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Past Presidents at the Past Presidents’ Breakfast:
Back row from left to right—L.M. Pals, D.R. McWilliam, J.H. Holmlund, L.H. Pratt, R.A. Bassil
Past Presidents of the Association

1911 - W. Pearce
1912 - L.C. Charlesworth
1913 - L.C. Charlesworth
1914 - R.W. Cautley
1915 - A.C. Talbot
1916 - J.L. Cote
1917 - H.H. Moore
1918 - A.S. Weekes
1919 - P.N. Johnson
1920 - G.W. McLeod
1921 - R.H. Knight
1922 - A.P.C. Belyea
1923 - C.M. Hoar
1924 - J.L. Doupe
1925 - P.N. Johnson
1926 - B.J. Saunders
1927 - O. Inkster
1928 - D.T. Townsend
1929 - C.H. Snell
1930 - C.M. Hoar
1931 - R.H. Cautley
1932 - E.D. Robertson
1933 - D.T. Townsend
1934 - C.H. Snell
1935 - P.N. Johnson
1936 - T.W. Brown
1937 - D.T. Townsend
1938 - N.H. Bradley
1939 - C.B. Atkins
1940 - H.S. Day
1941 - A. Cormack
1942 - W.E. Zinkan
1943 - C.H. Snell
1944 - W. Humphreys
1945 - J.W. Doze
1946 - R.M. Hardy
1947 - G.Z. Pinder
1948 - C.H. Snell
1949 - J.H. Holloway
1950 - R. McCutcheon
1951 - G.C. Hamilton
1952 - G.C. Hamilton
1953 - R. McCutcheon
1954 - C.W. Lester
1955 - W.D. Usher
1956 - D.K.F. Dawson
1957 - C.H. Weir
1958 - W.A. Wolley-Dod
1959 - L.O. Olsen
1960 - C.W. Youngs
1961 - E.J. Clark
1962 - G.C. Walker
1963 - A.J. Edwards
1964 - G. Oslund
1965 - W.E. Bright
1966 - T.E. Rippon
1967 - T.C. Swanby
1968 - D.C. Holmberg
1969 - D.B. Gillmore
1970 - M.A. MacCrimmon
1971 - R.A.F. Tate
1972 - T. Okamura
1973 - M.L. Sexauer
1974 - R.J. Watson
1975 - J.W. Hill
1976 - J. Deyholos
1977 - A. Hittel
1978 - E.J. Tessari
1979 - N.R. Mattson
1980 - J.E. Rasmuson
1981 - B.R. Bishop
1982 - W.R. Hunter
1983 - R.A. Bassil
1984 - R.J. Fulton
1985 - A.D. Hosford
1986 - R.E.D. McCuaig
1987 - L.W. Breton
1988 - G.E. Olsson
1989 - I.C. Maltais
1990 - S.M. Loeppky
1991 - G.L. Haggerty
1993 - H.E. Impey
1994 - L.H. Pratt
1995 - J.H. Holmlund
1996 - W.R. Dabbs
1997 - S.J. Longson
1998 - A. Hittel
1999 - D.R. Jaques
2000 - L.M. Pals
2001 - G.K. Allred
2002 - D.R. McWilliam
2003 - J.G. Halliday
2004 - J.G. Halliday, ALS
President 2003-2004
## Attendance at the 95th Annual Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorary Life Members</th>
<th>Retired Members</th>
<th>Articled Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker, R.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassil, R.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsen, L.O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, J.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton, W.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersen, C.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pham, A.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porylo, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt, L.H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefontaine, F.H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinlan, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachynski, A.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radovanovic, R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, A.L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney, L.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, R.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford, D.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, R.W.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selander, M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp, D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe, J.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, D.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skinner, I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan, J.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, G.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs, H.L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, R.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tate, R.A.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassil, R.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Webb, J.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsen, L.O.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weir, C.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, J.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson, M.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor, C.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson, A.J.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tripp, C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Van Berkel, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woychuk, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barich, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiddy, T.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeau, R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egger, R.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewoniak, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosling, D.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover, K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knott, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koncan, M.J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohnes, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacLeod, K.N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon, R.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, A.</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>AFFILIATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MEMBERS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufour, S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pominville, R.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, D.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standing, P.G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSOCIATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MEMBERS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choy, A.K.Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heck, W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grusie, T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MacPhee, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebb, G.B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parrish, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Members</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Honorary Life Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Articled Pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate Members</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Associate Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officers and Staff of the Association 2004-2005

