing here in Alberta with the Boundary Panel.

He had some preliminary discussions with Service Canada and Alberta Land Titles. Dr. Ballantyne has done more
research into this than any of us have. He has found the process to be very promising and encouraging.

President Fred Cheng invited Dr. Ballantyne to share the fruits of his research and talk about how something like this could work within Alberta or our existing Boundary Panel.

Dr. Brian Ballantyne addressed the assembly as follows:

Where doubt exists there is the *Boundaries Act* in Ontario, which has existed since 1959. The rationale for such a statutory body in Alberta is that it is very efficient, cheap and a quick way to resolve boundary disputes. Secondly, it has, since 1959 in Ontario, raised the profile and expertise of surveyors significantly because of the role that they play in the process.

There was a meeting in January that included Mr. Richard Schlachter and Curtis Woollard from Alberta Land Titles and Surveys, who impressed upon him that, although; there are various institutions and mechanisms available in Alberta, including Section 9 of the *Surveys Act*, the ALSA Boundary Panel, court orders and resolving issues at the counter, Land Titles and Surveys has significant concerns about the inadequacy of these processes. In their experience there is a combination of incoherent or poorly reasoned court orders, that they then have to deal with and hundreds of boundary issues festering across the province.

I wondered what would happen if surveyors owned the entire process. I have tried to relate everything to either the Alberta system of describing parcels or Alberta institutions and it is based on experience out of Ontario since 1959. If ALS 1 has some doubt about a boundary location, they are out there re-establishing a boundary, not establishing it. I am not talking about new subdivisions because in my experience disputes over new boundaries are either non-existent or very low. I am talking about re-establishing a new boundary or establishing a boundary that has not been surveyed.

If ALS 1 has some doubt about a boundary location, they could then apply to Alberta because it is a statutory tribunal and a statutory process so it would be administered by the province to confirm the true location. When they talk about the true location they have to make a distinction between the character of a boundary and the location of a boundary. For rectilinear boundaries, straight lines between monu-
ments, they are one and the same. For riparian boundaries the character is X but it has the potential to shift either through erosion or accretion. ALS 2 objects but they have to object based on boundary principles. They say that the boundary should not be in the position that ALS 1 is suggesting and it should be in position 2 for these reasons. ALS 3 then processes the application for Alberta, under the guise of either the deputy director of titles or assistant examiner surveys. ALS 4 presides over a public hearing. If there are objections to the process it goes to a public hearing.ALS 5 might well provide extra expertise perhaps to do with water levels gauges or seasonal fluctuations for ALS 1. ALS 6 provides extra expertise for ALS 2. There are six land surveyors who are not only integrally part of the process, they are the process. The process does not exist without them. At the end of the day the boundary is confirmed in law.

There was a case that went to the Boundaries Act Tribunal last week in Ontario but I have changed the description to apply to Alberta. The escarpment or cliff is 100 to 150 feet high and the horizontal distance between the lake on the right and the top of the escarpment is 30 rods, 7.5 chains or about 130 metres. I ask everyone to focus on Section 17 with a road allowance to the north and a large lake to the northwest. I wondered how this parcel is to be located on the ground and it is a fairly complicated description. It was drafted in 1938.

Focus on the three “thence” commencing at a point on the boundary line between Section 17 and 16 and that boundary point is 30 rods south of the northeast corner. There is the point of beginning and the point of commencement. Thence 30 rods northerly to the northeast corner. Thence westerly along the boundary line between Section 17 and 20, a distance of 30 rods. Thence in a direct line to the place of beginning. Given that he has highlighted three “thence”, it tells a fundamental characteristic of the parcel and that is that it has three sides so it is some sort of triangle but it is very difficult to get some sort of triangle out of that topography and out of that underlying parcel. There is genuine doubt and uncertainty as to where those boundaries are on the ground.

One option is from the point of beginning, thence in a northerly direction to the northeast corner, thence along the boundary line, thence in a straight line. That is a triangle that reflects the three legs of the description. A second
option is starting at a distance of 30 rods from the hypothetical northeast corner, ie. the northeast corner that was never surveyed because it is out in the lake, thence the same distance east west, thence in a straight line. You will have noticed that in all of the sketches and all of the scenarios the very significant feature, which is the escarpment that is 100 to 150 feet high and inaccessible. The beach is inaccessible from the tableland and the tableland is inaccessible from the beach so it is a significant physical barrier. In 1938, they know from other evidence, the whole point of the parcel was to create some sort of cottage lot or recreational lot on the lower portion with access to the lake.

The problem with option 1 is that there is no access to the lake. It terminates at a point of infinite narrowness. Option 3 is the proposal put forward by the applicant, ALS 1, who has made an application pursuant to the *Boundaries Act*. The application is supported by a whole bunch of survey evidence, including a brand new plan of survey accompanied by brand new field notes. They have suggested that starting at a distance of 30 rods or about 130 metres, thence northerly to the lake, then along the lake a distance of about 100 metres, thence westerly, thence in a straight line. The parcel as proposed is about 50 percent the low land by the lake at the foot of the escarpment and about 50 percent the inaccessible area above the escarpment.

ALS 2 in this case has objected and suggested that the parcel be using both the lake and the escarpment as boundaries despite the fact that neither are referred to in the description. The concern that ALS 1 has is that there is no reference in the description that meets the description in 1938 to the escarpment, which is a fair point but the counterpoint is that there is also no reference in the 1938 description to the lake, the lakeshore, the bank or the bed being a boundary. He cannot provide the answer as it only went to the tribunal last week but they will likely receive an answer in about six months. It is the sort of issue for which the *Boundaries Act* is ideal.

The answer is a quote from Section 3 of the Ontario *Boundaries Act*. “Where doubt exists as to the true location on the ground of any boundary of a parcel, then apply to the Director of Titles, also known as the assistant examiner survey and delegated to the deputy of the director of titles to confirm the true location of the boundary on the ground.”
The process is that first there has to be genuine uncertainty or vicious dispute as to the character and location of the boundary. We know that there are dozens, if not hundreds of them around Alberta. An application is then made by ALS 1, if they have the consent of the landowner or by the landowner or the crown (the Director of Surveys, the Surveyor General, people who work with highways and transportation). The vast majority of applications are made either by the landowner at the behest of the land surveyor or by the land surveyor themselves, with the consent of the owner.

The application has to include a brand new plan of survey, the field notes of the survey and other things including a report, which is primarily historical, any surveys of the parcel and field notes, any surveys of adjoining parcels, any first hand evidence such as conversations with old-timers, water gauge data, lake level data and everything to support the application and proposal. Notice is then given by the province to all persons affected, in the eyes of the province, by the application. Then there is a waiting period. Objections, if any, are then received. If there are no objections then the assistant examiner of surveys or the deputy director of titles confirms the boundary as applied for. If there are objections, then a hearing is convened. The hearing is an adjudicative process presided over by a surveyor. The key distinction between the process and the typical legal process is that everyone who is part of the process knows a great deal about boundaries. That is not true if someone applies for a court order or goes through a trial process.

One of the more recent trials involving a boundary in Alberta was in 2000. It was the Highwood River case, the Robertson Wallace case. The trial itself lasted about two weeks and the costs were about $400,000.

There may be a hearing and it is a public hearing if the processing officer, which is the surveyor working for the province, is not convinced that the application is complete and more evidence is needed but that is rare. What generally triggers the public hearing is an objection. Then a few weeks or months later the hearing officer comes out with their decision, reasons and order. Then the decision can be appealed to the court. Appeals to the court are phenomenally rare and successful appeals to the court since 1959 are even rarer.
The process is permeated throughout by the expertise of the land surveyor. The effect of the process is that the boundary is confirmed and certified by the director or whoever the director delegates their responsibilities to and the monuments shown on the plan shall be deemed to be the true boundaries of the parcel. This is the statutory sanction, which is not unlike a plan of subdivision that says that the boundaries as marked on the ground by the surveyor and reflected on the plan are the boundaries.

The effect is a three-part outcome. The boundaries are confirmed, the plan is certified and the plan is registered. He showed three examples. One said that the deputy director of titles, who happened to be a land surveyor in Ontario, confirmed on December 29 the boundaries but the plan then either needed to be revised, monumented or somehow updated so there was a bit of a lag until March 23. Then the plan is drafted and goes back to them for signature, at which point it is certified so it was confirmed in December and certified in March and registered in April. That is the three part process. If there is no need to revise the plan, then only two processes are needed. In this case it would be confirmed and certified on the same day and then registered about one week later.

In the early days there were many more applications per year and the primary reason for that is that many municipalities and towns were using the Boundaries Act to resolve a whole bunch of street issues. Currently Ontario is averaging about five applications per year and there are seven applications currently. The oldest one is from about 2013.

The application fee paid to the province is $410. The typical cost and there is a huge range depending upon the complexity and location, ranges from about $10,000, which is the cost charged by the surveyor, to about $25,000 to $30,000 for a hearing. Now compare these costs to the $400,000 cost for the trial process for the Robertson Wallace issue, which was a fairly simple boundary issue. They should be asking if the courts are an appropriate process given their lack of expertise and the costs involved.

About fifty percent of applications require a hearing, meaning that about fifty percent of applications are objected to. Going back through 32 hearing notices, decisions and orders from 1959 to last year, in about fifty percent of them (17 out of 32) the hearings approved the applications and a further 25 percent, so close to eighty percent, approved
the application in part. There have been 2,000 to 3,000 applications since 1959, maybe more as it is difficult to get the numbers out of the province but only eight decisions have ever been appealed to the courts and of those only two have been overturned. The vast majority, about ninety-nine percent of the decisions of the Boundaries Act process and the Boundaries Act tribunal are either not appealed or if they are appealed they are confirmed as is. The consensus coming from three people with a combined age of over 200 who have worked closely with the Boundaries Act in Ontario in various guises as applicant, as objector, as hearing officer and as processing officer, all three being Ontario Land Surveyors, is that it is very useful in resolving problems and it is still a good thing. It works with nothing significant to change and the last person lauded the various layers of expertise that have been brought to bear over the past 58 years on resolving the issues.

Given this sort of experience, there are ten lessons that can be gleaned from it for Alberta. ALSs are integral to the process. The process is only a success because of the expertise, knowledge and experience that surveyors bring to it. If it does go to a hearing, it is vital that the hearing officer is not the same ALS as the processing ALS. It is important that they are unsullied by any interactions with the applicant or objector. It is vital that surveyors be educated in historical research, boundary law and impartiality. For example, in not advocating a boundary on behalf of a client but simply using boundary principles in an impartial manner.

There was a court of appeal decision out of Ontario two or three years ago where a lawyer was fined $90,000 by the court, not because of anything that they had done that was necessarily bad but because they retained a surveyor who was not impartial. The surveyor was required to disclose a bunch of e-mail communications between them and the lawyer. In the final appeal it was overturned and the fine was waived but it is a cautionary tale.

The education comes from two sources. One is the various educational institutions but it also comes from continuing professional development courses and training offered by the profession. Surveyors working for the province have to be trained in alternative dispute resolution, mediation at the low end and arbitration at the high end.

The process should allow many boundaries to be confirmed at one time. The Ontario process does not allow that but
it would be a particularly good feature to build into the Alberta process to allow accretion to be apportioned across many parcels at one hearing. There was the Cooking Lake issue, the Andriet case from a few years ago. There was something in the order of eight to ten owners. It went to the Court of Queen’s Bench and then it went to the court of appeal and then back to the Court of Queen’s Bench. This sort of process would have been ideal, quick, cheap and efficient for resolving it.

Remember that confirmation, which is something that Ontario is still wrestling with, does not necessarily fix the location of a water boundary because they have the potential to move. In the case of water boundaries the confirmation merely says that yes, the water boundary is X and on day Y it is at this location.

Do not confuse occupation of evidence, which is occupation as the best evidence of the location of a boundary, with adverse possession occupation as they are two different things. The process as existing and as proposed does not deal with title issues. Keep in mind what is required before you can have adverse possession. It is a very rare occurrence in Alberta but it is allowed and it serves to quite title.

What is required before adverse possession is a boundary because it has to be some sort of possession over a boundary. There needs to be a clear distinction between the two types of occupation.

Sometimes mediation between surveyors suffices. He read with interest the recent article in ALS News, by Mr. Scott Westlund, about the role of mediation in the Boundary Panel and in getting surveyors who begin with conflicting opinions to come to some sort of common ground. Less than ten percent of the time in the Ontario experience, mediation does the trick. An even smaller portion, somewhere between one and five percent, require the issued to go to court because sometimes there is not enough evidence either before the processing officer or before the hearing officer to actually confirm a boundary but it is astonishingly rare and rarely but sometimes a trial is needed.

Alberta must ensure that all decisions of the Boundary Tribunal are published. They are not published in Ontario and one only receives them by promising solicitor/client privilege and through back channels. It would be very easy given the model in which all Alberta decisions from
a whole bunch of tribunals and courts are available, many back to day one and most back to the 60s and 70s. It would be very easy to institute a process like that to ensure that the public and surveyors are aware of the decisions.

President Fred Cheng thanked Dr. Ballantyne for his research and presentation. He hoped that Council will consider making a request to government to create the necessary legislation to institute a boundary adjudication tribunal similar to what was presented.

Mr. Ryan Pals wondered how the Ontario *Boundaries Act* is funded.

Dr. Brian Ballantyne replied that it is funded by the province but offset somewhat by the $410 application fee. The other costs of $10,000 to $25,000 that he had mentioned are funded by the client as they want the dispute resolved.

Mr. David Marquardt wondered if the land surveyors were paid as well or if they volunteer their time.

Dr. Brian Ballantyne replied that there has to be a clear distinction regarding the role of the surveyor. The Ontario system is not run by the profession. It is run by a department of the provincial government, which employs land surveyors and they are employed in two capacities. There are five or six employed across the province as deputy director of titles or as assistant examiners of surveys. They are provincial government employees who are Ontario Land Surveyors. In addition, there are one or two hearing officers and he thinks that they are employed on contract by the province and they are also Ontario Land Surveyors. They are employed on contract because hearings are few and far between. There may be one or two a year. In both cases, the land surveyors are employees of the provincial government. It is not a function or body of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors.

Mr. Bruce Drake commented that he would appreciate getting some thoughts from the Director of Surveys as he must have thought about it.

Mr. Ravi Shrivastava responded that he is not going to be able to give meaningful and thoughtful comments regarding it as he has just had the same exposure to the idea as everyone else. He definitely needs to think about it and try to relate it with the existing legislation. He is deeply enshrined by the teachings of Mr. Ken Allred and Mr. Lyall Pratt be-
cause in Western Canada the community development came after the survey system. In the East, the community existed prior to the surveys. In the Alberta system they give much more importance to the monument governing. That is one area where he will be looking into it and he will also look into it with the existing legislation and do the benefit analysis regarding it.

Dr. Brian Ballantyne informed the assembly that the Director of Surveys in Ontario, who is known as the Surveyor General, plays no role in the process. The process is administered by the equivalent of the department here, which administers the Land Titles Office. It is not uncommon on the applications for the Surveyor General to be either the applicant, as a landowner or in opposition but that office does not administer the process. If Alberta is serious about it, that arm’s length is critical.

President Fred Cheng informed the assembly that there is time on the agenda for open forum. It is their chance to speak on any subject or issue that concerns them and provides the opportunity to report on something, ask a question, get feedback from the membership or encourage people to join their committee. He noted that open forum is still being recorded.

Mr. Carl Larsen thanked the Future Committee for all of its work. One of the things that they are trying to do is not just make the Future Committee a visionary committee but also a think tank. They are thinking about a more open format and trying to get people a bit more engaged. They are looking for those types of people on the Future Committee who enjoy that type of thinking and discussion as it is good for the Association.

Mr. James Durant asked Council to consider in their deliberations regarding how the alternate funding model is going to move forward, that the current model is funded by post sales so obviously those who purchase posts and pound posts into the ground contribute. They need to build in some kind of equation or an amount for those who do not post so that they also still contribute to the fund. It is the same for practitioners who do not necessarily author plans but still practice surveying as they should also somehow still contribute to the fund and it should not just rely on those who pound posts or those who sign plans to fund the bulk of the Association.

Open Forum
Mr. Bruce Drake informed the assembly that they are looking for funding to continue to run the programs and initiatives that have been approved by the membership. When they talk about the funds that are generated by the ministerial order, there is always some sensitivity to who is actually paying for the posts. Their clients pay for it but ultimately it is the industries who put the most posts in the ground that are bearing the burden of those initiatives, such as the Boundary Panel and the CCR program. They are sensitive and when they were discussing, at Council, what the alternative funding is going to look like, they had extensive discussion regarding making sure that the alternate funding is broadly applied. The key component of any alternative funding model has to be that it is fair and transparent so the membership can see how the money coming into the Association is benefiting the profession, the public and the membership.

President Fred Cheng indicated that the tougher things get and things have been pretty thought this past year, the more our volunteers come through to give back to the profession and donate their time to a wide range of Association activities, research and events. He asked the assembly to join him in thanking them for making us a better and even more professional association. He encouraged everyone to volunteer for an Association committee. The Committee chairs were also thanked and presented with a gift of appreciation.

President Fred Cheng thanked Council for its support and hard work as they tried to deal with the many issues before them and he presented gifts of appreciation to those who would no longer be on Council. Gifts of appreciation were also presented to those remaining on Council.

President Fred Cheng called Mr. Mike Fretwell to the podium to take the oath of office as the 2017-2018 president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

Incoming president Mr. Mike Fretwell took the oath of office in front of the assembly.

Mr. Fred Cheng presented the gavel to Mr. Mike Fretwell.

President Mike Fretwell presented Mr. Fred Cheng with a plaque and pin signifying that he has faithfully served as president of the Association.

President Mike Fretwell asked the retiring Council members to step down and asked the returning and newly elected
President Mike Fretwell addressed the assembly as follows:

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen, honoured guests, fellow land surveyors; it is with humility that I assume the role of President of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. I truly appreciate the support of my colleagues, peers and family as I take on the tasks associated.

Thank you Brian Ball, Steven Van Berkel and Greg Boggs for your service on Council, your thoroughness, attention to detail and balanced approach to help guide us through the year. Welcome incoming Vice-President Bruce Clark and new Council members. I sincerely look forward to working with you this coming term.

Particular thanks go out to our public members, Russ Barnes for your ongoing service on Council and Rudy Palovcik, whose term on the Practice Review Board ended in December.

The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association is a strong organization supported by the efforts of committee volunteers, Council members, public members and Association staff. Our level of member engagement is one of our key strengths and reflects how important we consider our role to be. If it is not the envy of other professional bodies, that is simply because they are not aware of us.

A broad range of issues are dealt with by Council, some of which are administrative, others operational and yet others strategic in nature. In addition, Council deals with ad hoc concerns that arise throughout the year. Of these issues, there are those that we have control over, those over which we can have some influence and those we can only observe and to which we may have to react.

It is simple for us to identify those issues that we control and to deal with these effectively, we only need to understand the will of the membership. Some of these issues include alternate funding, long-range planning, internal management and oversight, public outreach and of course, our statutory obligations. Active and considered participation in questionnaires, ongoing dialogue and communication with Council is how you can let your views be known.
Speaking of alternate funding, we intend to move forward on this initiative but need your input. As outlined in this morning’s presentation by Stephen Rogers of MNP, we have made significant strides in narrowing our choices for short-term funding sources. However, we do need to gather additional information to lend some granularity to the analysis. You will be asked for input. Please participate and provide feedback. In this way our recommendations and decisions will have appropriate validity.

Some issues that we have influence over are easy to recognize, others require awareness and engagement beyond our conventional realm. We can influence and should take a leadership role on issues such as legislative review and enhancement, municipal government policy improvement as well as cadastral and control survey framework enhancement. We have external relations and liaisons with various government and industrial bodies to do just that but it takes constant effort. We should continue to leverage the investments we made through our government relations consultant and be consistent in our messages to all.

I have read, There are no New Issues, Just Old Issues in a Different Form and it is interesting to note how many recurring themes and issues there are for us. Items such as, digital/coordinate cadastre, boundary uncertainty resolution, public perception and media relations, enhanced profession and government relations and the impact of enhanced technology show up repeatedly in our deliberations.

Even the statutory boundary tribunal concept as presented earlier today by Dr. Brian Ballantyne is not new to us, having been voted on at our 91st AGM. Perhaps it is time to revisit this or at least review the previous research and analysis to understand why we chose the route we did. However, it is important to note that investigations and deliberations subsequent to the 91st AGM led to the formation of the Boundary Panel, which has gone on to successfully resolve a significant number of boundary uncertainties.

In order to be efficient and effective, it is important for Council to have a game plan from which to work. One that represents the wishes of you the members, one that enables completion of tasks and one that has the flexibility to deal with ad hoc requirements.
Longer-range goals need to be identified and executed in a consistent fashion and every step must progress towards achieving those goals. In order to do so, we need to simplify and focus. Identifying key issues, those most critical to both you and our key stakeholders and building a strategy to execute solutions will be a focus going forward.

Personally, I believe we need to demonstrate leadership by providing solutions and guidance appropriate to our stakeholders needs and to be a bit noisy in doing so.

I think it is past time that we put together an implementation plan for an Alberta comprehensive digital cadastre. We have the potential to build on lessons learned from Ontario’s digital cadastre corporation and to build a solution appropriate to Alberta’s needs.

In addition, I think we need a deliberate and focused guerilla media campaign that presents a simple and easy to understand message for all.

As a land surveyor, I endorse such initiatives; however, as President I represent Council, who in turn are your servants. Ultimately, your will dictates.

I want to thank my colleague Colin Jeschke for his support and incredible patience thus far and for his willingness to take up the slack while we are gallivanting around the country.

Finally, I especially thank my wife Barb, whose unwavering support and encouragement strengthens my resolve.

Thank you.

It was MOVED by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr. Bruce Gudim, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association consider Lethbridge as a meeting location for the 2020 ALSA AGM.

Motion Carried

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Michael Thompson informed the assembly that the 2018 and 2019 AGMs are already booked at the Fairmont Hotels in the mountain parks. It is really nice to come but it is quite an expensive place to visit and it precludes many people from attending the AGMs.

In order to host the AGM they need to have between 550 and 800 hotel room nights available, a meeting hall for 250 to
300 people and twenty, 8x10 booths. There are not too many places that can host something so large but that is not the case in Lethbridge as there are facilities in Lethbridge that could easily host the event.

Mr. Michael Thompson said that he spoke with Economic Development Lethbridge and there is a destination marketing fund, which is funded when you stay at a hotel and pay the tourism levy of a few dollars. That money could be given to the ALSA through Economic Development Lethbridge as an incentive to have the meeting in Lethbridge. What that means is that there would be no cost to the Association. In the case of the Jasper Park Lodge, the costs are offset by a commitment to book a certain number of rooms. In the Lethbridge case there would not be that requirement for the rooms because the destination marketing includes all of the hotels. It is just an incentive to bring business into the community and bringing people in is in their best interest.

In going through the process, two facility have provided proposals and both of them can host conferences of 800 people and there are enough hotel rooms available within stumbling distance that it would not be an issue. Hotel rooms would be about $115 a night, not $300. There is also other funding that would be available through government grants and business revitalization zones to help offset additional costs, such as honoraria and interpretive dancers.

The process would be that, if the motion is passed, they would want Council to consider Lethbridge as a destination for the 2020 AGM. Economic Development Lethbridge would then send out a formal request for proposals. Those proposals would come back for the Council of the ALSA to consider and if they selected one, the funding that would cover the costs of the facilities would be given to the Association by Economic Development Lethbridge and that could then be used in whatever fashion the Association wanted.

He also let the mayor of Lethbridge know that, in Ottawa on March 1 the mayor there said that it was surveyors’ day in Ottawa and the mayor of Lethbridge does not want Ottawa outshining Alberta in any fashion. He is quite sure that they could expect something similar in Lethbridge if the Association chose to go there. He is open to questions and has the proposals and numbers and a great deal of information regarding it.
Mr. Bruce Drake thanked Mr. Michael Thompson for his presentation and asked, if the membership votes in favour of it, if he would be able to provide the proposals and contact information on very short order as the rooms for the 2020 AGM are on hold at no cost right now so he would consider it to be timely. He also informed the assembly that all of the costs associated with the interpretive dance were his gift to the membership and the Association, except for a bit of Ms. Dawn Phelan’s time to organize it and there was no budget item for it.

Mr. Michael Thompson informed Mr. Bruce Drake that Mr. Brian Munday already has the information.

Mr. David Hagen commented that he does not have anything against Lethbridge but from Jasper to Lethbridge would be an eight-hour drive so it would likely be about the same from Edmonton. The national parks showcase the best of Alberta to the out-of-town guests. The Fairmont hotels have been treating them great and the tradition of rotating the meetings through the Fairmont hotels always seems to result in a good turnout because people love coming to Jasper. He would rather just have the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge as the place for the meetings continually, which is how it was earlier on because of its central location for most everyone. Lethbridge is at the very far end of the province so it is a long way to go and they are best served by maintaining the status quo.

Mr. Rob Scott informed the assembly that it took him eight and a half hours to come to the meeting. If it is important the time does not matter and Lethbridge has an airport.

Dr. Robert Radovanovic informed the assembly that he had just looked on Google and the flight is $600 to Lethbridge so he does not think that moving the AGM around to other major centres in Alberta is really a reason to consider it a cost saving measure.

In speaking in favour of the motion, Mr. Stephen Howard commented that they should go to different places, even if it is a long drive. There is no centre that is not far from somewhere. The argument that you cannot have a meeting in a smaller place is just not true. There are other provinces who do it regularly. They would really experience the local community spirit and a local team would be helpful. Moving around may result in the attendance being down but there would be a different group attending each year.
| **New Business #2:**  
**Non-Mandatory Schedule of Fees** |

*It was MOVED by Mr. Larry Pals, seconded by Mr. Bruce Gudim, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association research the possibility of publication on our website similar to the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association’s a suggested non-mandatory schedule of fees.*

*Motion Carried*

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Larry Pals informed the assembly that he has a copy of the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association’s website if anyone wants to take a look at it. There is a tab on the website that says survey costs, which shows a suggested schedule of fees, that Council would have to figure out. It is key that it is non-binding and there is a clause that says that “this schedule is not binding in any manner upon any member of the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association and was approved by the Council of the Association for the guidance and benefit of the public and surveyors as reflecting a fair and reasonable value for the professional services rendered.” It is key. There is also a position paper from the Competition Bureau that says that it is not outside the rules, if it is non-binding. It would be much better to have it on one website than 300 websites. On 300 websites they would all be different as there are 300 different opinions.

In speaking as the president of the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors Association, Mr. Robert G. King informed the assembly that back in 2000 the office was receiving plenty of telephone calls regarding real property reports. Currently in Saskatchewan the provincial government has provincial land where they require a mandatory real property report and they supply landowners with the checklist. The checklist was outside of a regular RPR and it required fire pits, wood decks and gazebos. People were calling wondering why they could get an RPR in Regina for $800 but it was $2,400 to get their cottage surveyed. The suggested schedule of fees is available on their website under the survey costs tab. They have a large section of disclaimers that indicate that it is non-binding and that they must discuss it with their surveyor, including the degree of the survey and the title involved. It outlines all of it on the first page and it indicates in bold that they must discuss all of these items with their surveyor, before commencing the work and that it is not binding. Many people in the public do not know what goes into a survey and an RPR and the complexity of it. Some think that they just need to come and take a picture and they are done. They just wanted to indicate what a suggested fee should be.
They polled their members and had a group that discussed a good place to start. Many of the fees are not realistic but they are non-binding and they are just a suggestion to the public and their membership regarding a good starting point. The Association receives telephone calls regarding what a typical RPR costs and they just provide a list of where the surveyors are and the suggestion of fees. Then the landowner can see what they can expect to pay for a residential RPR. It is non-binding and says to discuss all of the items with their surveyor before they enter into a contract with the surveyor as every job is different. As an Alberta Land Surveyor he supports the motion.

In speaking against the motion, Mr. David Hagen commented that it is a situation that he would not want to touch with a ten-foot pole. There are prices that are non-mandatory and they may not be realistic. There are too many variables in many different surveys. He does not know what the intent is. Most people get quotes from numerous companies. He does not think that it is a road that the Association should or needs to go down.

It was MOVED by Mr. James Durant, seconded by Mr. Lee Wang, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association add to the terms of reference of the RPR Working Group to prepare a document, endorsed by Council, to be distributed to the compliance department of municipalities across Alberta. The purpose would be to remind them of the purposes of the RPR, the MSP guidelines for preparing them, and the fact they are not necessarily an inspection and policing document to enforce local land use bylaws that drastically vary across municipalities.

Motion Carried

In speaking to the motion, Mr. James Durant commented that current RPRs seem to be inconsistent and they deviate from the fundamental purpose of preparing them. Municipalities seem to have become the driving force for what is included or excluded on a real property report, including whether they show fire pits, hot tubs and movable sheds in order for their clients to obtain compliance. Often they are showing many improvements that do not necessarily need to be shown. They need to remind municipalities that they are not their policing or inspection department and that as Alberta Land Surveyors they are bound to provide the services that are listed in the MSP as opposed to just the local land use bylaws for the municipalities.

New Business #3: Letter to Municipalities
Mr. David Hagen informed the assembly that he agreed with Mr. James Durant that it is a big problem with municipalities. He has told the municipalities no, he is not doing it and here is the MSP and what they are showing. Edmonton would now want them to show the trees, grass and gravel but they are not paying for the RPRs. It is a problem but the solution is that every land surveyor who is doing them needs to stand up to the municipalities. However, he does not see any problem with having a document that is sent out.

It was MOVED by Mr. Adam Berg, seconded by Mr. Kurt Popadynetz, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association consider to make a report to the government to create the necessary legislation to institute a boundary adjudication tribunal.

Motion Defeated

In speaking in opposition to the motion, Mr. David Marquardt commented that there was some good information that Dr. Brian Ballantyne presented but he has to speak against the motion. He referred the assembly to page 3 of the AGM package. The existing process is an extremely good one and they have worked hard on it for the last few years, Mr. Scott Westlund more so than himself, even though he has been involved in the process for the last ten years. If they read the relevant section on page 3, they have accomplished almost all of the items that were put forward in a report in 2010, with the exception of one thing. That one thing could make them 25 percent better, they would be able to serve the membership 25 percent better and they would be able to serve the public 25 percent better. That one thing is getting to meet with the Director of Surveys and finding out ways that they can work together. They are the real-world surveyors. There is a great deal of experience on the Boundary Panel, including about fourteen members who have over 25 years of experience. They know their stuff, their duties, their responsibilities and what the public expects of them. They have a process already and it could get better if they just had that one thing.

Mr. David Hagen commented that he thought it was a way of giving the Boundary Panel some teeth. He agreed with Mr. David Marquardt that the Boundary Panel is great but currently it has to be by consensus and it has no teeth. They could do their own made in Alberta thing and they just need to have some legislative authority behind the Boundary Panel. It could give the Boundary Panel some teeth.
Mr. Fred Cheng responded that the recommendation was just for the membership to consider an alternative and nothing is set in stone. If they do not even consider it as an option, they will just continue to face the stone wall of whoever.

Mr. Bruce Clark commented that as one of the few members in the province who has some experience in both systems, with the Boundary Panel in Alberta and the Boundaries Act in Ontario, he is strongly opposed to it. He is not opposed to the information going to Council as they should consider things but what Alberta has works up to a point and it could be tweaked. Of the Boundaries Act cases in Ontario, as much as Dr. Brian Ballantyne presented them as being quick, efficient and cheap, he has been involved in three of them and those three were not quick, efficient or cheap. When Dr. Brian Ballantyne was talking about the costs, he was talking about the costs paid by government but it is when they need expert surveyors that they need to take their time as it takes months to look at the plans and it is not that cheap or efficient. It does involve surveyors but so does the Boundary Panel, which is in place in Alberta.

In speaking against the motion, Mr. Bob Haagsma commented that it is not just a recommendation to Council to look at it but a recommendation to make a report to the government to create the legislation. Perhaps it is a couple of steps ahead of where it should have been but in light of what the chair of the Boundary Panel, Mr. David Marquardt said and he being vice-chair of the Boundary Panel and knowing intimately what they have achieved so far, he cannot support the motion as they are doing it much cheaper than Ontario. Mr. Scott Westlund would have the exact numbers per case but they are doing an excellent job for a bunch of volunteers. They have thousands and thousands of dollars that have basically been donated in order to preserve the survey fabric in Alberta. He does not think it is the right thing to do at this time.

Mr. Larry Pals informed the assembly that when the Boundary Panel was originally put together in 1999 and 2000, one of the things that they were unable to do was to include the right for the Boundary Panel to have that legislative hammer. They already have Section 9 by the Director of Surveys so why could they not be his researchers, send him the information and let him structure his boundary adjudication board. That was the intent that they started out with but they did say that maybe at some point in time they may need to
go to legislative changes. Maybe the time is now but he does not know and maybe they should do some research before creating the report.

In speaking against the motion, Mr. Stephen Howard commented that he thinks that it would lead to dilution and going in divergent ways. He thinks that it is a good thing that currently there is not a hammer or teeth. He would much rather see solutions by influence and persuasion as he hates to be dominated by hammers and teeth.

Mr. David Marquardt commented that when the process began, they looked at the authority route and they decided against it, simply because it was rather intimidating. It just did not sit right with many members who were debating it at that time. They thought they could attract more through the educational process, which the Boundary Panel has done. Back then he voted in favour of having the authority but he has since realized that he was entirely wrong. What they have accomplished with what they have done with the Boundary Panel is almost like a mentorship type program. They have many land surveyors who contact both Mr. Scott Westlund and himself with a problem, that they do not think is a Boundary Panel case but would like input regarding it. He is against the authority part of it. They have accomplished much more from an educational perspective than they ever would have accomplished with the authority route as it is way too intimidating.

Mr. Carl Larsen commented that he would like to see something that would complement the Boundary Panel. He looked at the numbers and they look great. Maybe it is just the wording that needs to be changed. Section 9 is a little inefficient but maybe it could be an alternative for cases that the Boundary Panel cannot resolve and perhaps something like this would be appropriate. He likes what the Boundary Panel has done.

In speaking against the motion, Mr. Grant Wallace commented that he was involved with a Boundary Panel case as an articled pupil and he thought that they did excellent work. The issue is that it is still not resolved. They made the recommendations but nothing has been done so he supports a better solution to ensure that something is done once a decision has been made but he is against this particular motion.
In speaking against the motion, Mr. Hugo Engler commented that, although the Boundary Panel does not have official power, if a case went to court after the Boundary Panel had dealt with it and the ALS involved chose not to follow the Boundary Panel’s suggestion, he thinks a judge would be hard pressed to side with the ALS when a panel of experts had ruled differently. Judges are not familiar with what ALSs do or why they do it and even though they do not have the legal authority to compel someone to do something, he still thinks that it is quite compelling when a panel of peer, with adequate experience, suggests doing it differently than the way the ALS did it.

*It is MOVED by Mr. Greg Boggs, seconded by Mr. David Hagen, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association consider consulting the membership on approving the concept of the funding model as prepared by MNP prior to incurring considerable costs.*

*Motion Withdrawn*

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Greg Boggs reminded the assembly that last year Council had asked the membership for alternative funding ideas. It was whittled down to the three that were presented in the morning. He thinks it is incumbent upon the membership to give Council guidance as to whether they want to proceed with what was presented, prior to incurring considerable costs.

Mr. David Hagen commented that after hearing the presentation and seeing some of the numbers, the computer expenses are probably short by a factor of ten, knowing computer programing and how things do not run so smoothly and that no extra staff should be required as it is a sort of pie in the sky dream. Everyone says that the post sales are going to go away and they are going to have a coordinate based cadastre but the reality is that they have had their *Examination & Training Regulation* before the government for seven years. They were about to be passed but then they were not gender neutral enough. He believes that one day the dreaded coordinate based cadastre will come but the problem with changing the legislation is that it is going to be a huge task so they are looking at it taking years. If it was seven years for the *Examination & Training Regulation*, just imagine how long it would take to get the major changes done to the *Surveys Act*. What he can see happening is that, the economy is going to pick up, post sales are going to pick up and then they are going to spend a bunch of money and time on the proposal and
they will present it to a meeting and the membership will defeat it. Prior to that, they should consult everyone to make sure that everyone supports it. It has to be equitable and currently the proposal as proposed is not equitable. He did a quick calculation. There are about 464 members and about a $1,600,000 budget so at $3,500 each per year it would cover the budget. It would be fair and equitable and everyone would pay the same thing. There would be no computer programs or administration costs. That would be the worst-case scenario if funding completely dried up to zero from the sale of posts. They would have a bill of $3,500 each and it would not be too onerous to fund their Association.

Mr. Bruce Drake informed the assembly that he would support new initiatives regarding funding being brought back to the membership for feedback and agreement. The only word of caution that he has for everyone is that when something is put in front of them that they give it fair consideration because there is always going to be a reason to say that the proposal needs work and that a different model may work better. Certainly the one that Mr. David Hagen just talked about regarding the budget, divided by the number of members, equals the fee for the year is certainly a valid option as well. He is worried that at some point, if the economy does not improve or there is something else that happens where post sales remain weak or get weaker, it may impact the ability of the Association to undertake the initiatives that the members have asked Council to undertake for them. He does not want alternative funding or whatever they are going to call it to drag on for years because if one day, a future secretary-treasurer stands in front of the membership and says the cupboard is bare and the cookie jar is down to the crumbs, then instead of talking about alternative funding, they will be talking about program changes, which is a different conversation. He supports coming back to the membership with whatever the membership wants them to come back with but they also need to remember that those funds pay for the programs that the membership wants to have.

Mr. Greg Boggs informed the assembly that he supports the funding model as presented but he thinks that they need to get everyone’s input and approval from the membership prior to spending a whole bunch of money when there is the possibility next year that it gets turned down.
In speaking against the motion, Mr. John Haggerty commented that he does not think that it is relevant. In his wildest dreams he cannot imagine that Council would proceed without the consultation of the membership. It is not the kind of thing to just sneak through. It has not happened in the past and he does not see it happening in the future.

Mr. David Marquardt commented that the problem is with the ministerial order as it could be cancelled at any time and then they would not have the funds from the post sales.

Mr. Bruce Drake informed the assembly that the ministerial order can be cancelled by either party with one-year’s notice. When they talk about looking at alternative funding, the worst-case scenario that they are considering is what happens if the ministerial order gets cancelled. If the ministerial order never gets cancelled, the economy goes great, they move to a digital product and charge everyone just one penny for applying their stamp because they are making so much other revenue off of ministerial order activities that would be great.

Mr. David Marquardt commented that the alternate funding model provides the Association with some independence so they do not have to rely on the government. Sooner or later the post sales will either level off or they will decline to a level that is not sustainable for the Association. He agrees that they will still be putting posts in the ground and they could possibly have two survey systems for a long time. He just wants clarification that if the ministerial order gets cancelled that funding would no longer be available to the Association.

Mr. Bruce Drake confirmed that that was correct but it was also fair to say that if it is cancelled there is always the possibility that it is replaced with a new ministerial order. They have not talked about it on Council and as the Director of Surveys indicated the day before, he is reviewing the current report and the current ministerial order. They are proceeding on the idea that having an independent funding model in place is in the best interest of the members and the activities that the membership has asked the Association to undertake.

In speaking in favour of the motion, Mr. John Lohnes commented that he thought Mr. Greg Boggs’ intention was for the membership to vote on it today but he is not sure that the wording of the motion says that. Being on Coun-
cil, he would like to see that as well. They have worked really hard in the past year to come up with some alternate funding ideas and it was his intention that increasing the membership fees was the absolute last thing that he thought they wanted to do but he has heard some feedback that maybe that is what some members would rather have. He would rather get the feedback from the membership to see where the democratic vote wants them to go. He does not necessarily think that they need legislative authority to have an alternate funding model but perhaps Mr. Brian Munday could speak to it.

Mr. Brian Munday replied that when Council considered all of the different funding models, one of the criteria was whether it was dependent or independent of the government mood of the day. The thought was that the model that Council asked MNP to look at was independent of the whims of government, would not require a change to the Surveys Act or Land Surveyors Act and it was something that the profession could do on its own. Certainly, there is more research that needs to be done on it but the intent is that it would not require government approval or an order of any kind.

Mr. Steven Van Berkel wondered if the motion was defeated, if it would give Council a blank slate to do whatever they wanted, without the membership’s approval. He requested that the motion be withdrawn and a clearer motion presented.

Mr. James Durant commented that many people are talking about clarity. He thinks they have one of the two components but what is missing is the by when component. He wondered if Mr. Greg Boggs would consider adding to the motion a “by when” date that the membership would be able to vote on the funding model. They need to decide when they are going to have the information so that they can actually move forward.

President Mike Fretwell informed the assembly that they do not know when they are going to have the information so setting a firm date would be difficult but they are committed to following through on it and they have made many positive steps so far. In speaking to some of the concerns that Mr. David Hagen had with regard to unfairness, it is far from complete and that is why he was asking for their support and commitment to respond to the questionnaires. If there are items that are not applicable they will become obvious.
Mr. David Hagen commented that he did not mean for there to be a straw vote today. He meant that once Council fleshes out the bones of it a bit more but prior to incurring considerable costs. The timeline indicated 2018 and it is 2017 now. Before going forward there should be a formal vote amongst the membership once Council has decided how they would like to proceed but before spending considerable money. That way it gives Council and everyone a say as to whether they think it is the way that they want to go. He thinks that it is very vague and that the costs he has seen are wholly under estimated, including $11,000 for the computer costs to set it up using the MyMember page. He would like the idea to be fleshed out a little more and then, once they have decided how they would like to proceed, it could come to the members, whether that be next year or sooner. Then they can bring it back to the membership before they spend a bunch of money. His worry is that they are going to spend a bunch of money, it is going to come to a meeting and it is going to be defeated. Before they spend considerable expenses, they need to allow the membership to give it the thumbs up or thumbs down but not by a straw vote today.

Mr. Greg Boggs confirmed that he wanted to see a straw vote that yes, the membership wants them to proceed with it prior to spending funds to do it and that was his intention.

President Mike Fretwell asked Mr. Bruce Drake if there was a budget set aside for MNP for the year.

Mr. Bruce Drake confirmed that there was nothing in the budget for the year that talked about spending money on implementing it or receiving any revenue from it. If someone came up with the perfect plan tomorrow there is no budget or money set aside for it so Council would still have to do a money vote regarding it. He would not be in favour of a money vote on first reading. He is in favour of consulting the membership regarding what they are going to do and he does not believe that they need this motion to pass to continue to be in favour of consulting the membership. It should be something that has firmer costs and budget projections so the membership is fully informed on whatever model is put in front of them. He firmly believes that once they have direction from the membership, it is not something that they try for six months and then say that it is not working, let’s do something else. It is a long-term quest to have stable funding for the initiatives that the membership wants the Association to undertake.
Mr. John Lohnes commented that he agrees with Mr. Bruce Drake. He does not think that anyone on Council would want to do anything without consulting the membership. He would like to see if Mr. Greg Boggs would consider an amendment to have the vote today. He just feels that they have heard the report and they know the general direction that they need to go regarding seeking further information and he thinks that it will require a little bit of money. He would like to hear from the membership as to whether they think the report was acceptable enough to give them permission to go further, study it more, come back with more information and in the future perhaps have a mail in vote when they are ready to go with something.

Mr. Greg Boggs commented that given some of the discussion, he is prepared to withdraw the motion. He thinks that it is the right thing to do but thought that prior to incurring additional costs they should have the membership’s agreement.

*It was MOVED by Mr. David Hagen, seconded by Mr. Glendon Chen, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association consider consulting with LTO to change the format of the downloaded plans from tiff images to pdf format. A pdf format is easier to use and is able to be read on smartphones and tablets.*

*Motion Carried*

In speaking to the motion, Mr. David Hagen commented that he is not sure if it would be possible and to him it would be minor. The TIFF images are sort of old technology and everything is PDF. He is not sure if it is doable or practical but if there was a way to possibly get the plans in a PDF form it would be much easier to send out to their crews. They could then use their smart phones and that is the idea with the motion. The Association could query the land titles office and ask if it was something that would be possible.

Mr. Bruce Drake confirmed with Mr. David Hagen that he was referring to downloaded plans, with no changes to the way that plans are uploaded.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Rob Scott, seconded by Mr. David Thomson, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association examine the position of vice-president as a president-elect position.*

*Motion Carried*
In speaking to the motion, Mr. Rob Scott commented that the intent is that the vice-president is a very important position on Council. It is a chance for that person to learn how to run Council and the initiatives that Council has decided on. Just jumping in as a CEO or a president is not a really good idea because Council has certain directions. They have initiatives with the government and other organizations that a new person is not necessarily aware of and they may try going in the opposite direction, which could cause many problems with Council. They would not put a chainman on their first day on the job as party chief.

Mr. Derrick Lipinski wondered if he was to understand that this would prevent a motion to have someone elected from the floor.

Mr. Rob Scott responded that they are asking Council to look at it. Instead of electing a vice-president they would elect a president-elect, who would automatically go on to be president so yes, there would not be a presidential election.

In speaking against the motion, Mr. Derrick Lipinski replied that he understands the rationale behind it but he speaks against it. Although he does not think that it has ever happened, he could envision a situation where, for whatever reason, something might occur that it may not be the most prudent decision for the Association to appoint the vice-president as the president-elect. Something may come up and the person, on the day of the election, might become incapacitated for some reason. He thinks they should keep themselves open to the option of having an alternative. It is a democratic process and he does not think that the system is broken. He is confident that the membership has the prudence of judgement to be able to make that decision regarding whomever decides to come forward at the last minute. He understands that the vice-president is there to be guided into the position of president but he feels that they should keep their options open. He thinks that they would be hamstringing themselves. They should reconsider this one so he is speaking against the motion.

In speaking in favour of the motion, Mr. David Thomson commented that although he recognizes the safety valve function of having the ability to elect a president versus appointing the vice-president, it might seem good in theory. In 108 years, to the best of his knowledge, it has never happened and to the best of his knowledge they have had two nominations from the floor and they kind of went down in
flames. It just seems to him that for the practical reasons that Mr. Rob Scott mentioned it would also do away with much of the drama and hijacking of agendas and allow them to focus on the things that they should be talking about, including the important business of the AGM. Given those considerations, he thinks that it might do away with some uncertainty, make it clearer from a more practical matter and it is the way that they have always done it.

Mr. Rob Scott responded that, if the vice-president becomes incapacitated, the bylaws have a mechanism in place to address it, which they saw with Mr. Scott Partridge. There is a mechanism to deal with such situations. He thinks that it is a really good idea to do it and it is done in some of the sister associations across Canada and it has worked for them.

Mr. David Hagen reminded the assembly that they had just voted on it two years ago and this very exact same situation and the vote was that no, they still want to keep the provision for the possible president as an elected position. They have to trust the wisdom of the membership. The reason why it has never been done is because he trusts their collective wisdom. If they find out that the vice-president is a crack addict or something it keeps their options open and as he saw this year that everything worked out the way that it should. He thinks that matters have a way of working out the way that they should. He agreed with Mr. David Thomson and Mr. Rob Scott that yes, in normal courses it happens and that is why it has not happened so why hamstring themselves. They did just vote on it two years ago and the vote was to keep it open so now they are just revisiting it in open forum when three quarters or half of the membership is gone. It was already dealt with, there was a vote two years ago and the vote was to keep it as it was.

Mr. Bruce Drake commented that just to let the membership know, on Council last year they were not deaf to what is going on around them. One of the things that they did for the coming year was that they established a term of reference for the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee to do a complete bylaw review and it stemmed from some of the good ideas or bad ideas or ideas in general that they heard coming from the membership. The recommendation is a direction to Council to bring something back to the membership next year. He believes that they are already planning on bringing a bylaw review of some type back to the membership, part of which may look at the positions on
Council or how Council is structured. If the motion passes, they have already directed the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee to look at it. If it fails as a new business item, the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee may end up looking at it anyways. He appreciates Mr. David Hagen’s comments but before any bylaw changes can happen, it is going to come back to the membership anyways. He just wanted to bring the membership up to date on what an already approved terms of reference was for the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee.

In speaking in favour of the motion, Dr. Robert Radovanovic commented that it stems from his experience this year. He received feedback during his presidential run that doing so was going against the traditions of the Association and it was a big sticking point because at the end of the day the intention was to attempt to bring change and push a policy and platform forward for the membership’s consideration. What happened as a result of his experience is that the desire to try to push the concept of changes became muddled in terms of they are not showing respect to the traditions and are showing disrespect to the membership. If there is a big red button on the wall that should not be pushed, then it should probably be labelled “do not push.” There is a difference between traditions and rules. He strongly supports it if the intention of the membership is that the vice-president position should be a president-elect position and as Mr. Rob Scott pointed out they have very good reasons as to why it should be. They could argue to the contrary but it is a valid logical point. If that is what they want to do, then they should make it a president-elect position. If they want to bring clarity then they should do that and make it happen.

Mr. Derrick Lipinski commented that he does not entirely disagree. He just feels that in extenuating circumstances, when something unforeseen happens, they should still have an option. He understands the respect issue and he agrees with it entirely but he just does not thing that they should shackle themselves by putting themselves in the position of having to accept someone, that for whatever reason something may come about that it may not be prudent for the Association to accept them as president.

Mr. Robert Morrison informed the assembly that next year is a leap year so they have 363 days before the next AGM, which is a long time for them to decide to run for office and volunteer their time and they can contact someone on the election committee, if they are interested. He finds the process of injecting someone at the last minute very disrespectful to the
office and disrespectful to the person who has volunteered their time. If they want to run, they can run for vice-president and the process works. They should not be able to jump in and push someone else out after they have put in volunteer time for a year or two.

In speaking in favour of the motion, Mr. Larry Pals commented that he believes that in the setting up of the bylaws, consideration for extenuating circumstances should be reviewed. Yes, there are certain circumstances where the president-elect may not become the president but normally they would. He fully supports the motion.

In speaking against the motion, Mr. Bob Haagsma commented that using the same set of data that Mr. David Thomson used, in 108 years they have not really required it. Although, as they spoke to it two years ago and he thinks he is going to say exactly the same thing again now. He wondered why they would limit their options. He does not understand it as it is working. It is just like the Boundary Panel. Why invent something new if it is already working so he cannot support the motion.

Mr. Rob Scott commented that he appreciates all of the comments but he still believes that it is a good thing to do. Mr. Larry Pals made a good point that they need to look at all of the options in case a situation happens. It is his understanding from what Mr. Bruce Drake said that it is going to happen with the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee.