PRESIDENT
A.W. Nelson, St. Albert

VICE PRESIDENT
S.C. Green, Calgary

PAST PRESIDENT
J.G. Halliday, Calgary

SECRETARY TREASURER
L.M. Pals, Edmonton

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL
D.C.J. Bruce (2004-2006)
L.J. Frederick, Edmonton (2003-2005)
D.N. Marquardt (2004-2006)
V.A. Ziegler, Drayton Valley (2003-2005)

PUBLIC MEMBER
L. Kluthe (Council)
R. Barnes (Practice Review Board)

REGISTRAR
R.A. Bassil, ALS (Honorary Life)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
B.E. Munday

OFFICE STAFF
C. Chomlak, Administrative Assistant
D.R. George, Assistant to the Director of Practice Review
M. Parrish, Technologist
D.A. Phelan, Information Services Administrator
L.H. Pratt, Director of Practice Review
S.D. Stecyk, Executive Assistant
M. Woywitka, Administrative Assistant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2004-2005 Committees</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chairman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice Review Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registration Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convention &amp; Social Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editorial Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical &amp; Biographical Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominating Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Relations Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards - Public Land Dispositions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future of the Association</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislation Ad Hoc Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oil and Gas Ad Hoc Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RPR Ad Hoc Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 9 of the Surveys Act Ad Hoc Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OTHERS

ALSA/DOS/LTO/Metis Settlements Liaison
  Members: T.G. Grusie, S.C. Green, P.M. Michaud,
  A.W. Nelson, L.H. Pratt, F.H. Prefontaine

ASSMT
  D.N. Marquardt, J.B. Lamarche

Canadian Council of Land Surveyors (CCLS)
  Director: M.E. Kinloch

Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee (GELC)
  Members: V.A. Ziegler, R.King

Joint Task Force On Buried Infrastructure in Alberta
  K. Allred

Real Estate Transaction Committee
  Members: R.L. Haagsma, S.M. Loeppky

Western Canadian Board of Examiners (WCBE)
  Members: G.D. Gross, V.G. Hut

2003-2004 Council from left to right— L.J. Frederick, R.O. Hall, J.B. Lamarche,
  D.H. VandenBrink, V.A. Ziegler, J.W. Lovse
Proceedings of the 95th Annual General Meeting
of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association held at the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge in Jasper, Alberta
April 22 to 24, 2004

Call to Order

President J.G. Halliday officially called the 95th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association open at 9:03 a.m.

The assembly rose for the Canadian national anthem.

Greetings from the Jasper Park Lodge

President Halliday announced that originally from the Netherlands, Mr. Schoningh began his career in the hospitality industry in 1988. Canada beckoned him in 1994 and he moved to Quebec City, being appointed Director of Operations at Fairmont Le Chateau Frontenac, holding this position until he was promoted to Manager in 1997. He speaks fluent English, French and German, in addition to his native Dutch. Mr. Schoningh officially joined The Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge team in August 2003.

Jan Schoningh, addressed the membership as follows:

Thank you very much, for us it is a great, great privilege to have you all here. We have few groups of this size. This makes you one of our most important guests. Welcome to the Lodge and have a great meeting.

President Halliday presented Mr. Schoningh with a mini surveyor’s chain.

President Halliday introduced the 2003-2004 ALSA Council and public members.

The assembly welcomed the following guests:

Max Batten, Vice President: Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors;
Jeff Fee, President: Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors;
Gerald Roberts, President: Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors;
Tom Bunker, President: Association of Ontario Land Surveyors;
Wayne Leeman, President: Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors;
Barry Clark, President: Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association;
David Bazett, President: Corporation of Land Surveyors of the Province of British Columbia;
Hal Janes, Vice President: Association of Canada Lands Surveyors;
Brent Johnston, President Elect: Land Surveyors Association of Washington;
Larry Glahe, President: Idaho Society of Professional Land Surveyors;
Jim Dobbin, President: Canadian Council of Land Surveyors;
John Holmlund, Past President: Canadian Institute of Geomatics;
David Allen, President: ASSMT;
Johann Martin Lun, Past President: Topographers of the Autonomous Region, Italy;
Tom Erdman: SAIT;
Terry Ingraham: NAIT;
Drs. Mike Barry and Mele Rakai University of Calgary, Department of Geomatics Engineering.

Mr. Adrian Pritchard, Manager of Professions and Occupations, Alberta Human Resources and Employment, responsible for the Land Surveyors Act was introduced.

Mr. Pritchard addressed the assembly as follows:
It is always a great pleasure to come to Jasper and represent the Alberta Government. I would like to bring greetings from Clint Dunford. I am always astonished by the turnout of members every year. It obviously shows a great commitment on the part of your membership to your activities. It certainly is a great help to us in Professions and Occupations in developing legislation. All the best for this year’s AGM.