It is MOVED by Dr. Rob Radovanovic, seconded by Mr. John Haggerty, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association consider rescheduling open forum to earlier in the AGM schedule. Motion Carried

In speaking to the motion, Dr. Robert Radovanovic pointed out the dwindling attendance and it explains what the genesis of the motion is. He and his seconder recognize that open forum and new business really rely on the totality of all of the things that happen at the AGM and of course they do relate to the new Council as opposed to the outgoing Council. However, it strikes him that over the AGMs that he has attended, much of the work and direction setting for the upcoming year stems from new business and open forum but this is when they are worn out, blood sugar levels are low and everyone is thinking of the President’s Ball. They are asking that Council considers resorting the
agenda so that perhaps the U of C, SAIT and BCIT things are at the end and new business takes place when everyone is there.

Mr. Bruce Drake wondered if Dr. Robert Radovanovic was referring to scheduling open forum earlier or scheduling new business earlier or both.

Dr. Robert Radovanovic confirmed that his intention was for open forum and new business to take place earlier and he recognizes that they are two separate things. However, in the consideration of time and expediency he would be prepared to leave the motion as it is or if they would entertain him amending the motion to read open forum and new business he would be willing to accept that as well.

President Mike Fretwell confirmed that the motion was then slightly revised.

Mr. Larry Pals commented that he would then have to speak against the motion as they cannot conduct new business until the new Council is installed. He could see perhaps splitting open forum and doing open forum on Friday and another one on Saturday but he cannot support the idea of moving new business to Friday as the past president cannot run new business.

Dr. Robert Radovanovic replied that he would then keep the original motion, with the intention that it will be open forum regarding new business to be voted on when new business actually happens.

President Mike Fretwell invited Mr. John Berghuis, president of the Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors to say a few words.

Mr. John Berghuis congratulated the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association on a very interesting and successful AGM at a beautiful venue.

President Mike Fretwell thanked Mr. John Berghuis.

President Mike Fretwell declared the 108th 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, 2016 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 inquiry, analytical procedures and discussion related to information supplied to us by the Association.

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

Based on our review, nothing has come to our attention that causes us to believe that these financial statements are not, in all material respects, in accordance with Canadian accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations.

Edmonton, Alberta
August 25, 2016

Collins Barrow Edmonton LLP
Chartered Accountants
# ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION

**Statement of Financial Position**  
April 30, 2016  
(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$824,993</td>
<td>$841,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities</td>
<td>167,082</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable (Note 3)</td>
<td>153,327</td>
<td>254,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses (Note 4)</td>
<td>29,662</td>
<td>44,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,175,064</td>
<td>1,140,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Cash and Marketable Securities (Note 5)</td>
<td>3,103,513</td>
<td>3,123,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and Equipment (Note 6)</td>
<td>143,703</td>
<td>167,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>$174,121</td>
<td>$113,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>37,261</td>
<td>37,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions (Note 8)</td>
<td>803,280</td>
<td>999,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,014,662</td>
<td>960,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Lease Inducement (Note 9)</td>
<td>160,402</td>
<td>180,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,175,064</td>
<td>1,140,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in equipment</td>
<td>143,703</td>
<td>167,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally restricted (Note 10)</td>
<td>3,103,513</td>
<td>3,123,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,247,216</td>
<td>3,291,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEASE COMMITMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROVED ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes to financial statements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNRESTRICTED - GENERAL FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating (Schedule 1)</td>
<td>$1,484,694</td>
<td>$1,570,575</td>
<td>$ (85,881)</td>
<td>$1,888,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>673,308</td>
<td>644,100</td>
<td>29,208</td>
<td>673,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment (Schedule 2)</td>
<td>99,226</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>(33,774)</td>
<td>301,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Boundary Panel</td>
<td>92,339</td>
<td>111,667</td>
<td>(19,328)</td>
<td>97,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,349,567</td>
<td>2,459,342</td>
<td>(109,775)</td>
<td>2,961,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and Committees (Schedule 3)</td>
<td>167,691</td>
<td>217,870</td>
<td>(50,179)</td>
<td>188,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Competency Review (Schedule 4)</td>
<td>285,872</td>
<td>294,261</td>
<td>(8,389)</td>
<td>275,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (Schedule 5)</td>
<td>892,464</td>
<td>901,258</td>
<td>(8,794)</td>
<td>877,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating (Schedule 6)</td>
<td>1,005,288</td>
<td>1,092,756</td>
<td>(87,470)</td>
<td>1,206,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,351,315</td>
<td>2,506,147</td>
<td>(154,832)</td>
<td>2,607,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1,748)</td>
<td>(46,805)</td>
<td>45,057</td>
<td>353,970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues)

*See notes to financial statements*
## ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION

Statement of Operations (continued)

For the Year Ended April 30, 2016

(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues (Expenses)</th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciple Revolving Fund</td>
<td>14,658</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>15,342</td>
<td>42,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>8,715</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,715</td>
<td>8,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>9,399</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9,399)</td>
<td>(9,046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Surveyors Levy Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>91,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,400</td>
<td>24,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>91,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>(91,200)</td>
<td>(26,609)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Their Mark Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(166)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Allowance Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(209)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>(579)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(579)</td>
<td>(35,552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>296,975</td>
<td></td>
<td>296,975</td>
<td>409,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>323,638</td>
<td></td>
<td>(323,638)</td>
<td>(447,012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,663</td>
<td></td>
<td>(26,663)</td>
<td>(37,689)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42,384</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(12,384)</td>
<td>(33,759)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUES (UNDER) OVER EXPENSES

$ (44,132) $ (76,805) $ 32,673 $ 320,211

See notes to financial statements

Collins Barrow
Chartered Accountants
# Statement of Changes in Net Assets

**Year Ended April 30, 2016**  
*(Unaudited)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balance at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Revenues 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>$</td>
<td>$ 22,459</td>
<td>(22,459)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invested in Equipment</strong></td>
<td>167,919</td>
<td>(24,207)</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>143,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167,919</td>
<td>(24,207)</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>143,703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internally Restricted (Note 10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Balance at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Revenues Over (Under) Expenses</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>2,874,595</td>
<td>(579)</td>
<td>(92,199)</td>
<td>2,781,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(14,658)</td>
<td>14,658</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors' Reserve Fund</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Presenter Revolving Fund</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>127,575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel Fund</td>
<td>(30,297)</td>
<td>(26,663)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56,960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Their Mark Fund</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Allowance Fund</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Board of Examiners for</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>(684)</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>3,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Surveyors Levy Fund</td>
<td>29,964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral Research Fund</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(3,805)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Surveyors Canada Fund</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(3,805)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized Practice Reserve Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,123,438</td>
<td>(42,384)</td>
<td>22,459</td>
<td>3,103,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 3,291,348</td>
<td>$ (44,132)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,247,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes to financial statements
# Alberta Land Surveyors' Association

## Statement of Cash Flows

Year Ended April 30, 2016

(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</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>Revenues (under) over expenses</td>
<td>$44,132</td>
<td>$320,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items not affecting cash:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>24,207</td>
<td>21,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>(19,642)</td>
<td>(17,122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized loss (gain) on marketable securities</td>
<td>73,630</td>
<td>(160,292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on disposal of marketable securities</td>
<td>(58,594)</td>
<td>(39,923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24,531)</td>
<td>123,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in non-cash working capital (Note 12)</td>
<td>170,501</td>
<td>9,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145,970</td>
<td>133,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTING ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted cash decrease</td>
<td>94,274</td>
<td>81,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of property and equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(180,013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of marketable securities</td>
<td>(711,374)</td>
<td>(1,446,715)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of marketable securities</td>
<td>454,907</td>
<td>1,403,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(152,193)</td>
<td>(141,082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCING ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred lease inducement received</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>196,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>196,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCREASE (DECREASE) IN CASH</strong></td>
<td>(16,223)</td>
<td>188,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash - beginning of year</td>
<td>841,216</td>
<td>652,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH - END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$824,993</td>
<td>$841,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes to financial statements

Collins Barrow
Chartered Accountants
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements
Year Ended April 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

1. PURPOSE OF THE ASSOCIATION

The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association (the “Association”) is a not-for-profit, self-governing professional organization 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 not-for-profit organization under the Income Tax Act (Canada), the Association is not subject to income taxes.

2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

(a) Basis of presentation

The financial statements were prepared in accordance with Canadian accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations.

(b) Cash

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

(c) Marketable securities

Marketable securities consists of investments in equity instruments that are quoted in an active market which are recorded at fair market value, as well as corporate bonds which are recorded at amortized cost. Unrealized gains or losses on investments in equity instruments are recognized in the statement of operations.

(d) Volunteer services

Volunteers contribute time to the Association in carrying out its services. The fair value of contributed services cannot be reasonably determined and are therefore not reflected in these financial statements.

(e) Property and equipment

Property and equipment are recorded at cost and are amortized over their estimated useful lives on a straight-line basis at the following annual rates:

- Leasehold improvements: 10%
- Office equipment: 20%
- Furniture and fixtures: 20%
- Survey equipment: 20%
- Computer equipment: 30%

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

(continues)
2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (continued)

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

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

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

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

Investment income is recognized as the amounts are earned.

(g) Financial instruments
Measurement of Financial Instruments

Financial instruments are financial assets or financial liabilities of the Association where, in general, the Association has the right to receive cash or another financial asset from another party or the Association has the obligation to pay another party cash or other financial assets.

The Association initially measures its financial assets and financial liabilities at fair value.

The Association subsequently measures all its financial assets and financial liabilities at amortized cost, except for investments in equity instruments included in marketable securities that are quoted in an active market and financial instruments designated to be measured at fair value, which are measured at fair value. Changes in fair value are recognized in operations. Marketable securities excluding corporate bonds are measured at fair value.

Financial assets measured at amortized cost include cash, restricted cash, corporate bonds included in marketable securities and accounts receivable.

Financial liabilities measured at amortized cost include accounts payable and accrued liabilities.

Impairment
Financial assets measured at cost or amortized cost are tested for impairment, at the end of each year, to determine whether there are indicators that the asset may be impaired. The amount of the write-down, if any, is recognized in operations. A previously recognized impairment loss may be reversed to the extent of the improvement, directly or by adjusting the allowance account. The reversal may be recorded provided it is no greater than the amount that had been previously reported as a reduction in the asset and it does not exceed original cost. The amount of the reversal is recognized in operations.

(continues)
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements
Year Ended April 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (continued)

(h) Use of estimates

The preparation of these financial statements in conformity with Canadian accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amount of assets and liabilities, disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the period. Significant estimates included in the financial statements are the collectability of accounts receivable, prepaid expenses, amortization and accrued liabilities. Actual results could differ from these estimates.

3. ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>$153,327</td>
<td>$258,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(4,780)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$153,327</strong></td>
<td><strong>$254,024</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the year, the Association recorded bad debts of $38,656 (2015 - $nil) which is included in administration expenses.

The bad debts recorded in the current year relate to legal costs that were incurred in a disciplinary case.

4. PREPAID EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$17,817</td>
<td>$17,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>21,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3,845</td>
<td>3,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,662</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,869</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **RESTRICTED CASH AND MARKETABLE SECURITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$94,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities</td>
<td>3,103,513</td>
<td>3,029,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,103,513</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,123,438</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Restricted cash and marketable securities have been designated for specific programs that are described in Note 10.

6. **PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>$117,852</td>
<td>$17,693</td>
<td>$100,259</td>
<td>$112,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>106,731</td>
<td>67,076</td>
<td>39,655</td>
<td>50,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>47,263</td>
<td>43,474</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td>4,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>32,147</td>
<td>32,147</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>304,093</td>
<td>160,390</td>
<td>143,703</td>
<td>167,910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuing Competency:

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

|                          | **$331,295** | **187,592** | **$143,703** | **$167,910** |

7. **BANK INDEBTEDNESS**

The Association has a line of credit at prime, to a maximum of $200,000, secured by a general security agreement. During the year, the Association did not draw on the line of credit.
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements
Year Ended April 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

8. DEFERRED CONTRIBUTIONS

The Association assesses its members and annual membership fees 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>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance, beginning of year</td>
<td>$ 809,255</td>
<td>$ 655,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions received during the year</td>
<td>803,280</td>
<td>809,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts recognized as revenue</td>
<td>(809,255)</td>
<td>(655,685)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>803,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>809,255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. DEFERRED LEASE INDEUCEMENT

The Association renewed the lease for its present offices in 2014 and received an inducement amount of $196,411. The Association amortizes the tenant deferred lease inducement on the straight-line basis over the term of the lease which expires on June 30, 2024. The current year's amortization of $19,642 (2015 - $16,367) was credited to rent expense.

Under the renewed lease agreement, the Association will also receive a tenant inducement of $27,525 based on five dollars per square foot of rentable area before July 1, 2019.
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements
Year Ended April 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

10. INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS

Financial Stabilization Fund
This fund was established for special projects, overruns of expenses of the operating budget and any other approved non-budgeted expenses. Surplusages from the operating accounts are transferred to the Financial Stabilization Fund at year-end and deficits in the operating accounts are balanced with funds from the Financial Stabilization Fund. Council may allocate funds for extraordinary expenses.

Discipline Revolving Fund
This fund was established 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 resets the fund at $50,000.

Communications and Public Relations Development Fund
This fund was established for special initiatives that promote the profession to the public. At the start of each year, Council resets the fund at $25,000.

Technology Transfer and Education Fund
This fund was established for non-capital expenses that allow the Association to take better advantage of technology and to educate members about subjects that will allow them to better serve the public. At the start of each year, Council resets the fund at $10,000.

Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund
This fund was established to reimburse members who are acknowledged delegates of international organizations, invited speakers or participants at conferences or meetings outside of Alberta. At the start of each year, Council resets 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 members, other professional organizations or the general public. At the start of each year, Council resets the fund at $15,000.

AGM Stabilization Fund
This fund was established 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.

(continues)
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Notes to Financial Statements
Year Ended April 30, 2016
(Unaudited)

10. INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS (continued)

Maintaining and Enhancing Professional Practice Fund

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

Making Their Mark Fund

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

Leasehold Allowance Fund

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

Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors Levy Fund

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

Cadastral Research Fund

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

Professional Surveyors Canada Fund

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

Unauthorized Practice Reserve Fund

This fund was established to provide funding to deal with situations where the organization alleges that non-current members or non-members are performing land surveying in an unauthorized manner.
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Notes to Financial Statements
Year Ended April 30, 2016
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11. LEASE COMMITMENTS

The Association leases office space under an operating lease agreement which expires on June 30, 2024. The Association also pays a proportionate share of operating costs.

The Association leases a photocopier under an operating lease agreement which expires on August 30, 2018.

Future minimum lease payments, including operating costs, due under these operating leases will be approximately as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$95,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$98,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$101,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$104,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$106,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereafter</td>
<td>$356,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$863,368</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. CHANGES IN NON-CASH WORKING CAPITAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>$100,697</td>
<td>$252,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>$15,207</td>
<td>($30,272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>$60,962</td>
<td>($387,398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable (recoverable)</td>
<td>($390)</td>
<td>$21,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions</td>
<td>($5,975)</td>
<td>$153,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$170,501</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,620</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. SCHEDULES

Schedules 1 - 6 compare actual revenues and expenses for the year to budgeted amounts, which are unaudited. The budgets were prepared by management and approved by Council.
14. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

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

The Association is exposed to various risks through its financial instruments. The following analysis provides information about the Association's risk exposure and concentration as of April 30, 2016.

Credit risk

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

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

It is management's opinion that there is no significant credit risk as of April 30, 2016.

Liquidity risk

Liquidity risk is the risk that the Association will encounter difficulty in meeting obligations associated with financial liabilities.

In management's opinion, this risk has been reduced due to the large cash and marketable security reserves kept on hand at April 30, 2016.

Market risk

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

The Association is exposed to market risk on its marketable securities. The Association mitigates this risk by having a diversified portfolio.

Currency risk

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

The Association is exposed to currency risk on its marketable securities invested in foreign currencies. The Association mitigates its risk by having a diversified portfolio managed by a major financial institution.

(continues)
14. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS (continued)
   Interest rate risk
   Interest rate risk is the risk that the value of a financial instrument might be adversely affected by a change in the interest rates.
   The Association is exposed to interest rate risk arising from its interest bearing assets.
   The Association's cash and marketable securities include amounts held by financial institutions that earn interest at market rates.
   The Association manages its risk by monitoring interest being earned on excess funds.

15. COMPARATIVE FIGURES
   Some of the comparative figures have been reclassified to conform to the current year's presentation.

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.
   The following accounting of revenues and expenses has been provided pursuant to sub-section 7(5) of the Ministerial Order.
# ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION

## Notes to Financial Statements

**Year Ended April 30, 2016**

*(Unaudited)*

## 16. INFORMATION REQUIRED BY MINISTERIAL ORDER *(continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post sales</td>
<td>$1,142,496</td>
<td>$1,527,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post sale admin</td>
<td>730,083</td>
<td>939,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Competency</td>
<td>254,783</td>
<td>237,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>94,561</td>
<td>184,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing pro. pr.</td>
<td>120,627</td>
<td>125,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness</td>
<td>196,029</td>
<td>115,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 47 plan monitoring</td>
<td>15,488</td>
<td>15,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field note/dormant plan repository</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,411,931</td>
<td>1,618,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues under expenses</strong></td>
<td>(269,435)</td>
<td>(90,912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>(117,118)</td>
<td>(26,206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$(386,553)</td>
<td>$(117,118)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel</td>
<td>$296,975</td>
<td>$409,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Boundary Panel</td>
<td>92,340</td>
<td>96,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Boundary Panel</td>
<td>231,298</td>
<td>350,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>323,638</td>
<td>447,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues under expenses</strong></td>
<td>(26,683)</td>
<td>(37,689)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>(30,297)</td>
<td>7,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$(56,960)</td>
<td>$(30,297)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Operating Revenues  
Year Ended April 30, 2016  
(Unaudited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Budget Variance (Over (Under))</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts, net of Boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel transfers</td>
<td>$854,226</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
<td>$9,226</td>
<td>$1,114,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts, net of Boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel transfers</td>
<td>288,270</td>
<td>351,125</td>
<td>(62,855)</td>
<td>412,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual general meeting</td>
<td>88,532</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>(71,468)</td>
<td>150,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention levy</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>75,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>59,625</td>
<td>38,800</td>
<td>20,825</td>
<td>29,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>54,788</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>29,788</td>
<td>37,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>23,920</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(6,080)</td>
<td>21,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>14,245</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>(3,755)</td>
<td>18,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>(4,050)</td>
<td>17,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(692)</td>
<td>2,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,484,694</td>
<td>$1,570,575</td>
<td>(85,881)</td>
<td>$1,888,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes to financial statements
### ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

**Investment Income**

*Year Ended April 30, 2016*

*(Unaudited)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
<th>Budget Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dividends</td>
<td>$52,982</td>
<td>$14,307</td>
<td>$62,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized gains</td>
<td>39,923</td>
<td>43,594</td>
<td>58,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>48,771</td>
<td>21,955</td>
<td>51,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized (loss) gain</td>
<td>160,292</td>
<td>(113,630)</td>
<td>(73,630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$301,968</strong></td>
<td><strong>$133,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$99,226</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See notes to financial statements*
## ACTUAL LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION

### Council and Committees

**Year Ended April 30, 2016**

*(Unaudited)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Variance Over/Under</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External relations</td>
<td>$67,969</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$(7,031)</td>
<td>$74,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and examination</td>
<td>$26,559</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$(3,441)</td>
<td>$31,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s travel</td>
<td>$22,410</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$(6,590)</td>
<td>$16,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>$19,550</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$(16,450)</td>
<td>$27,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Board</td>
<td>$17,475</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$18,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>$6,840</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$(3,160)</td>
<td>$13,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>$1,465</td>
<td>$1,520</td>
<td>$(55)</td>
<td>$352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>$1,403</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
<td>$(3,197)</td>
<td>$16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and biographical</td>
<td>$1,170</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$(830)</td>
<td>$1,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$(2,050)</td>
<td>$1,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$(1,600)</td>
<td>$1,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$(5,000)</td>
<td>$1,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation ad hoc committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$(1,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention and social</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$(250)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

$167,691 $217,870 $(50,179) $188,575

*See notes to financial statements*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>$ 229,771</td>
<td>$ 231,361</td>
<td>$(1,590)</td>
<td>$ 229,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fees</td>
<td>$ 43,492</td>
<td>$ 45,000</td>
<td>$(1,508)</td>
<td>$ 35,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and transportation</td>
<td>$ 9,109</td>
<td>$ 13,000</td>
<td>$(3,891)</td>
<td>$ 6,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$ 1,535</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td>$(465)</td>
<td>$ 1,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and dues</td>
<td>$ 1,395</td>
<td>$ 1,800</td>
<td>$(405)</td>
<td>$ 1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and plans</td>
<td>$ 438</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
<td>$ 338</td>
<td>$ 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>$ 132</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$(368)</td>
<td>$ 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Training - CCR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$(500)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 285,872</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 294,261</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(8,389)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 275,283</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See notes to financial statements
# ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION

**Administration**

**Year Ended April 30, 2016**

**(Unaudited)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Budget Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, benefits and contract staff</td>
<td>$537,770</td>
<td>$540,740</td>
<td>$2,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building operations</td>
<td>192,645</td>
<td>215,100</td>
<td>(22,455)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debts (Note 3)</td>
<td>38,656</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>38,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>24,207</td>
<td>7,037</td>
<td>17,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, internet and database</td>
<td>18,148</td>
<td>15,350</td>
<td>2,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>14,250</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>(250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies and photocopying</td>
<td>12,901</td>
<td>18,331</td>
<td>(5,430)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>10,091</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>(14,909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>9,792</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>(12,208)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>(250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>7,092</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery</td>
<td>6,730</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>(270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>4,593</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(1,407)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and subscriptions</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence and travel</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>(1,840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and courier</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(525)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical file management</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(1,347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(1,436)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training and library</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 47 monitoring</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$892,464 $901,258 $(8,794) $877,431

*See notes to financial statements*
# Alberta Land Surveyors' Association

**Operating**

**Year Ended April 30, 2016**

*(Unaudited)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2016</th>
<th>Budget 2016</th>
<th>Budget Variance Over (Under)</th>
<th>Actual 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts</td>
<td>468,087</td>
<td>445,000</td>
<td>$23,087</td>
<td>588,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts</td>
<td>204,800</td>
<td>245,125</td>
<td>(40,325)</td>
<td>290,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual general meeting</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>242,800</td>
<td>(88,800)</td>
<td>219,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges and</td>
<td>63,823</td>
<td>59,200</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>60,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>50,018</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>26,018</td>
<td>37,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>21,639</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>(4,361)</td>
<td>24,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>18,829</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>(2,171)</td>
<td>13,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>12,861</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>(4,639)</td>
<td>17,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>10,994</td>
<td>10,183</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>15,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>(1,700)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,005,288</td>
<td>1,092,758</td>
<td>(87,470)</td>
<td>1,265,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See notes to financial statements*
Last year, in my report to the membership, I said that 2016-2017 was going to be a difficult year. Check.

I said that there would be more Alberta Land Surveyors retiring and fewer pupils entering into articles. Check.

I said that the 2016-2017 budget cut $192,000 in spending across 34 budget line items (not including the reduced cost from selling fewer posts). Check.

I said that the biggest budgetary wildcard for the ALSA is complaints and discipline process as those costs can fluctuate dramatically from year to year. Check.

If there is any good news in this economy it is that the rate of layoffs of Alberta Land Surveyors and articling pupils has slowed down and some practitioners are finding work. But even that does not recognize the number of practitioners who are underemployed or continue to fight over what little work there is.

At the ALSA office, we have focused on our core mandate of protecting the public’s interest and carrying out our statutory functions. As the economy went down, our workload went up.

We have worked with articling pupils and the Registration Committee to try to help students who are struggling to complete their articles.

We have tried to work with Alberta Land Surveyors who have found themselves out of work or have been considering setting up their own surveyor’s corporations.

We have ensured that Alberta Land Surveyors have the necessary professional liability insurance requirements in place or have applied for an exemption.

We have had discussions with non-land surveyors who have considered establishing surveyor’s corporations as a means to extend their existing line of work. We go to great lengths to ensure that the non-land surveyors (and their prospective Alberta Land Surveyor partners) understand that the Alberta Land Surveyor is responsible for the supervision, direction and control of the practice.

We have had to spend more time with landowners who are considering making a complaint against a practitioner.

We have worked to try to provide educational seminars that are both of interest to the membership and reflect the needs of the membership (and these are often two different things).

In providing administrative support to committees, we try to anticipate the committees’ questions and any issues or concerns that might arise from any policy or action a committee
might undertake. It seems to me that, this year in particular, the committees have had more questions and have looked to the ALSA office for more advice and support.

Even then, not everything in our core mandate is rules and procedures and paperwork.

A significant part of my time this year has been providing support and research to Council on alternate funding ideas. The membership did a fantastic job of providing many ideas to Council for its consideration and now that the ideas have been narrowed down to a select few, I have been working with our consultant to help them put their analysis together. I have also been spending more and more time working collaboratively with Land Titles as they move toward the electronic submission of documents and need the ALSA to confirm that a practitioner is permitted to practice. I look forward to presentations on both of these subjects at the AGM.

At the ALSA office, we continue to look at our core services and try to imagine how they could/should/will be done differently. Everything has been up for discussion. Last year, in this space, I asked if *ALS News* should become a digital-only magazine. I also asked if the membership still preferred Jasper and Banff as AGM meeting locations. These are still valid questions and maybe the answers today would be different from the answers a year ago or five years ago. We tried an online regional meeting this year where we lost the benefit of face-to-face communications but had more people attend the regional meeting and at no cost.

I have investigated, or am in the process of investigating, other ALSA expenses such as staffing, office space, meeting room rentals and capital budgets.

Each of these line items in the budget lead to a broader discussion/strategic planning discussion about what level of service the ALSA office should provide to serve the public and aid the membership.

I have written on several occasions in *ALS News* about the importance of communication. There is communication between land surveyor and landowner/client. There is communication between land surveyor and land surveyor. There is also communication between land surveyor and the ALSA. The feedback from the membership about *ALS News*, the Friday Email and other forms of communication was very positive and very gratifying. The membership reads the material we put out there. However, I still cannot help but ask if there is more that we can do to get the word out to the membership about things that are going on within the ALSA. I don’t mean setting up a Twitter account or a Facebook page as those are forms of social media that can be hit-and-miss when the word absolutely positively has to get out there.
Still, regardless of the economy or whatever else might happen, it is a constant question that we ask ourselves, what is the best way to get the message out?

As someone who enjoys history and has studied the history of the ALSA, I know that this is not the first time that we have faced difficult times and challenges. I know that the best and brightest in the history of the profession in Alberta have dealt with tough tasks before and the profession has always, eventually, come through it stronger than ever. We can learn from their experiences in overcoming bad economies and difficult times.

In closing, I would like to thank all of my staff for all of the hard work and effort that they put in to everything they do.

Brian Munday
Practicing Alberta Land Surveyor Information
Increases/Decreases to Number of Practicing Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Started Year With</th>
<th>Added During Year</th>
<th>Subtracted During Year</th>
<th>Remaining At Year End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2016, the average number of years of experience of an active Alberta Land Surveyor was 15.63 years. Alberta Land Surveyors who received their commission in 2016 had articled for an average of 42.3 months.

Member Locations During 2016 (Calendar Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Articled &amp; Affiliate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande Prairie</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of Calgary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Toronto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Alberta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAIT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This only reflects the data available on actively practicing Alberta Land Surveyors.
### Committee Reports

**AER LIAISON COMMITTEE**
The Liaison Committee is a prolongation of the past ERCB/ALSA liaison group. It brings representation from Licencing and Disposition groups of AER and addresses any concerns either from AER or land survey profession clients. The group typically meets two times a year, in spring and fall.

Topics of Discussion in 2016 included:
- PBR/NALA (Play based regulations, new application life cycle: cradle to grave process)
- Water Boundaries
- As-builts and Statutory declarations for short and long term dispositions
- color survey plans
- AER team re-organization
- mandatory setback requirements

_Al Jamieson, ALS_

**ASCM NETWORK**
A small group of Edmonton-based Alberta Land Surveyors met once to discuss the challenges faced with the lack of ASCMs in newly developing areas in Edmonton. With the lack of any growth or updates of the ASCM network in Edmonton, it has been getting harder to integrate Section 47 plans into the control network. With the amount of construction in Edmonton as well, many of the monuments have been destroyed or disturbed, again complicating the integration process.

The group had discussed some strategies for the weaknesses of the ASCM network, including potential way to expand locally in the areas of need (new greenfield development) or a longer-term solution of an active control network in Edmonton. The challenge in all the cases was primarily financially related as to how all these efforts could be undertaken.

In the end, the group made a recommendation back to Council to look at a short-term and long-term solution and potential ways they could be funded.

_Keith Grover, ALS_
ASSMT
ASSMT has been active throughout the year holding monthly meetings concerning registration, budgeting, education, legislation requirements, public relations, and other ongoing requirements.

Of importance, the ASSMT membership has been relatively stagnant, and alternate methods of increasing membership are being reviewed and also pursued.

The RST syllabus is complete and is waiting for the legislation, through the Land Surveyors Act, to bring it to completion. ASSMT is active in scholarship and bursary programs and continues to embrace students in the field.

ASSMT is looking into having joint conventions with the ALSA. Joint conventions can be a great way to share information, technology, and socialize throughout the course of the concurrent venues.

Sandy Davies, ALS

Boundary Panel
As per 2015, the Boundary Panel has continued its busy and educational ways throughout this past year. Considering the calls both Scott Westlund and I get from newer land surveyors asking for advice on many types of evidence issues, and survey scenarios, the Panel’s reputation and relationship with members seems to be getting better and more obvious as the years go by. With an ever-increasing “bank” of case experiences to draw upon, I am only hoping that practitioners are starting to see the value of this wise and busy group.

The statistics for 2016 are as follows:
• 5 initial investigation reports complete;
• 7 final reports sent out;
• 6 meetings held;
• 10 cases resolved so far;
• court orders were obtained to resolve four cases and about a dozen affected plans;
• 6 cases that might/could be resolved before the end of the calendar year.

Based on this year’s stats, our most effective tool is the initial report. Once an ALS sees all of the available evidence, often times, conclusions are reached earlier before the recommendation stage.

Chair:
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Overall
A total of 126 case numbers have been assigned since the panel’s inception. These are broken down as follows:
• 20 active;
• 4 set up in error;
• 7 are not within the scope of the panel;
• 23 have not been reviewed (we are either waiting for the ALS to look at information or respond, or waiting for a proposal, waiting for spring to proceed, etc.);
• 49 have been closed because they were successfully resolved;
• 2 have been closed because they were resolved but follow-up on action is needed;
• 13 have been closed because we were unable to resolve the case or the ALS did not want to take action;
• 8 have been closed because we were unable to convince the ALS to take action but we are following up.

Of the 75 cases closed, **68-70% have been successfully completed** and actions taken have completely resolved the uncertainty reported. These seem to be very good numbers for an expert group that is voluntary in nature and is simply issuing peer-to-peer recommendations. These numbers continue to get better every year in part to some streamlining we have done with reports and timing, and likely due to reputation and relationship with land surveyor members. This indicates the process is working, and the recommendations we are making are the right ones.

Upcoming events and work for 2017 are as follows so far:
• Depending on funding, continued casework as required on 20 open cases;
• ALS News articles;
• Work on updating definitions of boundary uncertainty and alleged errors pursuant to amendment to ministerial order and updating Boundary Panel handbook;
• Continue to look at potential cases and scenarios for public relations initiatives. This all depends on funding.

Two unique happenings this year…we met with the Town of St. Paul at the end of October to move Case 2013-08 forward to a solution that works for the town and residents, and to educate them on the value of survey evidence and how to protect it and, in another Boundary Panel case in a small hamlet, several additional block corners were required to be re-established as per survey requirements that will facilitate future surveys there.
Next year will certainly bring its own challenges. The ministerial order for post sales which allows for our funding, may be amended or changed, in some way that will have a critical effect on Panel funding. We will know more by the AGM on what our funding and future will look like.

While putting this report together I had the opportunity to look over an independent consultant’s report done for the ALSA in 2010, entitled “Boundary Panel Review” as to recommendations for a more efficient Boundary Panel process. I was delighted to see how far we have come and that of the 35 recommendations made all but 4 have been addressed. Two of those remaining four involve public relations work with other similar provincial and government groups which we have not done. Of the remaining two, one of the recommendations was to give the Boundary Panel more authoritative power. We have proved over the last seven years since that time, that authority is not the way to go in nearly all cases, and peer-to-peer recommendations has indeed met with more success. The remaining 2010 recommendation has been much more difficult…that was to get a better working relationship with the Director of Surveys office. We hoped that a meeting this year would clarify roles, reduce duplicate work and would enable both of us to more efficiently and effectively work together to resolve boundary uncertainties for land surveyors and ultimately for the public good. We have proposed several meeting dates since last year’s AGM and have sent a proposed agenda but have been refused on the basis that the DOS is opposing an application for a court order that is being facilitated by the Boundary Panel. We continue to press and hope for said meeting.

It’s been a tough year for most of us, yet the commitment I see and experience from members still shows that when the going gets tough, the tough stay with it. I have been tabulating the commitment of Panel members and their respective companies over the last six years in terms of volunteer hours and at an average ALS charge-out rate…and the numbers are pretty phenomenal, about $850,000 to $900,000 of value in terms of donated time and advice, to the Boundary Panel process since Day 1.

To current and past Panel Members, their respective companies and to Kerry Barrett our administrative assistant, for putting up with us, I say THANK YOU.

David Marquardt, ALS
Buried Facilities

The year started out with the anticipation that the Ad Hoc Buried Facility Committee could address our concerns to the Alberta Common Ground Alliance with regards to including Alberta Land Surveyors as a special situation in the Alberta Common Ground Alliance (ABCGA) document, “Damage Prevention Process in Alberta.” Our concerns consisted of relaxing the requirement to call Alberta One-Call when exposing monuments that are more than 30 cm below the surface.

An Alberta Land Surveyor’s search consists of “hand digging” for buried survey monuments, which include, but are not limited to iron bars, rods, wood, statutory iron posts, iron spikes, or anchors. In particular, because the majority of the Alberta township fabric was surveyed between the late 1800s and early 1900s, Alberta Land Surveyors and their field crews regularly have to perform exhaustive searches for monuments by exposing more than 0.30 metres below the ground. In winter ground conditions they require the assistance of jackhammers to break through the frost after which they would “hand dig” to search for traces of the original monument; traces could consist of rust holes and wood splinters.

Survey monuments are frequently lost during construction of houses, utilities, and pipelines. As a result, Alberta Land Surveyors and their field crews are forced to expand their search by considering fences, monuments from a related plan of survey, or a common boundary that potentially could be miles away from the work site.

Hand digging to uncover existing survey monuments and to search for other survey evidence is being done by several hundred survey crews across the province each and every day. The exact locations of each hand dig are often difficult to foresee until the particular survey project has commenced. This makes the full and logistical use of Alberta One-Call very difficult, or even impossible, in many cases. It is for this reason that an Alberta Land Surveyor and their field crews need to be exempt from requesting an Alberta One-Call locate when the digging is limited to the use of hand tools and non-destructive excavation techniques when only searching for survey monuments.

Alberta Land Surveyors are involved in land transactions. They are governed by the Land Surveyors Act and the Surveys Act which allows them to define boundaries and
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interests in land. In an average year, Alberta Land Surveyors and their crews expose a minimum of 750,000 pieces of survey monuments in order to re-establish boundaries and prevent boundary conflicts. In an average year, they also place approximately 140,000 new statutory iron posts to establish new boundaries and restore old boundaries. Survey monuments are located in rural areas and urban centers, as well as, unsurveyed portions of the province where buried facilities exist but may only be accessible by an ATV, snowmobile, or helicopter.

As a result of determining boundaries and interests in land, as stated above, Alberta Land Surveyors and their field crews are an example of a group responsible for ground disturbances under “The digging community” on page 7 of the ABCGA document, “The Damage Prevention in Alberta.”

Preserving the integrity of the survey fabric is essential for Albertans and for that reason this type of digging is limited to the use of hand tools and non-destructive excavation techniques similar to those used for the physical exposure of buried facilities. Because of the amount of survey monuments exposed during a given year, it would be unreasonable for Alberta One-Call to accommodate all the requests and our proposed exemption is limited to hand digging activities when searching for buried survey monuments.

We submitted our concerns to the ABCGA best practices meeting in May and our request for an exemption was declined by a majority vote to include it in the ABCGA document, “The Damage Prevention in Alberta.” The Best Practices Committee was adamant that any digging below 30 metres would require an Alberta One-Call regardless of the situation. The Chair of the committee suggested that because Alberta Land Surveyors and their crews may not know the condition or depth of a monument, they could discuss with Alberta One-Call to submit a special request for all the areas they may have to expose a monument when they were preplanning their projects.

The Buried Facility Ad Hoc Committee had another meeting in June 2016 to regroup and discuss a new strategy to address our concerns, but this time, our ground wanted to include a section in the ABCGA document, “The Damage Prevention in Alberta,” with regards to the protection of survey infrastructure. A document was finalized in January, 2017 which was modeled under the section “Protection of
Survey Infrastructure,” in the Canadian Common Ground Alliance (CCGA) document, “Underground Infrastructure Damage Prevent, Best Practices Version 1.0.” This document has not been sent to the ABCGA Best Practices Committee for discussion.

At the Federal level, Bill S-229, “Underground Infrastructure Safety Enhancement Act,” which is an act respecting underground infrastructure safety, has been presented to the Senate committee. This bill would create a federal underground infrastructure notification system similar to the process in Alberta but for all federally regulated locates on federal land and persons planning to undertake a ground disturbance.

Kris Ritchie, ALS

Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors

Exam Statistics:
- March 2016 - 149 candidates (5.1 % less than last year) wrote 198 exams (9.2% less than last year)
- October 2016 - 93 candidates (22.5 % less than last year) wrote 158 exams (10.2% less than last year)
- Number of Certificates of Completion issued in 2016 = 81 (24.6% more than last year)

Candidate Distribution
(# exams written in each province, Spring/fall) 2016
- AB (68/30)  • NWT (2/0)
- BC (67/32)  • ON (1/2)
- MB (17/10)  • PE (0/0)
- NB (11/7)  • YT (0/0)
- NL (11/7)  • SK (8/6)
- NS (22/6)

Changes of Special Examiner
The Special Examiners for subject C8 Cadastral Studies was replaced in 2016 in time for the March exam sitting.

C12 - Hydrography
In 2015, the CBEPS Board of Directors received a proposal from the ACLS Hydrographic Surveyor Certification Program Task Force to modify the learning outcomes of subject C12 Hydrographic Surveying and create a new elective subject E2 Advanced Hydrographic Surveying.

The end results would be that some learning outcomes would be removed from C12 to be added to new subject E2
and more content would be added to E2. C12 also needed to be updated to be in line with the quickly evolving technology in the ocean mapping field.

The CBEPS Board of Directors met on December 8th, 2015 and passed a motion recommending that all surveying associations adopt these changes to the National Syllabus. Letters have been sent to all surveying associations in Canada requesting support for these changes to the National Syllabus.

At this time, CBEPS received letters of support from all associations except the following:
• Ordre des arpenteurs-géomètres du Québec
• Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors
• Association of Prince Edward Island Land Surveyors

Accreditations
The Lassonde School of Engineering of York University applied for accreditation with CBEPS in 2016. The submission was received at the beginning of October of 2016. The evaluation team was formed in August. The site visit was performed on November 17, 2016. At this time, the team is waiting for assessment of course content for subject E3 Environmental Management. The final report is expected at the end of January 2017.

Exemptions
The CBEPS Exemption and Accreditation Committee was very busy in 2016. The Committee dealt with the following tasks:
• Review of annual report from the University of New Brunswick and the University of Calgary in order to continue the accreditation of their programs.
• Review of material in submissions provided by the following learning institutions in order to obtain exemptions:
  • Northern Alberta Institute of Technology for subjects: C1:

- Athabasca University for subject C1 which was awarded.
- Saskatchewan Polytechnic for subjects: C1: Mathematics, C4: Coordinate Systems and Map Projections, C5: Geospatial Information Systems and C6: Geodetic Positioning. Only C1 and C6 were awarded.

Jean-Claude Tétreault, CBEPS Registrar
Brian Ball, ALS

CAPP Geomatics
The ALSA has representation on the CAPP Geomatics Committee as an invitee from CAPP, as ALSA is not eligible to otherwise be a member of CAPP.

The ABCLS has representation in a similar fashion, and are represented by Walter Johnson, BCLS.

Our role is to serve as a resource in land survey-related issues brought forth by the industry representatives sitting on the Committee.

The CAPP members are comprised of representatives from industry, typically geomatics related through land, surveying and geophysical companies represented include Encana, Shell, Imperial, Repsol, Suncor, to name a few.

The Committee met two times in 2016 - May and October. Topics of discussion related to surveying included:

AER
- Disposition renewals
- Post Construction Plans required within 60 days of construction completion
- Hybrid Cadastre

Al Jamieson, ALS
**Chair:**
Brian Munday

**Council Liaison:**
Fred Cheng

**Members:**
May Cheng, Barb Fretwell
Mike Fretwell

**Exhibitor Liaison:**
Garth Hartung

### 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 golf tournament was not held this year due to declining attendance and a poor economy. Council’s mandate this year was to focus on core activities and, unfortunately, the golf tournament was a victim.

Attendance at the 107th AGM in Banff was down but not as bad as originally feared. The business meeting was well attended but the social events were noticeably down.

When the ALSA signs a contract with any hotel for meeting space, there is always a provision that the cost of the meeting room space will be deeply discounted or even free if the ALSA makes a commitment to the hotel for bedroom nights and food & beverage spending. Until 2016, meeting the minimum requirements had never been a concern and, in fact, we had often far exceeded the bedroom night requirement in the boon years. 2016 was different – for many reasons. We were not going to be able to meet our minimum contractual obligations (even after taking the reductions permitted in the contract) and could have been financially responsible for thousands of dollars. Thankfully, we were able to negotiate with the hotel to waive any penalty fees due to our long-standing relationship with Fairmont and in exchange for holding a small meeting in Banff within one year of the AGM.

1. The 108th annual general meeting will be held at the Jasper Park Lodge from April 20-22, 2017.
2. Confirmed dates for future AGMs are:
   - 2018 – Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge - April 19-21
   - 2019 – Fairmont Banff Springs Hotel – April 25-27

Although the membership has consistently voted for Banff and Jasper as locations for the AGM, the ALSA office has been investigating alternatives locations and formats in light of the weak economy.

*Brian Munday*
**Discipline**

Between February 5, 2016 and the date of this report being written, February 24, 2017, there were eight complaints lodged with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. All of the complaints received were made by members of the public. One complaint, dated October 26, 2016, was withdrawn. The three complaints dated February 28, 2016, April 20, 2016 and May 24, 2016, were investigated by the Chairman who rendered a decision that no further action be taken. The remaining four complaints, dated May 31, 2016, September 19, 2016, November 23, 2016 and January 20, 2017, are currently under investigation by the Chairman of the Discipline Committee or his designate.

One complaint from the 2015/2016 term, dated June 14, 2015, carried over into the 2016/2017 term. A hearing was held and the decision was published in the September 2016 issue of *ALS News*.

One complaint from the 2013/2014 term, dated December 16, 2013, was appealed by the practitioner to the Alberta Court of Appeals. A decision was rendered by the Court of Appeals and will be published in the March 2017 issue of *ALS News*.

*Greg Boggs, ALS*

**Executive**

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

The Executive Committee met eight times throughout the year; six times by online conference call and twice face-to-face. The face-to-face meetings were held to deal with committee terms of reference and volunteers and the budget.

The Executive Committee plays an important role in prioritizing issues and streamlining matters for Council based on the overall directions set by Council.

*Fred Cheng, ALS*
Edmonton RPR Working Group

After discussions with municipalities in the greater Edmonton area, a small group of Edmonton-based Alberta Land Surveyors met several times to discuss the inconsistencies in the requirements for RPRs in this area. To address these inconsistencies, the RPR group met twice to discuss. The group reviewed the requirements in the MSP for RPRs, and proposed a number of riveting amendments either for clarity or consistency. As the group was entirely Edmonton focused, it was decided to poll a number of Alberta Land Surveyors in other centres to discuss the proposed amendments. These comments have been compiled, and a further meeting will be held to discuss next steps and a potential recommendation to Council.

External Relations

The Association’s External Relations Committee held five meetings throughout the year via gotomeeting. The purpose of the ERC is to create greater awareness within the general public, government, and industry about professional land surveyors and the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. The key demographic for the committee in the past year has been students from high school to post-secondary.

Members of the committee were assigned responsibilities for different events that the committee would attend throughout the year. The main events that the Committee focused on were:

- University of Calgary Geomatics Department Beef and Bun reception;
- University of Calgary Geomatics Exposition;
- University of Calgary 1st Year Event;
- Presentation to students at Ernest Manning High School
- Involvement with NAIT and Lethbridge College career nights
- Event arrangement for the SAIT Speakers Series
- Continued involvement with the National High School Task Force to raise awareness of land surveying as a career.

Students were provided with information on pursuing a career in Land Surveying, and given multiple forums to ask questions. Technological advancements in Surveying were also of interest to students. A continued message that was provided to the students over the past year was that Geomatics Engineering was a growing career, requiring
technological knowledge and post-secondary training. Some of the highlights of the past year was an increased presence at other post-secondary institutions (SAIT, NAIT, Lethbridge), an excellent turnout at the UofC Beef and Bun, a large number of student membership sign ups during the Geomatics Career fair, a successful presentation at Ernest Manning High School, and an invite back to present again, and interest from UofC summer camps for presentations.

In the upcoming year, the ERC will continue to connect with students and staff at various levels of school to raise awareness of the profession of land surveying. The committee is currently working with the UofC on summer camp involvement to reach even more students. In addition, the committee has been working with the Geomatics Engineering Student Society to create a first year event that will impress and educate! Finally, a findings report will be released in the next couple months with information from the National High School Task Force and where to go from there.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee members for their hard work and willingness to participate on the ERC this year.

_Gayle Noonan, Pupil/ALSA_

**Future**

“Change is the law of life and those who look only to the past or present are certain to miss the future.” - _John F. Kennedy_

If we are not already at a turning point in our history, then we ought to be soon. Technological advances throughout history have proven to be disruptive and those affecting land surveying are no exception. A sweeping inclination towards change and renewal has affected our municipal, provincial, and federal elected governments in the last few years. This change is also brewing in our own association.

The Future Committee started this year with two terms of reference that were somewhat inexplicit:

1. Develop ideas for new sources of survey related work for Alberta Land Surveyors and the ALSA and
2. Review the Practice of Surveying under both the _Land Surveyors Act_ and the _EGP Act_ and make recommendations to Council.
The first term was prompted by the keynote address at the 2016 AGM, by Bryn Fosburgh, Vice-President of Trimble.

Concern over missed opportunities (historically with GIS, and potentially with BIM) should be the impetus to stay diligent and keep our eyes on the future. The business climate in Alberta has been strong until late, and companies have been content to stick to their core competencies rather than allocate resources towards new ventures.

Our discussions were varied, but narrowed down to three areas: the promotion and marketing of land surveyors as measurement experts and consultants; adding value through data analysis and analytics; and activities not currently legislated, but perhaps should be in the future.

We feel that the identification of new survey related work should be left to the industry itself.

Entrepreneurial and innovative companies will research and develop their own services as demand and opportunity present themselves. Promotion and marketing by the Association is a tricky line to walk without appearing to favour companies and/or practitioners.

The second term was induced by a question from the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) regarding a compliance inquiry about a company doing surveying but not land surveying. This company was not registered with APEGA or ALSA. While complaints are rare, this scenario is all too common an occurrence in our current business world. Land surveying companies often lose out to other geomatics companies.

An argument can be made that one of the reasons for this, is that we have stuck to archaic systems and processes allowing the rest of the industry to develop ways to work around us. They only use land surveyors when they have to and not always when they should.

Despite our acceptance of new technologies and integration into our systematic practices (think EDMs, total stations, GNSS etc.), we have still lagged behind others and have paid the price.

The recent economic climate has affected all of our members in some way. There are many who have lost their jobs, many whose daily job has changed. More and more
practitioners are back in the field and are struggling to find enough work to make ends meet. This puts a strain on any extra-curricular activities and volunteer work. However, there is still an opportunity for the ALSA to become a leading authority. White papers and published standards for new technology show that we have the expertise. This will increase the visibility and stature of our Association and assure us a seat at the table when other industries cross into the grey area of spatial measurements that are not clearly related to boundaries.

Collectively we have the proficiency to identify, research, debate, and decide our position on new and pressing matters. As new technologies are developed and implemented into practice, we can also develop our minimum standards for use and acceptance of collected data (or whatever the technology is being tasked to do). Our biggest challenge is to publish something that is adequate. Too often our members strive for perfection the very first time and reject those attempts that are anything less. The “wordsmithing” that goes on at our AGM is often a painful reminder of this.

No matter your business or personal life, if you discuss an uncertain future long enough you will come back to a fundamental question, “Why do I do what I do?” When we ask this question of ourselves as land surveyors, a consistent answer is “to protect the public’s interest in land.” This alone should be a major factor to contemplate when looking forward. Any new venture, service, process or deliverable that we initiate must consider how the public will be affected and how we must proceed.

We are living in a period of hyper-change. Smart phones are used by toddlers and centenarians and yet the first iPhone came out only ten years ago. Data collection has become easier, faster, and cheaper, so the volume of data has grown exponentially. Both hardware and software have improved so much and the ownership costs have been reduced, such that 3D scanning and aerial photography are now accessible to smaller companies and even individuals.

Daniel Burrus, considered one of the world’s leading futurists on global trends and innovation, identifies these as hard trends. Backed by statistics that support them, these trends will happen as opposed to soft trends which might happen. Identifying hard trends is necessary to predicting future growth and innovation. On his website, www.burrus.com, he lists twenty trends for 2017 and highlights these
as game-changing opportunities. A few that easily stand out in their potential to affect our industry are: artificial intelligence (AI), advanced machine learning and cognitive computing applications; big data and the use of high speed data analytics; advanced cloud computing services; augmented reality (AR) and virtual reality (VR) apps and devices; drones reach a new height adding AI.

When you put a handful of Alberta Land Surveyors in a room with the premise of discussing the future, it is funny how the conversation ultimately ends up at a coordinate based cadastre and the need for an active control network. We believe these are the fundamental building blocks for future land surveying operations.

Sometime in the near future, the data collected by unmanned aerial vehicles (and smart phones, and autonomous cars…) will be compiled, analyzed and processed into a 3D living model of our populated world. This will likely start as a collaborative effort among a few, and evolve into open-source system where any and all data is considered and vetted for all to use. Using this data to see where your house is located will become as normal as using a toothbrush. A real property report in today’s form will be redundant and valueless.

A couple of years ago, Google Maps started showing property lines within the City of Calgary. We are not able to confirm where they got the data from, likely from City legal survey fabric which is available on-line. This was very short lived but it happened before and can happen again. Once the public see this and accepts it, any service we currently provide will fall below their expectations.

It is impossible to say with certainty what will happen, but we believe the future is coming fast. Much faster than which we have traditionally been able to cope. Our commitment to protecting the public means that we have to ensure the legal fabric is intact, accurate and a part of the future data infrastructure whatever it looks like.

A digital coordinate database is logically the next step. With this framework we can then build other applications, such as an as-built underground facility map or an RPR repository or any multitude of ideas that haven’t been thought of yet. These are ideas that could lead to increased survey related work for our members as well as potential for funding revenue for the Association. We are running out of things to sell, so we need to offer something more, something different.
In summary, some major transformation will be needed:
1. ALSA needs to define its authority
   • Timely and notable positioning towards new technology and new processes
   • Published standards for these same technologies and processes
2. ALSA needs to collaborate
   • Internally with our members to achieve long term visions
   • Externally with other associations, industry, government, and commercial partners

_The Obstacle is the Way_ by Ryan Holiday is a great book that I recommend reading (or at least the summary, available online). In it, he breaks down how to overcome an obstacle in your path and understand that obstacles will always happen. First is perception – how we see what occurs around us and how we decide what that will mean. Second is action – what must be done in the service of the whole and in the best interest of our goals. Lastly is will – the tenacity and internal power over a situation. There is no question that our membership has will; we have displayed that time and again over the years. We now need to alter our perspective and set in place our actions.

If we want to ensure that we don’t miss the boat, we must build the boat.

_Gord Linnell, ALS_

**Geomatics Liaison**

The Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee consists of representatives from the University of Calgary Department of Geomatics Engineering and the Western Canadian self-governing land survey associations. The committee meets once per year. The last meeting was January 18, 2017 (all stats accurate as of January 18, 2017).

Geomatics Engineering Graduate Students:
M.Sc. = 20
M.Eng. = 6
Ph.D. = 66
Six are studying Cadastral Studies (they did not specify whether they are, M.Sc., M.Eng, or Ph.D students)

Geomatics Engineering Undergraduate Students:
Second year = 24
Third year = 29
Fourth year = 39
Internship students = 9
Total Undergrad students = 101
Number of undergrad students graduated in June 2016 = 36

Number of 2017 first year students = 909 [including: civil, geomatics, electrical (all disciplines)]

Three new staff members hired in 2016:
• Dr. Alex Bruton, Instructor in Engineering Entrepreneurship
• Dr. Ivan Detchev, Instructor in Surveying and Mapping
• Dr. Mozhdeh Shahbazi, Assistant Professor in Digital Imaging

Teaching Staff Distribution:
• 10 Professors
• 2 Assistant Professors
• 4 Associate Professors
• 3 Professors Emeritus
• 3 Instructors
• 6 Adjunct Professors
• Total number of teaching staff = 28
  https://schulich.ucalgary.ca/departments/geomatics-engineering/faculty

Other:
• CBEPS Site visit to U of C scheduled for Fall 2017
• Dr. Mike Barry’s five-year John Holmlund Cadastral Studies Chair runs out this year
• President Fred Cheng extended an invitation to Dr. Derek Lichten, Department Chair, for one of their teaching staff members to the ALSA AGM in Jasper
• -The entire Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee group received a tour of their new shared building housing several Geomatics Engineering’s labs and their field equipment room.

Fred Cheng, ALS

Historical & Biographical
The Historical & Biographical Committee operated under a new structure this past year as the ALSA Council decided to abandon it as a standing committee of the Association out of the need to reduce budget expenses in the downsizing of Association activities.

This brought to an end twenty years as a committee, of which nine years was under the chairmanship of Les Frederick. Les spent many hours work on the committee over those years as its objectives and duties changed from book
publishing, travelling exhibit creation and maintenance, and interviews of members. The past and remaining committee members acknowledge Les’ dedication to the history of the Association and express a big thank you on behalf of the Association.

The previous Collections subcommittee, now known as the Historical & Biographical Committee members continued to function doing their work to maintain the “Making Their Mark” travelling exhibit. The exhibit opened in Strathcona County Museum and Archives (Sherwood Park), ACLS AGM (Sutton Place Hotel, Edmonton), Calgary Public Library and the Carstairs Museum over the past ALS year May 1, 2016 to April 30, 2017

The travelling exhibit, created for the ALSA Centennial in 2009, can only be deemed an ongoing success over the past eight years, having travelled our province to 18 events, museums or display sites. The tracking statistics show the exhibit has had 56,680 individual visitors (including 986 students) plus 60 groups plus 166 school groups plus 2 schools. It has travelled with little maintenance with its very detailed take down/setup instruction manual. The reviews from each venue have been very positive as the story it tells is a timeless account of the achievements of the first surveys in Alberta.

Committee discussion and review of responses about the future of the travelling exhibit revealed there were a number of smaller museums that had commented that they did not have the entry doors or display space for the full-sized 2009 exhibit which includes the surveyor’s tent. A decision was made in December 2016 to split the existing exhibit into Part A (four display cases) and Part B (the tent and accessories.) The two larger display cases were cut down to pass through a 30” doorway. The transportation criteria was changed to allow the museums to transport the crates themselves under weatherproof conditions or hire a carrier to do so. This resulted in considerable interest by smaller museums and bookings for the remainder of 2017. The exhibit can be stored/displayed in the ALSA office when it is not on the road to avoid off site storage fees paid over the past eight years.

**Summary of artifact donations to the ALSA collection**

- A staff forestry compass and several other items from Ken Moyer of Chase, BC
- A sizable donation from the estate of Reg Watson, ALS
A full set of map sheets of the Canada/US boundary from the Canadian International Boundary Commission. The map sheet pages were bound in several large binders for future display.

**Cataloging artifacts**
This is an ongoing process. Some collections were the slide photos of the Matt Wuhr collection and the Reg Watson accession.

**Displays of artifacts and publications**
The travelling exhibit Part A is set up in the ALSA boardroom when it is not on the road.

The Bob Baker tribute was shown at the 2016 AGM and again at a Robbie Burns event at Bob’s Care Centre in Edmonton. No tribute display is planned for the 2017 AGM.

We acquired three large old geodetic astronomic instruments from Natural Resource Canada and a modern Wild T4 along with numerous other survey accessories last year and now have them displayed in the boardroom and the foyer. There is also a display of Wild theodolites, T1, T1A, T16, T2, T3 and the T4 in the foyer of the ALSA office in Edmonton.

Writing and publication of “Demarcation of the boundary between Canada and the United States of America from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains” article by Gordon Olsson in December *ALS News*.

I would like to personally thank all the members of this committee for their dedication and commitment during the past year and to the local surveyors who pitched in to do a setup or take down of the travelling exhibit at a site near them.

*Monroe Kinloch, ALS (Hon. Life)*

**Hybrid Cadastre Liaison**
The Hybrid Cadastre Liaison Working Group is a new committee that was formed by Council at their May 17, 2016 meeting. The committee is a joint working group consisting of Association members and the Director of Surveys Office. The first meeting was in held June, with over a half dozen other meetings since.

With new hybrid cadastre standards issued April, 1, 2016, the main priority of the working group was to review the new standards and reduce the number of hybrid plans being rejected. The standards were reviewed and office/field check-
lists were created to aid members in hybrid plan preparation. FAQs were also developed and reviewed to ensure there were solutions for situations that may arise over the course of a hybrid cadastre survey.

Lastly, the material for the hybrid cadastre seminars put on by the Director of Surveys Office was discussed and analyzed. Hybrid Cadastre seminars were held in Calgary (3), Edmonton (4), Grande Prairie (1) and Lloydminster (1), free of charge, for anyone interested in attending with future seminars to be scheduled pending interest. At the time of this writing, another seminar will be scheduled for Calgary due to demand.

I would like to thank everyone on the working group, as well as everyone who provided feedback on the standards, checklists and FAQs.

Nicholas Madarash, ALS

Nominating
The following slate of nominations was 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: M. (Mike) Fretwell, ALS
For Vice-President: W.B. (Bruce) Clark, ALS

An additional nomination of Robert Radovanovic, ALS was received for the position of president. Dr. Radovanovic consented to the nomination.

Additional nominations may be made by two Alberta Land Surveyors, with the consent of the nominee in each case, up to February 26, 2017 and at the floor of the Annual General Meeting at 9:00 a.m. on Friday April 21, 2017 at Jasper Park Lodge.

The election will take place on Saturday April 22, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.

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

Greg Boggs, ALS
Practice Review Board
The Practice Review Board (PRB) is currently reviewing practitioners under Phase 2 of the Continuing Competency Review (CCR) framework. The PRB commenced CCR Phase 2 files on May 20, 2014. Phase 1 of the CCR was fully completed in October 2016.

Phase 1
Phase 1 of the CCR was primarily completed in 2014 but there were two outstanding Phase 1 files that the PRB closed in 2016. The final results of Phase 1 are as follows:
- Files opened: 454
- Files closed: 454
- Comprehensive Reviews: 35
- Second Comprehensive Reviews: 7
- Field inspections: 48
- Formal hearings: 5
- Files referred to the ALSA Registrar: 2

Common areas identified for improvement during Phase 1:

Field notes:
Primarily with respect to not clearly showing sufficient information for found evidence and noting the extent of search for lost monuments.

Redundant Measurements:
Not clearly showing the method of redundant measurements.

Drafting:
Drafting errors were the most prevalent issue during Phase 1 with respect to practitioners not using checklists, copying and pasting incorrect text, not completing closure checks, not confirming details, not clarifying reestablishments, and other miscellaneous issues that can be improved using rigorous plan checking procedures.

Calibration Programs:
Many firms did not have a calibration policy.

The CCR Phase 1 program met the objectives as set in the Terms of Reference for the PRB as approved by Council and the Continuing Competency Review framework document.

Chair:
Mitch Ettinger

Vice-Chair:
Dwayne L. Edmundson

Council Liaison:
Colin Keir

Public Member:
Rudy Palovcik (to December 2016)

Members:
Arlin Amundrud, Christopher Ashton, Scott Boulanger, Ron Bridges, Connie Hanrahan, Mark Kocher, Joseph Longo, Irwin Natt, Roger Ross, Sara Spence
Phase 2
The CCR Phase 2 program continues with minor changes from Phase 1. Since commencing Phase 2 in May, 2014, 285 files have been closed as of December 2016 and we are on track for completing Phase 2 in accordance with our mandate. We currently have been reviewing and closing approximately 17 files each month.

The Practice Review Board and Director of Practice Review have gained valuable experience during the on-going CCR process. Minor administrative changes have been implemented to improve the efficiency and value of the program. The reviews and responses to practitioners have also been improved to provide informative and consistent messaging.

Status
The current status of Phase 2 at the end of 2016 is as follows:
- Files opened: 330
- Files closed: 285
- Comprehensive Reviews (conducted or to be conducted): 31
- Second Comprehensive Reviews (conducted or to be conducted): 6
- Field inspections: 29
- Formal hearings: 2
- Files referred to the ALSA Registrar: 1

General Observations
Drafting errors have decreased to date during Phase 2. 21% of reviewed products have drafting errors, while 46% of the products had at least three drafting errors during Phase 1.

Field notes have improved with 19% of reviewed products having issues, while 43% of the field notes had issues during Phase 1.

Redundant observations or an insufficient method of showing redundant observations were an issue during Phase 1. Redundant observations are being completed and shown effectively in almost all surveys now with 7% of the reviewed files during Phase 2 having insufficient redundancy or an insufficient method of showing redundancy.

I would like to thank the Director of Practice Review, Scott Westlund, and our administrative assistant, Kerry Barrett, for the value they bring to the Board. Their hard work has
provided our association with a solid CCR program that the public and our association can rely on. I would also like to thank our board members for their work they completed during this term.

Mitch Ettinger, ALS

Professional Development
The Professional Development Committee held a strategic planning session on June 22, 2016 to determine the professional development priorities for the 2016-2017 fiscal year. The committee determined that the professional development priorities were as follows:

1. A seminar to explain the AER/AEP application process and how information on survey plans is used.
2. A seminar on the use of UAVs in geomatics.
3. A series of on-line webinars including a Forestry 101 webinar and a series of seminars on contracts for land surveyors.
4. A business seminar presented by Donald Cooper.

In 2016-2017 the following seminars were held:
- Edmonton Evidence tour (August 2016)
- UAV Seminar (Calgary/Edmonton November/December 2016)
- Forestry 101 webinar (January 2017)
- Online Regional meeting (November 2016)
- Donald Cooper is scheduled to present a business seminar at the AGM (April 2017)

For the coming year I am continuing to try to develop an AER seminar and am arranging other webinars. Another strategic planning session will be held in June 2017 and I encourage you to put your name forward to help determine our professional development priorities.

Scott Westlund, ALS

Registration
The Registration Committee is a statutory committee. The statutory duties of the committee as outlined in the Land Surveyors Act and the Examination and Training Regulation are as follows:

- Approve articles;
- Approve transfer of articles;
- Review/approve affidavits of service;
- Conduct annual, initial, transfer and other interviews, as required;
- Review the training and experience obtained by the pupil during the preceding calendar year;
• Hold a hearing and make an order under section 12 (Breach of Articles) of the *Examination and Training Regulation*;
• Monitor termination of articles;
• Approve applications for prior field service credit;
• Decide any questions that arises as to the qualifications of any candidate;
• Review applications for extension of articles;
• Review and approve proposed examination questions. Mark the written professional examinations including appeals of exams;
• Prepare an article for *ALS News* for each issue;
• Attend the qualifying examinations and make recommendations for registration;
• Review and mark project reports.

The 2016-2017 Registration Committee consisted of forty-one volunteer members who, in conjunction with the registrar, executive director, and administrative assistant, oversaw the progress of 92 articled pupils. As of February 28, the Committee had conducted 29 qualifying exams with the addition of 15 newly-commissioned ALSs to the Association. In addition, the committee has reviewed and marked 35 project reports, marked 23 written exams, including two jurisdictional exams. Under the new project report system, the committee has had one appeal.

The final sitting for the practical surveying exam will be in April. After this sitting, all articled pupils will be in the in the new exam system.

In 2016, Council heard two appeals after articles were terminated due to extension request denials by the Committee.

The Registration Committee held one hearing pursuant to section 12 of the *Examination and Training Regulation*. The hearing was held on the 17th of June 2016. The result of the hearing was published in the September addition of the *ALS News*.

One pupil was terminated due to failure to provide their affidavit of service by January 15, 2017.

Based on the advice and recommendations of the registrar, the Committee was also tasked with implementing the recommendations of the Articling Pupil Process Ad Hoc Committee. The following were the Committee’s additional obligations and their status of completion as of February 28th:

Continued...
1. **Update checklists and report marking**
   The checklists are still in progress. The Committee has focused a considerable amount of time addressing the standardization of project marking and improving the quality of project reports.

   The project report subgroup should be submitting the updated lists for review in May.

2. **Articling Handbook and AIT & Affiliate Member Handbook**—Completed and online.

3. **Update forms**—Completed

4. **Create good character questionnaire**
   Completed and has been provided to Council for review.

5. **Create a principal course**
   The registrar has completed an outline for the principal course. The committee is looking to review the first module in May. The implementation date of this course is yet to be determined.

6. **Investigate what a reciprocal labour mobility agreement with the signatories to the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP) might look like and make recommendations to Council.**
   As of Feb 28th there was nothing to report. With ratification of the accord in doubt due to the changes with the American administration, the Registration Committee has put the investigation on hold pending further instruction from Council.

   In addition to our terms of reference for 2016-2017, the Committee is investigating having annual group interviews by gotowebinar. If successful, the format will be used in subsequent years.

   The Registration Committee is also working on developing a policy on disability guidelines.

   The 2016-2017 term has been a challenging year. We saw a number of unemployed students and principals. Changes to the written exams and report marking have added to the commitment for the committee. I would sincerely like to thank all of the Registration Committee members for their dedication and hard work.
I am proud of the perseverance and character of each pupil and principal. It has not been easy with the changes to the articling process and the consistent downturn in the economy. The future may be uncertain, but the quality of individuals I have seen over the last twelve months has never been better.  

Roger Luard, ALS

**RST Implementation**

The RST Implementation Ad Hoc Committee is a joint ALSA and ASSMT committee that has been assigned with preparing the processes required to implement the RST designation at ASSMT once the Government of Alberta adopts the legislation and regulation changes to the *Land Surveyors Act*, creating the RST designation.

For 2016-2017, the Committee was directed to:

1. Review the ASSMT bylaws associated with the RST designation and recommend any changes required.
2. Review the RST Code of Ethics.
3. Develop a detailed process for the registration of RSTs, the maintenance of the RST designation and the removal from the RST register.
4. Discuss continuing education requirements (including funding models) for a person to maintain their RST designation, including the creation of a mechanism for the auditing of a person’s compliance with any continuing education requirements.

It was acknowledged that this work cannot be finalized until the legislative review is in place. The consensus best-case scenario for the government bringing the amendment to the *Land Surveyors Act* forward is now thought to be in the fall of 2017 or beyond.

Nonetheless, the ad hoc committee met five times during the term. A mark-up of the current ASSMT bylaws dated May 25, 2013 was presented detailing numerous housekeeping changes as well as specific drafts associated with the Registered Survey Technologist designation. This included a completed code of ethics which was written into the draft bylaws for recommendation.

Flowcharts were also completed with the draft bylaws to provide greater certainty on the processes relating the registration of RSTs, the maintenance of the RST designation and the removal from the RST register.

The ASSMT Council gave the direction that a continuing education requirement be developed for all members.

**Chair:**
Darryl Larson

**Vice-Chair:**
Marty Robinson

**Council Liaison:**
Brian Ball

**Members:**
Barry Bleay, Rob Cream, Steve Dixon, Richard Heacock, Lance Hummel, Lee Morden, Troy Motz
including that of the Registered Survey Technologist. The draft bylaws establishes the program, mandatory participation and exemption criteria with additional suggestions pertaining to periodic review, adoption, and suspensions for non-compliance.

It was noted that it will be necessary for the RST Implementation Ad Hoc Committee, in the 2017-2018 term, to further refine and develop the bylaws and concepts before final recommendations can be presented to the ALSA and ASSMT Councils for their respective consideration.

Other key documents contributing to the body of the work from previous RST Implementation Ad Hoc Committees include:

- RST Draft Regulation (Approved April 2014)
- Syllabus – Level 1 (Updated January 2015)
- Syllabus – Level 2 (Updated March 2014)
- Guideline for Certification Process (Undated)

Some of these will require a review to ensure conformity to the final recommendations made to the respective Councils.

The ad hoc committee expects to meet only a couple of times in 2017-2018 as we wait for the green light from government.

Darryl Larson, CST

Standards

The 2016-2017 Standards Committee was composed of a total of 34 members including representatives from ASSMT, the Director of Surveys Office and Council.

There was no representation from the Land Titles Office during this term, but the Executive Director and Survey Plan Team Lead attended the last meeting and committed to have one person designated for the upcoming term.

The Committee started working in June on seven terms of reference received from Council; one more term was assigned in October. Each subject matter was studied by a subgroup and then discussed during eight online meetings held along the year.

The results are three recommendations to revise the Manual of Standard Practice that were forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM, one report recom-
mending no revision, and two recommendations to publish reference documents. Further studies are required for other two items.

The participation on the committee showed a great level of involvement of future and newer members; 10 of them were articling students, 22 received their commission within the last ten years, and we also had the contribution of a member who received his commission more than 40 years ago. Given the recurrence and history behind some topics, the addition of members with more than 10 years of commission could help to add different viewpoints for the next term.

I would like to thank all committee members, from the subgroup leads who are the driving force within the committee to all the contributors who spent time compiling information, writing, and reviewing the documents and recommendations produced. Your participation should be especially appreciated in these times of economic uncertainty that makes more difficult to volunteer time to a committee agenda.

**Manual of Standard Practice Revisions**

**Remove hyperlinks from the Manual of Standard Practice**

In addition to removing the hyperlinks, the committee proposed to have to some key words formatted in italics text that could be used as key words in an internet search. A complete, revised version of the MSP was sent to council, who approved sending a recommendation to the 2017 AGM for consideration of the membership.

**Replace any reference to a Government of Alberta approval agency with a generic reference to the appropriate approving authority**

The Standards Committee found that once the hyperlinks were removed from the Manual, it was difficult to also remove the specific approval agency references and still provide clear direction and information. This term of reference was later removed by Council.

**Review advertising guidelines and make recommendations to Council**

Changes to Part B, Section 2 of the MSP were suggested. Council approved sending this recommendation to the AGM for consideration of the membership.

Continued...
Michael Metcalfe, Bradley Middlemiss, Mohamed Mouallem, Patrick Myette, Noah Nichols, Rich Nixon, Trevor Pasika, Tyler Robinson, Garry Schirrmacher, Vedran Todic, Chase Van de Brand, Nicholas Weir
Clarify the responsibility of an Alberta Land Surveyor who is working on a project that began prior to the land surveyor’s date of commission.
A guideline was prepared, submitted and later revised as per Council’s request. A final version is to be reviewed by Council at their meeting in March.

Consider developing a document that provides Alberta Land Surveyors with guidelines for developing equipment calibration policies and procedures.
A reference document was prepared and submitted to Council and will be published in ALS News.

Review Part C, Section 7 (Integrated Surveys) of the Manual of Standard Practice to consider the addition of a reference to “integrated survey area boundaries” and to ensure that the methodologies described reflect the modern survey methods in use (for example, the use of GNSS).
A draft set of changes to the MSP is currently under revision, this item will be completed in the next term.

Develop a standard for AEP’s statutory declaration with respect to disposition renewal of PLAs
A recommendation to amend the MSP was sent to Council and will be forwarded to the AGM for consideration by the membership. The recommendation included a supporting document to be placed on the ALSA website once the membership approves the amendments.

Define “encroachment” and make recommendations on how they are to be shown on real property reports.
A definition was proposed but later reconsidered as required by Council. The final recommendation was that the item be assigned to the RPR working group as they are reviewing the definition of improvement, which is related with the definition of encroachment.

Investigate the need for total coordinates on wellsite plans and make recommendations to Council.
A report was produced outlining the investigation and the Committee recommended that no changes be made, at this time, to the Manual of Standard Practice.

Hector Muniz, ALS
RATIONAL DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the revision of Part D, Section 5.12 of the Manual of Standard Practice.

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)**
   
   A new business motion was passed at the 2016 ALSA AGM, advising Council to consider assigning the Standards Committee the task of developing a standard for AEP’s statutory declaration with respect to disposition renewal of PLAs.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**

   There is no standard outlining when a Statutory Declaration is acceptable for disposition renewal. As a result, practitioners are handling renewals differently from one another. Amendment Survey Plans may have been required for some renewals that utilized Statutory Declarations and vice versa.

   The proposed document identifies common situations and outlines how to handle each of the examples. By adding to the ALSA website as reference material, all members have access to review and analyze how to handle their specific survey. The proposed revision to Part D: Section 5.12 of the Manual of Standard Practice simply provides further clarity on how to deal with PLA disposition renewals.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**

   To create a standard for members outlining when use Statutory Declarations versus Amendment Plans of Survey for PLA disposition renewals.

4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**

   The Director of Surveys Office was provided with the examples and felt the conclusions and rationales provided were consistent with their thinking on the matter. It was pointed that two questions need to be considered when determining if a Statutory Declaration is acceptable. They are

   1. *Are the dispositions independently tenable?*
2. **If one disposition is cancelled, will the other one (or more) be left hanging?**

The proposed recommendation is also consistent with correspondence received in the past from the AER. No feedback was received from the AER with respect to the example outlined in the PLA Disposition Renewal Document.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**

The recommendation provides increased clarity and quality assurance. Disposition boundaries will cover the improvements. While the field time required to as-built the PLA will be similar, the office time required to prepare a Plan of Survey for the amendment of the PLA disposition will be higher than if a Statutory Declaration was used for the renewal.

Statutory monumented plans are used to establish boundaries and, through right-of-way documents, limits of the public’s right to land. This recommendation hopes to ensure these rights are protected in a public registry.

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 other than editorial costs to update the Manual of Standard Practice.

RATIONAL DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the revision of Part B, Section 2 of the Manual of Standard Practice.

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)**

William Akehurst, who is an Ontario Land Surveyor and an Alberta Land Surveyor, recommended in a letter to Brian Munday, dated December 7th, 2015, that Part B, Section 2.1 of the Manual of Standard Practice (advertising guidelines) be reviewed as the guidelines appear to be unenforceable. At the March 8, 2016 Council meeting, it was decided against reviewing the guidelines but the main concern seems to be about the references to price.
2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**

The rationale for the review is that some practitioners are making references to prices and fees on their websites although this is contrary to the current Manual of Standard Practice. There is little the ALSA could do in reality to prevent a practitioner from advertising its prices.

At the March 8, 2016 Council meeting, it was decided against reviewing the guidelines but the main concern seems to be about the references to price. The subgroup’s recommendation removes the restriction of advertising fees and gives an opportunity to offer guidelines to follow when those fees are advertised.

The recommendation creates two guidelines, one for marketing of professional services and another for advertising of fees. The section regarding the marketing of professional services is structured with a common sense approach to have the public interest in mind. On the other hand, the section regarding the advertising of fees is structured to give guidelines when fees are advertised for professional services. From previous court rulings such as “Rocket v. Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario” and “Bates v. State Bar of Arizona”, professional bodies have a duty to adopt appropriate guidelines which do not unduly restrict the freedom of expression of their members.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**

The intent is to ensure the Manual of Standard Practice is up to date and is in line with previous applicable Supreme Court cases and statements from the Competition Bureau.

4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**

No one from outside the Association membership was consulted; however, guidelines from other associations were reviewed in regards to marketing and advertising of fees that were published on their association’s website. Below is a list of associations:

- Manitoba Law Society.
- College of Chiropractors of Ontario.
- Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario.
- Professional Engineers of Ontario.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation #3</th>
<th>Hyperlinks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Alberta Law Society.
- Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors
- Law Society of New Brunswick
- Association of Engineers and Geoscientists of New Brunswick
- The Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors

5. How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?
   Con: None.
   Pro: The public will receive a factual summary of professional services and transparent advertising of fees.

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 costs will be included as part of the update of the Manual of Standard Practice.

RATIONAL DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the revision of hyperlinks 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 to remove all hyperlinks arose from a membership vote at the 2016 AGM. The members voted in favor of removing the hyperlinks from the MSP.

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
   The problem that is trying to be solved is that websites are constantly being changed and as a result the hyperlinks in the Manual of Standard Practice become broken and useless. Instead of having hyperlinks we are proposing to have some key words in italics text that could be used as key search words in an internet search. You would no longer have to worry about broken links and the user would be pointed in the right direction for the information they were seeking.

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   The subgroup was given the task of removing the hyperlinks from the Manual of Standard Practice. The subgroup recommends removing the hyperlinks.
4. *Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?*
   No one outside the Association membership was consulted.

5. *How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?*
   The recommendation will have no direct affect to the public.

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 would be minimal, less than $1,000. It would be a one time cost of updating the MSP.

**RATIONAL DOCUMENT** for the motion pertaining to the deletion of Sections 32(3) and 32(4) of the Association’s bylaws.

1. *What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)*
   At the 2014 AGM, the membership approved a bylaw change to increase the term of an ALSA councillor from 2 to 3 years. The bylaw change included a schedule on how to manage the transition from three new Council members per year for a two year term to two new Council members per year for a three year term. Now that the transition is complete, the schedule in the bylaw is no longer needed.

2. *What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?*
   There are extra provisions in the bylaws that no longer apply.

3. *What is the overall intent of the recommendation?*
   The recommendation cleans up the sections of the bylaw that are no longer needed to manage the transition.

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

5. *How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?*
   As these sections of the bylaws are no longer applicable they have no effect on the public.
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?**
   Apart from administrative time to update the bylaw document, no ongoing commitments are needed.

**RATIONAL DOCUMENT** for the motion pertaining to the revision of Section 51(3)(b) of the Association’s bylaws.

1. **What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of committee discussions?)**
   President Fred Cheng observed that the current bylaw’s cap of five honorary members may have been appropriate 30 years ago, but with the increased population of the province and the size of ALSA the cap should be significantly increased.

2. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
   At the moment, under Section 51(3)(b) of the current ALSA Bylaws the maximum number of honorary members is five. We have reached the limit and could not nominate even though there are many deserving individuals having served the surveying profession eminently (provincially, nationally, and internationally). The “five limit” was established when the ALSA was a small organization, and when Canada’s entire surveying profession consisted of a few hundred people.

3. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
   Recognizing additional deserving individuals for outstanding contributions and signal service to the surveying profession.

4. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**
   This recommendation was discussed and favorably received at the ALSA Council and Executive Committee.

5. **How will this recommendation affect the public interest (pro and con)?**
   Pro. – Individuals who’d provided eminent service will be recognized thereby raising public awareness of the profession. Con – none.
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 to the ALSA other than the time vetting prospective recipients and minor costs towards bestowing the honorary membership certificates to the individuals. There are no ongoing financial commitments to ALSA.
New Members 2016-2017

Meredith Bryan
ALS

Logan Ceretti
ALS

Ryan Deighan
ALS

Benjamin d’Eon
ALS

Garret Dillabough
ALS

Michelle Hua
ALS

Maurice Liboiron
ALS

Michelle Merrick
ALS

Richard Edmonds
ALS

Greg Hebb
ALS

Mitchell Scheuerman
ALS

Maurice Liboiron
ALS

Dorin Resek
ALS

Danu Vandermark
ALS

Ryan Walker
ALS

Ryan Smith
ALS

Drew Stodalka
ALS

Chad VandenBrink
ALS

Garret Dillabough
ALS

Xianglei (Lee)
Wang
ALS

Jean-Sebastien Mathieu, ALS and Malcolm Richmond, ALS were unable to attend.
President Fred Cheng asked Michelle Merrick and Ryan Smith to come forward to say a few words on behalf of the new members about what receiving their commission means to them.

Michelle Merrick addressed the luncheon as follows:

I would like to thank my husband, Bruce, and my boys, Kyle and Trent, for all of the support they gave me while I was articling. Just before my qualifying exam, I think my husband knew way more than he ever wanted to know about surveying, the profession and the Association while listening to me recite what I should know over and over and explain how I would re-establish evidence for every scenario I could think of.

I want to thank my principal, Stephen Howard, for deciding to have me as his first ALSA articling pupil. I hope I have not deterred him from having another pupil in the future.

I was honoured when Fred asked if I would speak with Ryan on behalf of the 21 new ALSA members. I am sure there will be redundancy in what Ryan and I have to say since we have gone through the same articling process as, with the other new members, we shared some common experiences along the way. But since we are speaking to a room full of land surveyors and redundancy is something we strive for, here it goes.

Some of my fellow new members achieved their CBEPS certificates through graduating university in geomatics engineering or after another form of post-secondary education followed by challenging exams like Ryan and I did but in the end we all signed into the same articling student process. We all spent many nights studying for our exams, wrote reports and crossed our fingers that they would be approved the first time and we all had to go through the most stressful three hours in order to get our commission by completing the dreaded qualifying exam.

Just before my exam, I was greeted by Robyn and she asked how I was doing. My responses was, “I do not remember ever being this nervous ever before in my life.”
As nervous as I was, I had a great panel and I can now say that my qualifying exam was an enjoyable experience. On behalf of the new members, I would like to thank the Registration Committee for the time you put into marking exams, going through project reports and volunteering for qualifying exams where you get to hear the same definition of the discipline process and why we would or would not post a section corner using a witness monument, which you probably heard many times before. You have a large responsibility to ensure that in three hours you are confident that we are ready to practice land surveying and to represent the ALSA as professionals.

There have been so many ALSA members that have helped many of us through the process by taking time out of your weekends for study sessions and to host mock oral exams to help us prepare, not only for written exams but for the qualifying exams. I have had the pleasure to be able to help host study sessions on some Sundays this past spring and will continue to do so.

I encourage all new members to participate in the betterment of the ALSA in whatever capacity you feel most comfortable and passionate about. This could be through volunteering for a committee, throwing your name in for running for Council in the future, helping current articling students through the process so they are ready to practice land surveying or by giving your input at the AGM on issues and recommendations.

In April 2012, I attended my first ALSA AGM in Banff where Connie Petersen became the first female president in the history of the Association. I was very impressed with how members were friendly and would talk with me about the profession and the Association; although, I was only an associate member and not done with my CBEPS yet. My husband and I attended the formal dinner and watched the pipining in of Connie as the new president. My husband, who is an avid reader of history, told me after that he was really impressed with how the Association has kept a piece of their history; although, surveying has changed so much with the advances in technology. Since then I have viewed the ALSA as a family that is rich in history.

When members get together they frequently disagree on matters regarding evidence, re-establishments and changes that should be done to move the Association forward into
the future. I think the saying goes, if you put ten surveyors in a room you will get eleven opinions. Through these discussions and differences of opinions the ALSA has become the best of all ideals brought forward. We are now part of the ALSA family of 460 members and the future of the Association. Like my fellow newly-commissioned Alberta Land Surveyors, I cannot imagine doing anything but surveying. I have met the most helpful people who are willing to devote much of their time and efforts to the betterment of the Association. We are in a profession that gives us the opportunity to continue learning and expand our knowledge as surveyors. We will be a part of the ALSA in the future and how the practice of surveying will change due to advances in technology.

Congratulations to all new members on the achievement of your Alberta Land Surveyor’s commission.

Thank you.

Ryan Smith addressed the luncheon as follows:

What she said. It is a great honour to be standing here in front of so many people that I have admired and respected for so long and to finally be able to refer to you as my colleagues. There is an old saying that has really come to make sense over the past few years to me and that is that it takes a village to raise a child. Well it takes a village to raise a land surveyor too. There is not one of you out there, land surveyor or articled pupil, who was not willing to lend their knowledge and experience whenever they were asked and certainly no one ever hesitated to lend their opinions. I would like to thank my principal, Dave McArthur, for putting up with me for so many years. I really learned a lot about the technical aspect of surveying from Dave but more importantly I think I learned how to deal with clients and to embrace the importance of our role as land surveyors and that is to protect the public. Thanks Dave.

I would also like to talk for a second about Fred. I met Fred my first year at NAIT and we became friends immediately. Fred has been there throughout my entire process through the CBEPS, my articles, prepping for the qualifying and many, many evenings spent in Fred’s basement studying. Thanks Fred and May for opening your house up to anyone who was looking for help. It was not just me. Then I ran out of time but I would really like to say that I am extremely proud to be able to share this moment with
land surveyor #377, my father Barry Smith who is here with his partner Jane today and I am just really proud to be a part of the family. I look forward to continuing to learn and practice.
Thank you.

President Fred Cheng thanked Michelle Merrick and Ryan Smith.
Charge to the New Members

President Fred Cheng asked Larry Pals to come to the stage to say a few words to the new members.

Larry Pals addressed the luncheon as follows:

So I am the final redundancy here today. What you have heard already, you will hear again. I would now ask all of the new members who received your commissions today to stand up, put on those new vests and look around the room while I complete this short presentation and we will wait until you get your vests on. When I sent Ryan back to his room to get his vest because he did not have it he said, well Fred told me I did not need it. I said, “oh yeah, you need it.” So look around the room. As you look around the room, I want you to observe a number of different things. Firstly, about half of the faces that you are looking at are fellow land surveyors, some of whom are from other provinces. 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 us.

Secondly, 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 to receive your ALS commission here today.

Thirdly, as you look around you will see past and present Council members and also members of Association staff. Remember that the Council and staff are also 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 all the 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 this society.

I would like to read a quote shared with us recently, well maybe not recently, by Ashley Robertson in an *ALS News* article from The Honourable Madam Justice J.B. Veit, “From this day forward and for the rest of your life you represent all of the men and women who shared this profession with you. Our profession will be judged by your conduct for you will be the living evidence of the standards, the aspirations and the ideals of our profession.”

Congratulations on becoming newly commissioned land surveyors. A great and wonderful, rewarding career awaits you.

Thank you.
25-Year Pin Recipients

Paul Dixon, ALS
Richard Heacock, ALS with his wife Karen
Steve Yanish, ALS with his wife Tami

Alberta Land Surveyors Jim MacLeod, Doug Neufeld and Gerry Smyth were unable to attend to receive their 25-year pin.

50-Year Pin Recipients

Richard (Dick) Bassil, ALS (Hon. Life) was unable to attend. His wife Jill attended with their daughter Jennifer and son Chris on his behalf.

Jack Hagen ALS (retired) with his wife Joyce

Marlin Sexauer, ALS (Hon. Life) and Roy Wilkins, ALS (Retired) were unable to attend to receive their 50-year pin.
President Fred Cheng addressed the luncheon as follows:

The land surveying community has got to be one of the closest connected communities among other professions in Canada. Everybody unselfishly helps each other out whenever anyone is crying out for help. We tackle each other’s problem as if it is our own. This has got to be part of the best land surveyors’ culture we have across Canada.

As I’d mentioned in one of my presidential messages in ALS News last year – special homage is given to people like Ross Woolgar and Bruce Gudim, the two co-founders of Eclipse College. Their online and classroom training seminars have been running since 2009, every Wednesday afternoon between September and April each year.

It is not just the two gentlemen alone. There are also many volunteers who donate hours of their time in educating and sharing their knowledge for all articled pupils and anyone willing to learn.

This president’s award is not about Eclipse College. Eclipse is just an exemplifying model of how land surveyors are so unselfish and generous in helping each other; even students of other principals. I am sure there are many, many examples out there within the profession.

Today, I am going to recognize one geomatics company that has gone the extra mile in helping others to succeed. There is one surveying practice that I am aware of that has been holding regular study sessions for articling students to help others in preparing for professional exams and qualifying exams. I do not know for how many years they have been doing this. It must have been over ten years by now. Rob Cream, of Challenger Geomatics, has been involved in all of the study sessions and mock qualifying exams but so have others like Tim Harding, Andriy Vasynda, Sirt Lin and Connie Hanrahan from the same office. Of course those people will be there whenever they are available.

Rob would you please come up to the podium and accept this well-deserved President’s Award.
Rob, on behalf of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association this plaque is a token of my appreciation to you and your company for your exemplary leadership in contributing to the betterment of the profession of land surveying. Congratulations to you and Challenger Geomatics’ achievement. Thank you.

Rob Cream addressed the luncheon as follows:

Thank you Fred. This award is not about me. I may mention myself in my comments but that just speaks to my experience, not my claim for credit for this award. This award is for Challenger Geomatics and in my mind it is about mentoring. I have been with Challenger in Edmonton for the past five years and I inherited this role but Challenger has been helping pupils for the last ten years, mostly in the form of hosting mock orals for articling pupils ahead of their qualifying exam.

A bit of history. In 2007 my boss and eventual principal, Tim Harding finished his term on the Registration Committee and wanted to do something to assist pupils to prepare for the qualifying exam. He decided that hosting mock orals was the answer. Most of these mock orals are for pupils from companies other than Challenger.

Recently, with the assistance of Alberta Land Surveyors from other companies in Edmonton they have hosted mock orals, not only at Challenger’s Edmonton office but also on occasion at the offices of Pals Geomatics and Can-Am Geomatics. Our success rate is well over 80 percent. Listen to some of these names: Tim Harding, Fred Cheng, Hugo Engler, Christy Thompson, Dwayne Westacott, Frank Meashaw, Dwayne Edmundson, Bruce Gudim, Mitch Ettinger, Bruce Drake, Larry Pals, Dave McArthur, Ben DeJong, Jason Workman, new member Ryan Smith, Les Frederick, Nicholas Madarash, Sirt Lin, Andriy Vasynda, Connie Hanrahan, Adam Pluim and myself. These are just some of the Alberta Land Surveyors who have helped over the last ten years with these mock orals. That is the first thing that this award is about. Almost sixty of the Alberta Land Surveyors practicing today participated in these mock orals. In fact over fifty percent of this year’s new members attended a mock oral in Edmonton. That is quite an accomplishment but wait, there is more.

Two or three years ago Les Frederick, ALS started a study group for articling pupils who were preparing to either
write the professional exams or sit the qualifying exam. Being a strong believer in paying it forward, I volunteered to help, much to my wife’s chagrin. Over the years I have learned so much from many of the Alberta Land Surveyors in this room and many other members of our Association who are not with us here today. In my opinion, it is a crucial expression for pupils to learn. It is our duty and our responsibility to do our best to pass on what we have learned from those who went before us to those who follow after us.

Winston Churchill said, “We make a living by what we get but we make a life by what we give.” Bob Dylan said, “This land is your land, this land is my land” but the world is run by those who do not listen to music anyways. Leslie Nielsen in the film Airplane said … but that is not important right now.

These study sessions are held on Sunday afternoons during the lead up to the exams in the spring and in the fall. In Edmonton we have seen students traveling from all over the greater Edmonton area, from Lloydminster and from Calgary. Those of you who were at the New Members’ Lunch on Thursday will have heard new member Michelle Merrick speak about how she and Altus Geomatics began hosting these sessions this spring. Michelle, Les Frederick, John Haggerty and I were able to help students over the course of six weekends this March and early April, right up until the written exams.

This is not teaching per se. The students bring the questions. We help by providing a forum and then the group discusses and provides answers or opinions, as applicable. Albert Einstein said, “I never teach my pupils; I only attempt to provide the conditions in which they can learn.” I learn a lot in discussion with these students. Rest assured, there are some fantastic bright students in the system. I believe the future of our Association is in good hands.

Lyndon Johnson said, “You aren’t learning anything when you’re talking.” There is a reason why we have two ears and only one mouth. I said that.

There is always a big demand for mock orals every spring. Everyone wants to get their commission before the AGM. Students who have attended these study sessions tend to do better on their mock orals.
I know there are lots of spouses here. For those who are not familiar with the premise, a mock oral is intended to be harder than the qualifying exam. We want to find out what the pupil does not know and what they need to work on. This is why it is so important that they are held several weeks before a qualifying exam. They are more difficult so they will know what they need to work on. Knowing what you need to work on is not very helpful if your qualifying exam is days away. With a few weeks’ notice a student can address any shortcomings and if necessary even sit through another mock oral. At three or more hours, these exams are exhausting, not just for the candidate. They are exhausting also for the panel.

I do not envy the Registration Committee and the members of that Committee who often sit through two qualifying exams in one day.

I cannot sufficiently express my thanks to all of the Alberta Land Surveyors who have volunteered to sit in on these mock orals. As I said at the beginning, this award is for Challenger Geomatics. Calvin Coolidge said, “No person was ever honored for what he received but for what he gave.” You know, my father, he grew up on a ranch near Buffalo Lake during the Depression. He did not have a lot but he said to me, “Son.” He said so many things but he said, “To be good is noble but to teach others how to be good is nobler and less trouble.”

This is a great honour. Thank you very much.

President Fred Cheng addressed the luncheon as follows:

I have a second President’s award to present this year.

Fifteen years ago in 2002, the Association was looking to retain a new administrative assistant to work at the front desk as Dawn Phelan would be taking on new responsibilities with Systematic Practice Review.

So the Association went to the NAIT Office Administration program and asked the graduates to submit their resumes for this front desk position.

Each of the candidates had similar skills with business administration and familiarity with the latest version of the Microsoft Office program. Most of them even wore what became known as the official NAIT job interview uniform, which is a white shirt and black pants.
There was one person who stood out however and we are glad that she was hired by the Association that day and Michelle Woywitka remains with the ALSA office to this day.

When the Association checked Michelle’s references they turned out to be honest and true. We were informed that Michelle was pleasant, confident, efficient, hardworking and liked to be busy.

All of those things are true and we have found out over the last fifteen years and so much more that she has offered to our membership.

From working at the front desk and learning how the ALSA office operates, she quickly gained experience working with the Public Relations Committee and several other committees and task forces.

She then transitioned to doing the Association’s books for ten years. Although she did not have formal bookkeeping experience, she was one of the best and most organized at this task.

Michelle took over from Sharon Armstrong to organize this event called the Annual General Meeting. She handles every detail extremely well, making sure that coffee is ready to serve, from handling contracts to handling the entertainers and the exhibitors. There is not a weekend in March or April that Michelle is not working in the office working on the details to make sure everything happens.

When Sharon fully retired after 32 years with the ALSA, Michelle took over the production and design of the ALS News without missing a beat.

Michelle has also become the go-to person for students and principals who have questions about their articles. She keeps the Registration Committee on track for all of its qualifying exams, transfer interviews and other meetings.

Yes, Michelle is very pleasant, very quiet, very confident and very punctual at work. She goes above and beyond. More importantly, she gets the job done.

I would like to invite Michelle to the front.

Michelle is so shy she is probably looking for which table she should dive under.
Michelle Woywitka addressed the luncheon as follows:

Obviously it is a big surprise for me so I do not have anything prepared. I would just like to thank President Fred for giving me this award. I would like to thank the members as well as the Association staff. Thank you everyone.

President Fred Cheng congratulated Michelle and informed her that it was well deserved.
President Fred Cheng addressed the luncheon as follows:

Norm Mattson received commission #330 on June 3, 1968.

Norm articled to Bill Dabbs and A.J. Edwards – two honorary life members in their own right.

Norm had been actively involved in Association business since Day 1. Over the course of his professional career he has been on numerous committees – including the Director of Surveys Review Committee, the Vision 2000 Future Committee and other committees that needed a visionary aspect and someone who could think strategically and plan for what he could see happening ten or twenty-five years down the road.

Norm was president of the Association in 1979-1980 and received the Professional Recognition Award in 1996.

At the time of receiving the Professional Recognition Award, Bill Hunter said…

It is difficult to pick up an *ALS News* or annual report without finding a report, commentary, speech, lecture or a motion by him; at all times demonstrating his keen interest and dedication to the profession of surveying. Norm has developed an uncanny ability to sift the wheat from the chaff; possibly related to spending long hours on a combine contemplating its inner workings. In any regard, a necessary attribute when serving on hearings or meetings. Most important, this man at all times manages to keep the best interest of the public in mind and is quick to remind fellow members on committees that this interest must be held paramount in all Association activities.

Norm articled future Alberta Land Surveyors Harvey Cummings, Al Nelson and Gerald Whaley. Norm retired his commission in 2006 after 38 years.

Even though Norm has been retired for a number of years now, his legacy to the profession lives on. That is a great testament to any professional, any person.
Norm is not able to be with us this weekend. His wife is awaiting surgery. Regardless, let’s give Norm Mattson a big round of applause for his career and being recognized.

President Fred Cheng addressed the luncheon as follows:

If you are a recipient of the Prestigious National Tim Koepke Award from the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors. If you are nominated by the President of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and your nomination is endorsed by nine past presidents, sixty active members (one of them is the Surveyor General of Canada) and a group of articled students – you are Bruce Gudim, honorary life member.

Mr. Gudim has been a member of this Association for over 35 years and has devoted a considerable amount of time and energy to the surveying community, provincially and nationally, through his committee work.

His co-founding of Eclipse College and his idea and effort for setting-up GeoEd, the continuing education system with the Association of Canada Land Surveyors and his generosity in sharing his extensive survey experience, abundance of surveying knowledge with articling students and other professionals is exemplifying.

After completing the Surveying program at the University of Alberta, Bruce commenced articles with Alberta Land Surveyor, Carl Norm Hanson of UMA Engineering. He subsequently transferred and completed his articles under Irwin Maltais. He obtained his commission as Alberta Land Surveyor #524, on April 14, 1982.

Bruce spent the better part of his professional career with Maltais Geomatics, first as an employee and then as a shareholder and a director. Later on with Altus Geomatics after Maltais had been acquired by Altus. Bruce’s dedication to the land surveying profession in Alberta and Canada has inspired many up and coming land surveyors. Five articled students have benefited from Bruce’s tutelage, three of which have received professional recognition. One is nearing completion of his articles to become an ALS.

Bruce has served on at least twelve ALSA committees and many ACLS committees throughout his career, often serving as chair. He also served as chair of the Western Canadian Board of Examiners. Even today, he is a member of the Registration Committee.

Presentation of Honorary Life Membership
Bruce Gudim
Yes, Bruce has retired as an active member of the Association and yet he continues to volunteer with the Association’s Registration Committee and Eclipse College.

His retirement life includes committee work, spending quality time with his grandchildren (one granddaughter in Calgary and two grandsons in Nelson, BC) and pursuing his hobby in wildlife photography.

Throughout the years that I have known Bruce, I can say that Bruce is a very humble individual, a mild mannered person, a genuine caring friend, a man of high ethics and personal morals, a true professional indeed and an excellent mentor. Bruce is so modest he always professes himself as an ordinary man but in actuality, he turns out to be an extraordinary asset for the surveying profession and humanity. Bruce, in my mind you are truly a well-deserving professional for this recognition.

Bruce, would you and your family please come up and receive this recognition.

Bruce Gudim addressed the luncheon as follows:

Thank you Fred. I cannot walk on water and I am not a day over thirty. I thought this award was for my good looks and charm but Fred seems to have other ideas. I suppose the award is for my uncommon volunteerism. However, in this Association, uncommon volunteerism is really common in this Association.

We have 22 committees composed of our Council, our Board and committees. We have 351 members volunteering for these 22 committees. So much so that some of our volunteers are volunteering for as many as five different committees at one time. Out of all of our members, we have a total of 238 members that volunteer. Our membership is sitting roughly at 480 people. That is roughly half of every one of us who are volunteering for committees. I think that is pretty impressive.

I have been rewarded so many times through volunteering. I have worked with incredible land surveyors, incredible people. Many have been role models for me in my own profession and I have learned a lot working on committees. I have learned that I am not the only one that digs for rust holes. Having worked on committees and working in collaboration, it is for these reasons that I have been awarded.
It is for these reasons that I continue to provide and work for Eclipse College.

Thank you Fred for the award and recognition and thank you everybody who put their names forward for this recognition.

President Fred Cheng addressed the luncheon as follows:

Stan Longson was born in High River, Alberta and grew up south of Longview.

Stan went on to SAIT’s Survey Technology program and graduated from there in 1969. Soon after, Stan entered into articles under the late Lorne Vanderford and honorary life member Bill Dabbs before receiving commission #381 on June 18, 1974.

Over the next twenty years, Stan worked on various committees throughout the Association and served a term on Council in 1980-1981.

In the early 1990s, Stan Longson became a member of the Practice Review Board and served as its chair in 1993-1994. This was at a time when the Systematic Practice Review program was just getting started and Al Nelson and Don George were hired as Director of Practice Review and Assistant to the Director of Practice Review.

As chair of the Practice Review Board, Stan worked with Al and staff and Board members to draw up terms of reference for this new SPR, Systematic Practice Review program.

A few years later, Stan put his name forward to serve as vice-president and he was president of the Association in 1997. That year was a time of great upheaval. Al Nelson was moving on to other challenges and the executive director position was vacant. Through Stan’s leadership, he oversaw the hiring of Lyall Pratt, the former Director of Practice Review and Brian Munday as executive director.

Stan was president during the one-of-a-kind GPS/GIS symposium and was the person who made it his mission to bring back the Historical & Biographical Committee, which had been dormant for a number of years at that time.
Stan Longson was president of Walker Consulting Group during his year as president but was in discussions with selling the company to Stantec Geomatics. It was obviously a busy time but Stan was able to handle it with his usual sense of calm and collective manner. One always had the sense that there was no need to worry because Stan always appeared so calm and relaxed. I don’t know if that was true but it always appeared that way.

Stan Longson was an expert at running a Council meeting; something I have grown to appreciate. Stan always had a clear vision and idea of what needed to be done and when things were going off the tracks – regardless of who wanted to get down in the details that surveyors love to do so much.

After articling Doug Lunty, Kevin MacLeod, Kevin Grover and Meredith Bryan and after 42 years as a professional land surveyor, Stan Longson decided to pack it in.

After giving so much to the profession over that time, it is only fitting that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association convey this honorary life membership on Stan Longson.

Stan and Fay, would you please come forward to the podium.

Stan Longson addressed the luncheon as follows:

Any way I am going to be up here again doing another duty so I do not want to make you suffer anymore. I will just step down. Thank you.
20 Year Employee Recognition

Stan Longson addressed the luncheon as follows:

This is important to us as members and for the staff of the Association. I would like to make a presentation to Brian Munday. This is for Brian on his twenty years of service.

I was president in 1997 when our executive director resigned and Council was charged with finding a new director. This was twenty years ago. My recall may include alternative facts.

The Executive Committee at the time included John Holmlund, past, past president, Bill Dabbs, past president, myself as president, Alex Hittel as vice-president and Dennis Tomkinson as secretary-treasurer. We advertised the position in Calgary and Edmonton as well as various professional associations. John Holmlund, as the ALSA’s member on the Canadian Council of Surveyors, had worked with the executive director of ACLS based in Ontario, Brian Munday and suggested we contact him and ask him to apply.

We narrowed the applicants down to five candidates, one of which was Brian Munday. After the interview process, our oilfield contingent of John, Bill, Dennis and Alex were unanimous in their support for the guy from Ontario.

I had met privately with Brian in a downtown hotel and was pretty sure that he could do the job. My biggest concern was that he would be able to work with Sharon, Al and Don. We were able to come to an agreement with Brian and he and his wife Lynn moved to Edmonton. He started work on August 5, 1997.

He was immediately confronted with finding a new Director of Practice Review and a new public member on Council. Our public member had applied for the executive director position and never showed up to another meeting. Our Director of Practice Review had provided many months of advance notice.

During this time Sharon and Don worked with Brian to become familiar with our administrative process. Brian had
an aptitude and interest in IT and Council provided him with funding to update his equipment, software and procedures.

We are very fortunate that we have such a long-term staff and this is a tribute to Brian for his part in being a leader.

On behalf of the Association and staff I present you with … I did not know if he was going to get anything so that part is blank. I am not sure what you are getting but I think Dawn knows quite a bit about it.

But I think what all of us in this room know, all the people who have worked on committees, all the committee chairman, all the people who run for Council, all the people past, present, etcetera who have come into contact with Brian, you all have your own personal thoughts and stories. We are very, very fortunate for his twenty years. Thank you Brian.

Brian Munday addressed the luncheon as follows:

Thank you very, very much. I will keep this short.

I think there are four thank yous that I want to make. The first one is to Stan and Council for giving the kid a chance, so I thank you for that.

Second, I want to thank all of the presidents and the Councils in the last twenty years for really making my job so much easier, so much fun and so interesting and so different from year to year. I thank all of you for that.

I also want to thank the membership. Again, for every time that you have served on a committee as Bruce talked about, every time that you have called in with a suggestion, sent an e-mail and contributed and been part of the Association. I thank you for that as well.

I also most sincerely want to thank the staff, both past and present of the Association. Al, the first Director of Practice Review who I worked with, Dick Bassil, who was my mentor when I first started with the Association, which was greatly, greatly appreciated and all of the staff that are here with me, not only here in Jasper but who are here in the office with us every day who make the job so interesting and fun and really enjoyable to come into the office every day so I want to thank you as well.

Thank you very much.
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Proceedings of the Special General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association held online on September 27th, 2017

The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association’s President, Mr. Mike Fretwell, called a special general meeting on Wednesday, September 27, 2017.

President Mike Fretwell called the meeting to order at 12:07 p.m. and advised that he would chair the special general meeting.

President Mike Fretwell advised that Council called this special general meeting pursuant to Section 21 of the by-laws of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. He noted that the purpose of the special general meeting is to vote on amendments to the Land Surveyors Act.

President Mike Fretwell commented that the Association has not previously conducted a special general meeting in an online format. He explained that he and the attendees at the Association office would be able to speak to the membership but the members attending online would not be able to vocalize their questions. Instead, an online chat box has been provided where members can enter their questions.

President Mike Fretwell stated that the meeting was being recorded and that he appointed Mr. Larry Pals as parliamentarian for the meeting. President Mike Fretwell commented that the parliamentarian has assured him that the procedures for today’s meeting are in order.

President Mike Fretwell also advised that he appointed Mr. Tom Gee of the accounting firm of Collins Barrow as scrutineer for the special general meeting voting.

President Mike Fretwell stated that the meeting will follow Robert’s Rules of Order and that Alberta Land Surveyors holding a valid annual certificate and Honorary Life Members may propose motions and resolutions and vote on all issues. He encouraged everyone to participate in the discussion.
President Mike Fretwell explained that amendments cannot be entertained to the motions as any proposed amendments to any of the regulations would mean that the proposed amendments would go back to the legislative drafters to re-write the wording and another special general meeting would need to be called for the membership to approve the wording the drafters comes up with.

President Mike Fretwell noted that, if there is a motion that a member feel needs to be changed, the member may vote against the motion and the Association can take the changes back to the legislative drafters.

President Mike Fretwell pointed out that each of the motions being addressed at the special general meeting have already been approved in principle by the membership at a previous AGM.

President Mike Fretwell stated that if any of the four regulations are not approved today, none of the regulations will be approved by the government. The government has told the Association that they will not review and approve the regulations on a piece-meal basis.

It was MOVED by Mr. Bruce Clark, seconded by Mr. Scott Westlund, that the membership of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association approve the proposed amendments to the Code of Ethics Regulation.

Motion Carried

Recommendation #1
Code of Ethics Regulation
(see page 220 for regulation amendments)
(see page 222 for rationale document)

President Mike Fretwell commented that, normally, he would ask the committee chair involved with this to speak to the motion but that, instead, he would provide a brief overview.

The proposed amendments to the Code of Ethics Regulation will make the wording in the regulation gender neutral. The membership approved making the wording in all of the regulations gender neutral at the 2017 AGM. There are no other changes to this regulation.

Now that the government has finalized the proposed wording in consultation with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, in accordance with Section 16 of the Land Surveyors Act, the final wording must be approved the membership before it is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.
Executive Director Brian Munday advised that all Alberta Land Surveyors and honorary life members registered for the special general meeting were sent instructions on how to vote online. He commented that the voting mechanism being used is called ElectionRunner and that it can be downloaded to vote from either a smartphone or a computer.

President Mike Fretwell indicated that the membership could proceed with voting on the regulation at this time and that voting would remain open until 2:00 p.m. that afternoon. Results of the votes would be provided to the membership via email later the same day.

There were no questions or comments from the membership with respect to the Code of Ethics Regulation.

It was MOVED by Mr. Colin Keir, seconded by Mrs. Rosalind Broderick, that the membership of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association approve the proposed amendments to the Discipline Regulation.

Motion Carried

President Mike Fretwell pointed out that there are two substantive changes to this regulation. The principle of allowing for recorded mail, including electronic mail, and specifically adding in the costs of independent legal advice were approved by the membership at the 2014 AGM as Recommendation #4.

The proposed amendments to the Discipline Regulation will make the wording in the regulation gender neutral. The membership approved making the wording in all of the regulations gender neutral at the 2017 AGM.

President Mike Fretwell commented that eagle-eyed members will see that in Section 4(2)(b) of the mock-up, there is a reference to “him.” However, in the appendix on page 31, that reference to “him” had already been removed. The recommendations package states, “In the event of a discrepancy between the regulation mock up and the appendix, the appendix shall prevail.” Therefore, the motion being voted on includes removing both of the references to “him” in Section 4(2)(b).

President Mike Fretwell indicated that the membership could proceed with voting on the regulation at this time and that voting would remain open until 2:00 p.m. that afternoon.
It was MOVED by Mr. Roger Luard, seconded by Ms. Robyn Graham, that the membership of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association approve the proposed amendments to the Examination & Training Regulation.

Motion Carried

President Mike Fretwell reminded the membership that the proposed amendments to the Examination & Training Regulation were approved in principle by the membership at the 2014 AGM as Recommendation #5. The key changes approved by the membership were:

- The Registration Committee can receive documents in case the Registrar is not involved in the examination and training process.
- Provision for parental leave was added.
- An option to take the oath of office before the registrar or a Council member was added.
- Residency requirements were removed.
- Articles are terminated if the pupil fails to pass any professional practice examination after three attempts.

The intent of the amendment is to update the regulation to, in part, streamline the process and eliminate those things which do not help the Registration Committee assess whether a pupil is ready to be an Alberta Land Surveyor.

The wording in the Examination & Training Regulation was already gender neutral.

President Mike Fretwell noted that Mr. Ryan Pals, who is now a Council member but, at the time these changes were being discussed, was a member of the Articling Pupil Ad Hoc Committee was in attendance at the Association office to assist with any questions that might arise.

President Mike Fretwell indicated that the membership could proceed with voting on the regulation at this time and that voting would remain open until 2:00 p.m. that afternoon.

Mr. Mark Sutter asked if allowing three attempts at the practice examination, under Section 14(1)(c), was reviewed by a solicitor.

Mr. Munday replied to Mr. Sutter’s inquiry and advised that the specific part was not reviewed by the Association’s solicitor but the entire regulation was reviewed by government.
Mr. Ryan Pals noted that there are other professional associations, such as accountants, that already have this in place.

It was MOVED by Mr. Bruce Drake, seconded by Mr. Michael Thompson, that the membership of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association approve the proposed amendments to the Professional Practice Regulation.

Motion Carried

President Mike Fretwell noted that the proposed amendments to the Professional Practice Regulation will make the wording in the regulation gender neutral. The membership approved making the wording in all of the regulations gender neutral at the 2017 AGM.

President Mike Fretwell commented that the other proposed amendments to the Professional Practice Regulation were approved in principle by the membership at the 2013 AGM as Recommendation #7. The intent of the recommendation is to broaden the ownership requirements to include land surveyors from other Canadian jurisdictions. An Alberta Land Surveyor must still take responsibility for the supervision, direction and control of a practice.

The recommendation arose from a new business motion at the 2010 AGM.

President Mike Fretwell advised that Mr. Bruce Drake, who was Council liaison to the Legislation Committee back in 2013 when the matter was voted on by the membership, was in attendance at the Association office to address any questions from the membership.

President Mike Fretwell indicated that the membership could proceed with voting on the regulation at this time and that voting would remain open until 2:00 p.m. that afternoon.

Mr. Rob Cream asked if the government is finally prepared to move forward on the regulations if all of the recommendations are passed at the special general meeting.

President Mike Fretwell commented that the government is under pressure from a number of associations to move forward. Executive Director Brian Munday indicated that the Association has not received any indication of further holdups but that he cannot speak to how long it will take the regulations to get in front of cabinet.
President Mike Fretwell thanked the members for taking the time to participate and vote at the special general meeting today. He indicated that the results would be announced as soon as the vote closes and has been confirmed by the scrutineer, Tom Gee of the accounting firm of Collins Barrow.

President Mike Fretwell advised that, if the membership approves each of the regulations, he would sign four voting certificates, one for each regulation, to tell the government that the membership has passed the regulations.

The amendments will then wait for them to reach the cabinet table so they can vote on them.

President Mike Fretwell reminded the membership that, if any one of the regulations is not passed, none of the regulations will be able to go forward for change.

President Mike Fretwell provided a brief summary of what Council has been up to and then provided Secretary-Treasurer Bruce Drake an opportunity to speak to some membership polling the Association will be doing and the need for the membership’s input.

President Mike Fretwell thanked the membership and asked them to contact himself or any Council member if they have a question or issue to raise that they did not feel comfortable doing so during the special general meeting.

President Mike Fretwell reiterated that the results of the vote will be sent to each member once the election is closed at 2:00 p.m. and the results have been confirmed by the scrutineer. Members will also receive a questionnaire asking for their opinions on this type of format for a meeting.

President Mike Fretwell declared the special general meeting closed at 12:51 p.m.

Subsequent to the special general meeting, the scrutineer provided the following to the Association via email:

I met with Mr. Brian Munday on Tuesday, September 26, 2017 and on Wednesday, September 27, 2017 to review the controls that had been implemented by the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association with respect to the electronic vote that was conducted from noon to 2 p.m. on Wednesday,
September 27, 2017 and satisfied myself that:
(1) Only members and life members could register to vote;
(2) Prior to the vote, a unique user identification code and password was sent out to each member or life member who had registered to vote, in order to enable them to vote; and
(3) Once a member or life member who had registered to vote, submitted their vote, they cannot submit another vote.

It is my understanding that the membership totaled 450 members and life members. The number of members and life members who registered to vote totaled 164. Out of this total, 136 actually voted which represented a voter turnout of approximately 30.22%. The votes were overwhelmingly in favor of the proposed changes. If the twenty eight members who had registered to vote but did not vote, had cast a vote against the proposed changes, the potential negative votes would not have had an impact on the final outcome.

Thomas J.B. Gee, MBA, FCPA, FCA
Partner
Collins Barrow Edmonton LLP

Once Mr. Gee had provided his report to Executive Director Brian Munday, the membership was provided with the results of the special general meeting voting via email.
Code of Ethics Regulation – Recommendation #1

MOCK UP, August 2017

ALBERTA REGULATION 324/82
Land Surveyors Act
CODE OF ETHICS

Part 1
The Code

1 An Alberta land surveyor shall serve society, his clientele and his profession with the ultimate objective of contributing to the knowledge of land, to the better management of land and to the preservation of peaceful and lawful enjoyment of land.

Duty to Personnel

2(1) An Alberta land surveyor has a duty to assist his pupils and employees to achieve their optimum level of contribution to society through their contribution to the profession.

Professional Impropriety

(2) An Alberta land surveyor should avoid even the appearance of professional impropriety.

Professional Confidences

(3) An Alberta land surveyor has a duty to preserve the confidences of his client and regard as privileged the information he may obtain regarding the affairs of his client.

(3) An Alberta land surveyor has a duty to preserve the confidences of clients and regard as privileged the information the Alberta land surveyor obtains regarding the affairs of clients.

Professional Judgment

(4) An Alberta land surveyor has a duty to exercise unbiased independent professional judgment on behalf of his client and shall represent his client clients and shall represent clients competently.
Integrity and Competence

(5) An Alberta land surveyor shall assist in maintaining and improving the integrity and competence of the profession of surveying.

Dignity of the Profession

(6) An Alberta land surveyor has a duty to maintain the dignity of the profession through his association with his clients, colleagues and subordinates.

Professional Services

(7) An Alberta land surveyor should assess and receive fair and just compensation from his client, commensurate with the professional and technical complexity, level of responsibility and liability potential of the services performed.

Unauthorized Practice

(8) An Alberta land surveyor shall assist in preventing the unauthorized practice of land surveying.

Part 2

General

3 When the context permits, in this regulation “Alberta land surveyor” includes a surveyor’s corporation and a surveyor’s partnership.

Publication

4 The sections that constitute the Code of Ethics shall be published and distributed to members of the profession of surveying and made available to the general public.

Amendment

5 This Regulation may be re-enacted, amended or repealed in the same way that the General By-laws of the Association may be enacted, amended or repealed but, in accordance with the Land Surveyors Act, an enactment, amendment or repeal does not come into force unless it is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

AR 324/82 s2

AR 324/82 s3

AR 324/82 s4
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Rationale Document
Code of Ethics Regulation
The proposed amendments to the *Code of Ethics Regulation* will make the wording in the regulation gender neutral. The membership approved making the wording in all of the regulations gender neutral at the 2017 AGM.

Now that the government has finalized the proposed wording in consultation with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, in accordance with Section 16 of the *Land Surveyors Act*, the final wording must be approved the membership before it is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Any proposed amendments to the regulation would mean that the proposed amendments would go back to the legislative drafters for their review and another special general meeting would need to be called to approve the wording.
Discipline Regulation – Recommendation #2

ALBERTA REGULATION 325/82
Land Surveyors Act
DISCIPLINE REGULATION

Part 1
General

1(1) In this Regulation
   (a) “Act” means the Land Surveyors Act;
   (b) “chairman” or “vice-chairman” mean respectively the chairman or a vice-chairman of the Discipline Committee;
   (c) “chair” or “vice-chair” means respectively the chair or a vice-chair of the Discipline Committee;
   (d) “recorded mail” means a form of document delivery by mail or courier in which receipt of the document must be acknowledged in writing by the recipient.

(2) Unless the context otherwise requires, the Interpretation Act applies to this regulation.
AR 325/82 s1

Discipline Committee

2(1) The Discipline Committee shall be composed of at least 5 Alberta land surveyors appointed by the Council.

(2) The chairman chair of the Discipline Committee shall be a member of the Council.

(3) A quorum of the Discipline Committee is 3 of its members, one of whom shall be the chair or a vice-chair of the Discipline Committee.

AR 325/82 s2

Complaints and Notification

3 If a complaint is made to the Registrar about a practitioner, the Registrar shall, if necessary, request that the complaint be made in writing.

AR 325/82 s3

4(1) On receipt of a written complaint the Registrar shall determine whether the complaint can properly be the subject of mediation and if so whether both parties agree to mediation.

(2) If the Registrar determines that the complaint is not capable of being the subject of mediation, or if one or both parties do not agree to mediation, the Registrar shall

   (a) refer the complaint to the chair or a vice-chair for investigation,
(b) notify the complainant in writing that the complaint has been referred to the chairman or a vice-chairman for investigation and send the complainant a copy of the relevant sections of the Act and this regulation, and

(c) notify the practitioner concerned that the complaint has been referred to the chairman or a vice-chairman for investigation.

(3) If a complainant and the practitioner concerned both agree to mediation, the Registrar shall notify both of them and the mediator concerned of their desire for mediation under section 37 of the Act.

Service of Notices

5(1) When a notice is permitted or required to be served under the Act or this regulation, it shall be served

(a) by personal service,

(b) if, in the opinion of the chairman, personal service is not possible or practical, the notice may be served by pre-paid double registered mail or certified mail addressed to the person at his last known business address as recorded in the records or register of the Association, and the notice shall be deemed to have been served on the 5th day after it is mailed.

(b) by recorded mail addressed to the person at the person’s last known business address as recorded in the records or register of the Association, or

(c) by an electronic method on the person, at an address specifically provided by the person for this purpose, if

(i) the sender receives confirmation of the successful transmission of the notice, and

(ii) the recipient receives the notice in a form that is usable for subsequent reference.

(2) If notice must be served on the Registrar, the Discipline Committee or any member of it or the Council, it may be served on him or it at the head office of the Association by personal service, recorded mail or an electronic method referred to in subsection (1)(c).

Costs

6 If the Discipline Committee or the Council makes an order as to the payment of costs those costs may include all or any of the following costs:

(a) any transportation, accommodation and living expenses paid to a person conducting a preliminary investigation or a member of the Discipline Committee or the Council involved in investigating and hearing the matter;

(b) the fees of an Alberta land surveyor making a survey for the purpose of the proceedings;

(c) an honorarium or payment made to a person referred to in clause (a) for participating in the manner;

(d) cost of hiring a reporter to take a transcript of the proceeding and the transcript of proceedings;
(e) witness fees;
(f) cost of renting rooms or renting recording equipment;
(g) fees payable to the solicitor acting on behalf of the Association and to any solicitor providing independent legal advice to the Discipline Committee or the Council;
(h) any other costs incurred by or on behalf of the Association that are attributable to the review, investigation, hearing or an appeal resulting from it.

AR 325/82 s6

Part 2
Re-instatements

Application for Reinstatement

7(1) A practitioner whose registration is cancelled as a result of disciplinary proceedings may apply to the Council to be reinstated.

(2) The Council may establish a committee of inquiry to consider the application for reinstatement and make recommendations to Council.

(3) The registration of the former practitioner shall not be reinstated in the register except by order of the Council or a Court of competent jurisdiction.

AR 325/82 s7

Re-examination

8 If a practitioner is suspended or his registration is cancelled for 1 year or more, the practitioner may be required by the Council to take examinations prescribed by the Practice Review Board or the Council before his reinstatement becomes effective.

AR 325/82 s8

Fees

9 Subject to section 8, a practitioner whose registration is cancelled as a result of non-payment of fees, dues or levies shall be reinstated on application to the Council together with payment of arrears and on payment of any fees, dues or levies that are payable under the General By-laws.

AR 325/82 s9

Part 3
Amendments

10 This Regulation may be re-enacted, amended or repealed in the same way that the General By-laws of the Association may be enacted, amended or repealed but, in accordance with the Act, a re-enactment, amendment or repeal of this regulation does not come into force unless it is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

AR 325/82 s10
**Rationale Document**

**Discipline Regulation**

The proposed amendments to the *Discipline Regulation* will make the wording in the regulation gender neutral. The membership approved making the wording in all of the regulations gender neutral at the 2017 AGM.

The principle of allowing for recorded mail, including electronic mail, and specifically adding in the costs of independent legal advice were approved by the membership at the 2014 AGM as Recommendation #4.

Now that the government has finalized the proposed wording in consultation with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, in accordance with Section 16 of the *Land Surveyors Act*, the final wording must be approved by the membership before it is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Any proposed amendments to the regulation would mean that the proposed amendments would go back to the legislative drafters for their review and another special general meeting would need to be called to approve the wording.
Examination & Training Regulation – Recommendation #3

MOCK UP, August 2017

ALBERTA REGULATION 86/2003
Land Surveyors Act
EXAMINATION AND TRAINING REGULATION
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Definitions
1 In this Regulation,
(a) “Act” means the Land Surveyors Act;
(b) “affidavit of service” means an affidavit of service prescribed in the General Bylaws;
(c) “articles” means articles of service entered into between an individual seeking to become an Alberta land surveyor and an Alberta land surveyor permitted to accept pupils, and, for the purposes of section 3, includes a transfer of articles;
(c.1) “domestic trade agreement” means a domestic trade agreement as defined in section 2 of Schedule 6 to the Government Organization Act;
(d) “Examination Board” means the Western Canadian Board of Examiners for Land Surveyors established by agreement between the Corporation of Land Surveyors of the Province of British Columbia, the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association and the Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors in association with the Department of Geomatics Engineering of The University of Calgary or such other Board as may from time to time be designated by the Council;
(d) “Examination Board” means the Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors or other Board as may from time to time be designated by the Council;
(e) “General Bylaws” means the General Bylaws of the Association;
(f) “principal” means an Alberta land surveyor to whom a pupil is articled;
(g) “professional practice examinations” means the oral and written examinations prescribed by the Registration Committee on legislation, survey law, practical surveying and any other matters considered necessary;
(h) “pupil” means an individual who has entered into articles with a principal;
(i) “transfer of articles” means a transfer of articles described in section 7.

Prerequisites for articles
2 An individual may enter into articles with an Alberta land surveyor if
(a) the individual
(i) holds a Certificate of Completion issued by the Examination Board, and
(ii) pays to the Association the required fees prescribed in the General Bylaws,
(b) the Alberta land surveyor
(i) has been engaged in the active practice of surveying as an Alberta land surveyor for at least the 2 years immediately preceding the date the articles are proposed to be entered into, and
(ii) unless the Registration Committee otherwise permits, is a resident of Alberta,
(b) the Alberta land surveyor has been engaged in the active practice of surveying as an Alberta land surveyor for at least the 2 years immediately preceding the date the articles are proposed to be entered into,
(c) the articles are in the form prescribed in the General Bylaws, and
(d) the articles have been approved by the Registration Committee or, on review, by the Council.
Approval of articles

3(1) The Registration Committee may not approve articles unless it is satisfied that

(a) the Alberta land surveyor will provide the individual with sufficient practical training and experience or, if the Alberta land surveyor is not able to personally provide it, is able to satisfactorily arrange that training and experience,

(b) the individual will be under the direct personal supervision of

(i) the Alberta land surveyor or,

(ii) if during any part of the articling period the Alberta land surveyor will not be able to personally supervise the individual, another person satisfactory to the Registration Committee,

(c) the relationship between the Alberta land surveyor and the individual is such that the Alberta land surveyor will not, through employment arrangements or otherwise, be subservient to the individual, and

(d) the Alberta land surveyor will be personally responsible for the training given and experience received by the individual.

(2) An individual and the Alberta land surveyor with whom the individual wishes to enter into articles must have such interviews with the Registration Committee as the Committee requires before it approves the articles.

(3) If the Registration Committee refuses to approve the articles, it must send written reasons to the Alberta land surveyor and the individual.

(4) An individual whose articles are refused by the Registration Committee may, within 30 days of receiving a notice of refusal and the reasons for it, request the Council to review the articles by serving on the Registrar a written request for review by the Council setting out the reasons why, in the individual’s opinion, the articles should be approved.

(5) The Council must, after receipt of a request for review under this section, review the articles.

(6) An individual who requests a review

(a) must be notified in writing by the Registrar of the date, place and time that the Council will review the articles, and

(b) is entitled to appear and make representations to the Council when it reviews the articles.

(7) A member of the Registration Committee who is also a member of the Council may participate at a review by the Council under this section but may not vote in a decision of the Council.

(8) On considering a review under this section, the Council may make any decision the Registration Committee may make under this section.

Length of articled service

4(1) A pupil must complete at least 2 years of articled service.

(2) Except as otherwise permitted by the Registration Committee, the 2 years of articled service referred to in subsection (1) must consist of

(a) at least 18 months of field practice, and

(b) at least 6 months of office practice.

(3) If a pupil has completed the term of articled service, but has not passed the professional practice examinations, the pupil must, unless the Registration Committee otherwise permits, continue to serve under the articles until the pupil has passed the examinations.
Number of pupils

5 Unless the Registration Committee otherwise permits, a principal may not accept more than one pupil in any one calendar year.

Filing of articles

6(1) A pupil must, within 2 months after the articles are entered into, file one copy of the articles with the Registrar Registration Committee together with the fees referred to in section 2(a)(ii).

(2) Subject to subsection (3), the term of articled service begins on the date that the articles are entered into.

(3) If a pupil fails to comply with subsection (1), the term of articled service begins on the date on which the articles and the required fees are received by the Registrar Association.

Transfer of articles

7 Articles may be transferred from the service of a pupil’s principal to another Alberta land surveyor if

(a) the pupil

(i) files with the Registrar Registration Committee a transfer of articles and an affidavit of service for the period of articles served to date, and

(ii) pays to the Association the required fees prescribed in the General Bylaws,

(b) the Alberta land surveyor

(i) has been engaged in the active practice of surveying as an Alberta land surveyor for at least the 2 years immediately preceding the date the transfer of articles are proposed to be entered into, and

(ii) unless the Registration Committee otherwise permits, is a resident of Alberta,

(b) the Alberta land surveyor has been engaged in the active practice of surveying as an Alberta land surveyor for at least the 2 years immediately preceding the date the transfer of articles is proposed to be entered into,

(c) the transfer of articles is in the form prescribed in the General Bylaws, and

(d) the transfer of articles has been approved by the Registration Committee.

Filing of transfer of articles

8(1) A pupil must, within 2 months after the transfer of articles is entered into, file one copy of the transfer of articles with the Registrar Registration Committee together with the fees referred to in section 7(a)(ii).

(2) Subject to subsection (3), the term of articled service begins on the date that the transfer of articles is entered into.

(3) If a pupil fails to comply with subsection (1), the term of articled service begins on the date on which the transfer of articles and the required fees are received by the Registrar Registration Committee.

Affidavit of service

9(1) On or before January 15 of each year, a pupil must provide to the Registrar Association an affidavit of service that

(a) is signed by the principal, and

(b) describes the surveying operations in which the pupil was engaged during the preceding calendar year.

(2) After providing an affidavit of service under subsection (1), the pupil must meet with the Registration Committee to review the training and experience obtained by the pupil during the preceding calendar year.
Educational leave—Leave from articles

10(1) A pupil may, with the permission of the pupil’s principal, take educational leave for the purpose of attending a course of study at a university, college or technical school.

10(1) A pupil may, with the approval of the pupil’s principal and the Registration Committee, take a leave from the pupil’s articles

(a) for the purposes of attending a course of study at a university, college or technical school, or
(b) the purposes of a maternity or parental leave under the Employment Standards Code.

(2) A pupil must provide to the Registrar a letter signed by both the pupil and the principal setting out the details of the educational leave.

(2) A pupil must provide the Registration Committee with a letter signed by both the pupil and the pupil’s principal setting out the details of the leave.

(3) Any period of time during an educational leave that requires the pupil to be absent from service with the principal may not be considered field practice or office practice for the purposes of section 4(2).

(3) The period of time that the pupil is on leave may not be considered field practice or office practice for the purposes of section 4(2).

Courses and seminars

11 A pupil must, during the pupil’s articled service, take such courses of study or seminars as are prescribed by the Registration Committee.

Breach of articles

12(1) If a pupil

(a) leaves the service of the pupil’s principal without consent,
(b) breaches any of the pupil’s obligations under the pupil’s articles, or
(c) is involved in conduct that may put in question the pupil’s good character,

the principal or the Registrar may report the matter to the Registration Committee and request that

(d) the articles be terminated, or
(e) the Registration Committee provide direction as to the future conduct of the pupil or the principal, or both.

(2) If a pupil’s employment with the principal is terminated by the principal, the pupil or the Registrar may report the matter to the Registration Committee and request that

(a) the articles be continued, or
(b) the Registration Committee provide direction as to the future conduct of the pupil or the principal, or both.

12(1) If a pupil

(a) leaves the service of the pupil’s principal without consent,
(b) breaches any of the pupil’s obligations under the pupil’s articles, or
(c) is involved in conduct that may put in question the pupil’s good character,

the principal or the Association may report the matter to the Registration Committee.

(2) If a pupil’s employment with the principal is terminated by the principal, the pupil or the Association may report the matter to the Registration Committee.
(3) On receipt of a report under subsection (1) or (2), and after giving notice to the pupil and the principal, the Registration Committee must hold a hearing into the matter and may
(a) order the articles terminated,
(b) suspend the articles,
(c) permit or order the articles to continue with or without conditions, or
(d) make an order as to the future conduct of the pupil or the principal, or both, or
(e) order that the pupil enter into a transfer of articles with another Alberta land surveyor.

(4) On receipt of a report under subsection (2), the Registration Committee may meet with the pupil, or the pupil and the principal, and may
(a) order that the articles be continued, or
(b) provide advice, suggestions or direction as to the future conduct of the pupil or the principal, or both.

Termination of articles by mutual consent
13(1) A pupil and the pupil’s principal may terminate articles by mutual consent.

(2) If articles are terminated by mutual consent under subsection (1), the principal must provide to the Registrar Association a letter signed by both the principal and the pupil notifying the Registrar Association of the termination.

Automatic termination of articles
14(1) If a pupil fails
(a) to pay annual fees to the Association within the time prescribed in the General Bylaws, or
(b) to provide the Registrar Association with an affidavit of service in accordance with section 9, or
(c) to pass any of the professional practice examinations after 3 attempts,
the articles are terminated and the Registrar Association must notify the pupil and the principal accordingly.

(2) Articles terminated under subsection (1) may be reinstated by the Registration Committee on application to it and after payment of any required reinstatement fees prescribed in the General Bylaws.

(3) If a pupil’s articles are terminated under subsection (1), the pupil may apply to the Registration Committee for approval of new articles after paying any required fees prescribed in the General Bylaws.

(4) If a principal dies or the principal’s registration as an Alberta land surveyor is suspended or cancelled, the articles are terminated.

(5) A pupil whose articles are terminated under subsection (3) may apply to the Registration Committee for approval of new articles for the balance of the pupil’s term of articled service.

Transfer of articles required
15(1) Unless otherwise permitted by the Registration Committee, if a principal ceases
(a) to be a resident of Alberta, or
(b) to engage in the practice of surveying in Alberta,
the principal must transfer the articles of a pupil to another Alberta land surveyor permitted to accept pupils in accordance with section 7.
15(1) Unless otherwise permitted by the Registration Committee, if a principal ceases to engage in the practice of land surveying in Alberta, the principal must transfer the articles of a pupil to another Alberta land surveyor permitted to accept pupils in accordance with section 7.

(2) If a principal fails, refuses or is not able to transfer the articles of a pupil under subsection (1), the pupil may apply to the Registration Committee for termination of the articles and approval of new articles for the balance of the pupil’s term of articled service.

Times when training and examinations must be completed
16(1) Subject to subsection (2), a pupil who commences articles must complete the pupil’s required practical training, experience and professional practice examinations within 5 years of the commencement of the articles, whether or not the articles are terminated and subsequent articles are entered into.

(2) The 5-year period referred to in subsection (1) may be extended
   (a) by the same period of time that the pupil is granted educational leave under section 10, or
   (b) by any other period approved by both the pupil’s principal and the Registration Committee.

Prior service
17(1) If articles are terminated and subsequently the pupil articles with another principal, the pupil may apply to the Registration Committee for any period of prior service under the articles to be credited as field practice or office practice for the purposes of section 4(2).

17(1) Unless the Registration Committee otherwise permits, if a pupil’s articles are terminated and the Registration Committee approves an application for new articles, the pupil must subsequently
   (a) pass all of the professional practice examinations, and
   (b) complete all of the field practice and office practice requirements under section 4(2), even if the pupil had completed any or all of these examinations or practice requirements during prior articles.

(2) If prior service is credited the Registration Committee permits credit for prior service under subsection (1), the Registration Committee may impose any conditions that it considers appropriate with respect to future field practice and office practice.

(3) Subsections (1) and (2) do not apply in respect of articles terminated under section 14(3) or 15(2).

Termination of articles
18 If a pupil fails to complete the pupil’s required practical training, experience and professional practice examinations within the 5-year period under section 16(1) or any longer period extended under section 16(2), the Registration Committee must terminate the articles of the pupil by notice in writing to the pupil and the principal.

Part 2
Qualifications for Registration as an Alberta Land Surveyor
Alberta applicants
19 An applicant is entitled to be registered as an Alberta land surveyor if the applicant meets the requirements of section 24 and
   (a) the applicant
      (i) completes the term of articled service in accordance with Part 1, and
(ii) passes the professional practice examinations to the satisfaction of the Registration Committee, or

(b) the applicant has a combination of education, practice requirements, examinations and other qualifications that demonstrate the competence required for registration to the satisfaction of the Registration Committee.

Canadian land surveyors

20 An applicant is entitled to be registered as an Alberta land surveyor if the applicant meets the requirements of section 24 and

(a) the applicant

(i) is authorized to survey land under the Canada Lands Surveys Act or an Act of a province of Canada governing land surveyors,

(ii) holds a Certificate of Completion issued by the Examination Board,

(iii) completes such period of articles prescribed by the Registration Committee, and

(iv) passes the professional practice examinations to the satisfaction of the Registration Committee,

or

(b) the applicant

(i) is registered in good standing with a land survey profession in another jurisdiction recognized by the Council as having substantively equivalent competence and practice requirements, and

(ii) passes the professional practice examinations to the satisfaction of the Registration Committee.

20 An applicant is entitled to be registered as an Alberta land surveyor if the applicant

(a) meets the requirements of section 24,

(b) is an individual who is authorized under the Canada Lands Surveyors Act (Canada) to engage in the practice of land surveying or is registered as a land surveyor in good standing with a professional regulatory organization governing land surveying in a province of Canada that is a signatory to a domestic trade agreement in force in Alberta at the time the application is made, and

(c) passes an examination designed to test the level of knowledge of specific surveying topics unique to Alberta.

Retired members

21 A retired member of the Association is entitled to be registered as an Alberta land surveyor if the member meets the requirements of section 24 and the requirements of section 19(b).

Procedure for examinations

22 An individual who wishes to take a professional practice examination under this Part must

(a) apply to the Registrar Association at least 6 weeks 2 weeks before the date set for the examination by the Registration Committee,

(b) satisfy the Registrar Association that the other requirements of this Regulation have been met, and

(c) pay to the Association the required fees prescribed in the General Bylaws.
Authority of Registration Committee

The Registration Committee must decide any question that arises as to the qualifications of a candidate for examination under this Regulation or as to the candidate’s compliance with any requirement of the Registration Committee with respect to professional practice examinations.

Applicants for registration

In addition to the other requirements of the Act or this Regulation for registration as an Alberta land surveyor, an applicant must

(a) be at least 18 years old,

(b) satisfy the Registration Committee that the applicant is of good character,

(c) pay to the Association the required fees prescribed in the General Bylaws,

(d) provide the Registration Association with a discharge of articles prescribed in the General Bylaws and,

(e) take and subscribe before a judge of the Court of Queen’s Bench or Court of Appeal the oath of office set out in the Schedule.

(f) clause repealed

(f) take and subscribe the oath of office, set out in the Schedule, before

(i) the chair of the Registration Committee, a member of the Council or the Registrar if the chair, member or Registrar, as the case may be, is a commissioner for oaths in and for Alberta,

(ii) a judge of the Court of Queen’s Bench, or

(iii) a judge of the Court of Appeal.

Subsection (1)(d) and (e) does not apply to an applicant described in section 19(b) or 20(b).

Application referred to Registration Committee

The Registrar must refer an application for registration as an Alberta land surveyor to the Registration Committee for its decision on whether to register the applicant as an Alberta land surveyor in accordance with section 20 of the Act.

Transitional

In this section, “previous Regulation” means the Examination and Training Regulation (AR 326/82).

A person who immediately before the coming into force of this Regulation was a pupil under the previous Regulation continues as a pupil under this Regulation.

A person who immediately before the coming into force of this Regulation was registered as an Alberta land surveyor under the previous Regulation continues to be registered as an Alberta land surveyor under this Regulation.

Repeal

The Examination and Training Regulation (AR 326/82) is repealed.

Schedule

Oath of Office

I, [name], do swear (or solemnly affirm) that I will diligently, faithfully and to the best of my ability, execute according to law the office of land surveyor; and that I will, as an Alberta land surveyor, conduct all surveys faithfully and to the best of my ability, giving due consideration to the lawful rights of all persons; I will accurately locate and record all evidence of boundary monumentation truly and accurately to the best of my ability, I will measure and record all data truly without prejudice either toward or against any land owner, but in all things conduct myself truly and with integrity; maintaining and upholding the law and the interests of the public.

So help me God
(omit if affirmed)
Rationale Document
Examination & Training Regulation

The proposed amendments to the *Examination & Training Regulation* were approved in principle by the membership at the 2014 AGM as Recommendation #5. The key changes approved by the membership were:

- The Registration Committee can receive documents in case the Registrar is not involved in the examination and training process
- Provision for parental leave was added
- An option to take the oath of office before the registrar or a Council member was added.
- Residency requirements were removed
- Articles are terminated if the pupil fails to pass any professional practice examination after three attempts.

The intent of the amendment is to update the regulation to, in part, streamline the process and eliminate those things which do not help the Registration Committee assess whether a pupil is ready to be an Alberta Land Surveyor.

The wording in the *Examination & Training Regulation* was already gender neutral.

Now that the government has finalized the proposed wording in consultation with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, in accordance with Section 16 of the *Land Surveyors Act*, the final wording must be approved the membership before it is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Any proposed amendments to the regulation would mean that the proposed amendments would go back to the legislative drafters for their review and another special general meeting would need to be called to approve the wording.
Professional Practice Regulation – Recommendation #4

Alberta Regulation 327/82
Land Surveyors Act
Professional Practice Regulation

1 In this regulation,
   (a) “Act” means the Land Surveyors Act;
   (b) “branch office” means a full time office, located at a different location than the primary office, established to provide surveying or land surveying services;
   (b.1) “Canadian land surveyor” means an individual who is licensed under the Canada Lands Surveyors Act (Canada) or is registered as a land surveyor in good standing with a professional regulatory organization governing land surveying in a province or territory of Canada that is signatory to a domestic trade agreement, as defined in section 2 of Schedule 6 of the Government Organization Act, in force in Alberta;
   (c) “designated resident Alberta land surveyor” means an Alberta land surveyor who is designated to the Council as maintaining a specific business office as the Alberta land surveyor’s normal day to day place of practice;
   (d) “primary office” means an office established by a practitioner to provide surveying or land surveying services;
   (e) “project office” means a temporary office established only to provide a convenient work environment for a specific project.

AR 327/82 s1,62/84,329/85

Part 1
Professional Practice

Reply to Communications

2 If the Registrar sends a communication requiring a reply to a practitioner by registered mail or certified mail the practitioner shall reply to the communication within 30 days of receiving it.

AR 327/82 s2

3 Every practitioner shall respond to correspondence requiring a reply within a reasonable time of receiving it.

AR 327/82 s3

Branch Offices

4(1) A practitioner may establish and maintain only 1 primary office for the practice of surveying or land surveying.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), if a practitioner wishes to establish any additional offices, the practitioner shall obtain the prior approval of the Council in accordance with subsection (3).
(3) A practitioner may establish and maintain a branch office if
   (a) the Council is satisfied that the office shall be under the direct personal supervision, direction and control of a designated resident Alberta land surveyor who
      (i) shall be present at the office at all material times, and
      (ii) shall ensure that all surveying or land surveying advice and all services shall be provided by or under the personal supervision, direction and control of the designated resident Alberta land surveyor, and
   (b) before opening the branch office the practitioner has received prior approval by the Council and, in the case of a corporation or a partnership, it has obtained a permit stamp and certificate for the branch office.

(4) No practitioner shall operate a branch office so that members of the public may consider that they are dealing with an Alberta land surveyor when that is not the case.

AR 327/82 s4; 329/85

4.1 (1) An Alberta land surveyor may act as a designated resident Alberta land surveyor for only 1 business office, whether a primary office or a branch office, at any given time.

(2) An Alberta land surveyor may act as the designated resident Alberta land surveyor for only one practitioner at any given time.

AR 329/85 s3

4.2 A surveyor’s corporation or partnership may receive only one permit stamp and certificate for each approved branch office.

AR 329/85 s3

4.3 Notwithstanding section 4, the prior approval of the Council is not required for the establishment of a project office.

AR 329/85 s3

Surveyor’s Corporations

5(1) A corporation that has, as its object or as one of its objects, the practice of surveying, is eligible to become registered as a surveyor’s corporation if it satisfies the Council that:
   (a) its corporate name or the name under which the corporation proposes to engage in the practice of surveying, or both, is appropriate,
   (b) the ownership of the majority of its voting shares is vested in one or more Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors, or in a corporation or corporations the majority of whose voting shares are vested in one or more Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors,
   (c) a majority of its directors are Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors, unless there are only 2 directors in which case one of them shall be an Alberta land surveyor Canadian land surveyor, and
   (d) it has one or more full time permanent employees who are Alberta land surveyors and who:
      (i) are qualified by training and experience in the fields of surveying in which the corporation intends to engage or offer to engage, and
      (ii) will assume personal supervision, direction and control of the practice of surveying in which the corporation engages.
(2) A corporation that has as its object or as one of its objects the practice of surveying, and the practice of engineering as defined in the *Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act*, is eligible to become registered as a surveyor’s corporation if it satisfies the Council that:

(a) its corporate name or the name under which the corporation proposes to engage in the practice of surveying and the practice of engineering is appropriate,

(b) the ownership of the majority of its voting shares is vested in one or more Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors and one or more professional engineers, or in a corporation or corporations the majority of whose voting shares are vested in one or more Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors and one or more professional engineers, and the voting shares are distributed to the Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors, or their corporations, and the professional engineers, or their corporations, on a basis which will bear a reasonable relationship to the distribution of the practice of the corporation as between the practice of engineering and any surveying that is under the control of a land surveyor, but

(i) Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors or their corporations shall hold at least 10% of the voting shares and professional engineers or their corporations shall hold at least a further 10% of the voting shares of the corporation, and

(ii) if the Council is not satisfied as to the distribution of the voting shares between the Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors or their corporations and the professional engineers or their corporations it shall refer the matter to a committee composed of Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors and professional engineers for a decision by that committee,

(c) a majority of the directors of the corporation are Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors and professional engineers,

(d) it holds a valid permit from the *Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta* to engage in the practice of engineering, and

(e) it has one or more full time permanent employees who are Alberta land surveyors and who:

(i) are qualified by training and experience in the fields of land surveying in which the corporation intends to engage or offer to engage, and

(ii) will assume personal supervision, direction and control of the practice of land surveying in which the corporation engages.

(3) Notwithstanding subsection (2), a corporation which was actually engaged in the practice of land surveying and the practice of engineering as of June 2, 1981 and which submits an application for registration as a surveyor’s corporation within one year of the date this regulation comes into force shall be registered as a surveyor’s corporation if it satisfies the Council that:

(a) a majority of its voting shares are vested in one or more Alberta land surveyors or in a corporation or corporations, the majority of whose voting shares are vested in one or more Alberta land surveyors, or in one or more professional engineers or a corporation or corporations, the majority of whose voting shares are vested in one or more professional engineers, or both,

(b) a majority of its voting shares will be continued to be owned and controlled by one or more Alberta land surveyors or by a corporation or corporations, the majority of whose voting shares are controlled by one or more Alberta land surveyors, or one or more professional engineers or by a corporation or corporations, the majority of whose voting shares are controlled by one or more professional engineers, or both,

(c) it will continue to have, as one of its objects the practice of land surveying.
(d) it has one or more full-time permanent employees who are Alberta land surveyors and who:
   (i) are qualified by training and experience in the fields of land surveying in which the corporation intends to engage or offer to engage, and
   (ii) will assume personal supervision, direction and control of the practice of land surveying in which the corporation engages.

AR 327/82 s5;62/84;170/2012

Surveyor’s Partnerships

6 If
   (a) an Alberta land surveyor a Canadian land surveyor or surveyor’s corporation or both, and
   (b) one or more persons who are not Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors or surveyor’s corporations

wish to enter into partnership as a surveyor’s partnership for the purpose of engaging in the practice of surveying, the Alberta land surveyor the Canadian land surveyor or surveyor’s corporation shall apply to the Council for registration of the partnership as a surveyor’s partnership.

AR 327/82 s6

7 An application for registration as a surveyor’s partnership may be granted by Council if it is satisfied that:
   (a) the partnership name or the name under which the partnership proposes to engage in the practice of surveying, or both is appropriate,
   (b) the partnership has at least one full-time partner who is an Alberta land surveyor a Canadian land surveyor or surveyor’s corporation or a corporation or corporations the majority of whose voting shares are vested in one or more Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors,
   (c) the partnership has an individual who is an Alberta land surveyor and is a partner or full-time employee who
      (i) is qualified by training and experience in the fields of surveying in which the partnership intends to engage or offer to engage, and
      (ii) will assume personal supervision, direction and control of the practice of surveying in which the partnership engages,
   and
   (d) a controlling interest of the partnership is vested in one or more Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors or surveyor’s corporations or in a corporation or corporations, the majority of whose voting shares are owned by one or more Alberta land surveyors Canadian land surveyors.

AR 327/82 s7;62/84

Names Under Which a Practitioner May Engage in the Practice of Surveying

8 A practitioner may only engage in the practice of surveying
   (a) in the case of an individual, in his the practitioner’s own name,
   (b) in the case of a surveyor’s corporation, in its corporate name or in a name approved by the Council,
(c) in the case of a surveyor’s partnership, in its partnership name or in a name approved by the Council, or

(d) where the permit is issued in the name of a corporation that is itself a subsidiary of one or more parent corporations, in its corporate name if the words “subsidiary of (the name of the parent)” are included in any reference to its corporate name.

AR 327/82 s8;87/94

9(1) The Council shall not approve

(a) the name of a corporation or partnership that is applying for a permit to practice as a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership under section 5 or 7, or

(b) a name other than a corporate or a partnership name in which the corporation or partnership wishes to practice,

if the Council considers the name self laudatory or misleading to the public.

(2) The Council may only approve a name that it considers to be appropriate and that maintains the dignity of the profession.

AR 327/82 s9

10(1) If the Council determines that the name of an applicant for a permit or other approval of a name is not or may not be appropriate under which to conduct the practice of surveying the Council shall give the applicant an opportunity to be heard before Council.

(2) After hearing the applicant, the Council shall approve or refuse to approve the name.

AR 327/82 s10

Responsibility

11(1) A surveyor’s corporation and surveyor’s partnership shall keep the Registrar advised of the names of the one or more Alberta land surveyors who are full time permanent employees of the corporation or a partner in the partnership, who are supervising the practice of the corporation or partnership and who are assuming professional responsibility for it.

(2) The Alberta land surveyor taking professional responsibility for the practice of a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership shall, on relinquishing that responsibility, forthwith notify the Registrar in writing.

AR 327/82 s11

Part 2

General

Quorums

12 The quorum for a meeting of the Council is 6 members of Council.

AR 327/82 s12

13 The quorum for a meeting of the Practice Review Board is 3 members of the Board.

AR 327/82 s13

Registration Committee

14(1) The Registration Committee shall be composed of at least 4 persons appointed by the Council.

(2) The quorum for a meeting of the Registration Committee is 3 members of the Committee.

AR 327/82 s14

Amendments

15 This regulation may be re-enacted, amended or repealed in the same way that the General By-laws of the Association may be enacted, amended or repealed but, in accordance with the Act, an enactment, amendment or repeal does not come into force unless it is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

AR 327/82 s15

Repeal

16 The By-laws of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association (Alta. Reg. 91/66) under the Land Surveyors Act being chapter L-4 of the Revised Statutes of Alberta 1980 are repealed.

AR 327/82 s16
Rationale Document
Professional Practice Regulation

The proposed amendments to the Professional Practice Regulation will make the wording in the regulation gender neutral. The membership approved making the wording in all of the regulations gender neutral at the 2017 AGM.

The other proposed amendments to the Professional Practice Regulation were approved in principle by the membership at the 2013 AGM as Recommendation #7. The intent of the recommendation is to broaden the ownership requirements to include land surveyors from other Canadian jurisdictions. An Alberta Land Surveyor must still take responsibility for the supervision, direction and control of a practice.

The recommendation arose from a new business motion at the 2010 AGM.

Now that the government has finalized the proposed wording in consultation with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, in accordance with Section 16 of the Land Surveyors Act, the final wording must be approved by the membership before it is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Any proposed amendments to the regulation would mean that the proposed amendments would go back to the legislative drafters for their review and another special general meeting would need to be called to approve the wording.