President Halliday introduced Mr. Michaud, Director of Surveys.

Mr. Michaud addressed the assembly as follows:
We recently have been working on a number of initiatives in the geodetic area. Geoff Banham has been working very busily with other provincial associations and the federal government. We recently launched the CDGPS service. This is where you can get a $1,500 radio receiver and attach it to your GPS and get real-time positions between one and ten metres. More information can be found on the cdgps.com website.

Geoff has been looking at re-observing and re-publishing values on our basenets - our EDM calibration baselines in the province. In 2003, we re-measured Lethbridge and Grande Prairie and in 2002 we re-measured the Edmonton baseline. We consider the Edmonton baseline to be the official baseline for the province. During our recent re-measurement of the Calgary baseline we found considerable problems with stability and with the last set of measurements,
which we called “provincials values.” Our recommendation is to consider replacing the Calgary baseline. In Jeff’s group, across Canada they are looking at height modernization as there is a need to review the vertical datum.

Geoff has also completed a re-adjustment of our entire network on NAD 83 (CSRS) and we expect to publish new values for that sub-set of one thousand markers in June.

In the land surveys area, Ron Cote has been busy dealing with day-to-day concerns and complex survey issues such as re-establishments and boundary problems.

Another initiative Ron has been working on is getting field notes on SPIN and we hope to have them on there in June. We have had them scanned for a year or two and are finally in the position of building the interface and you will be able to access all field notes on SPIN. Another benefit is that we anticipate there to be no charge for the access to that datum.

Ron continues to be busy with official plans and the areas that a lot of time is spent on are land claims and the Metis areas.

Section 47 monitoring - Ron is playing an active role. We have had recent discussions with the Association. Our last review was of information on compliance with Section 47, ensuring you get an extension under the requirements of the Surveys Act. We have seen some poor results within the last year; we have seen the number of compliance activities under section 47 go down. I know that the Association reminds members whenever you are using delayed posting (to get an extension). That program has been fairly successful and a lot of old survey plans where the monuments were not installed or at least form 11.1 was not filed at the Land Titles Office. If I remember correctly, there is one survey that is six years old. We are still working with that particular land surveyor to get his monuments in the ground.

One of the key things that has been done the last year is getting the indexes that we heard about yesterday in colour so you can at least read them. Digital mapping and looking at accepting activities in a digital format are on hold but one area that we will pursue this year is working with surveyors on standards for digital submissions and we hope to make some progress there.

Lastly, a few comments on the Canadian Council of Geomatics. This is a Council that has provincial representatives across Canada and I sit as Alberta’s member. A few initiatives that we are busy on are new integration standards and national standards for integrating your surveys to survey control. We have tabled the report with the Association and it will probably go to the Standards Committee for review. The intent is to see, at a national level, what other provinces and the federal government are suggesting for a common standard.

Another area CCOG has been working on is data licensing policies and issues. Also, it appears that another cross Canada workshop which will be sponsored by GIAC and GeoConnections on June 1 in Edmonton will look at the policy around geomatics and infrastructure and maintenance issues. Thank you.
President Halliday introduced Mr. Grusie.

Mr. Grusie addressed the assembly as follows:

Thanks President Jim for inviting me to attend this year’s AGM. I look forward to participating in the business meeting. I enjoy attending this function for the information gathering and networking opportunities and it is especially special to do it in Jasper. Not that I am influenced by this, but of all of our stakeholders I have the best most workable relationship with the Association and its members.

Alberta Land Surveyors were very busy again last year. To put some context around this, in 2000 there were 8,351 plans registered resulting in the creation of about 32,600 titles. In 2002, 12,327 plans were registered, resulting is 43,814 titles. In 2003 9,874 plans were registered, resulting in the creation of 43,202 titles. While the total number of plans fell slightly, the number of titles remained the same. What this seems to indicate is that land development is now demanding larger numbers of parcels to be created in each one of the phases. I think this is a sign of an aggressive optimistic economy.

One thing that has been very noticeable over the past year is the increase in the number of documents submitted with your plan packages. I know that this has added to the complexity and time that it takes for you to put these packages together but it has also increased the examination time required by the survey section at Land Titles.

With that being said, the survey sections in both Edmonton and Calgary were both fairly successful in keeping turn around times to two or three days for the majority of the year.

Overall, the Land Titles Office in Alberta registered just over one million documents in 2003. This is a record number and surveyors definitely played a fundamental role in this achievement. Each new parcel that you create eventually results in the registration of three or four documents. The resale of existing homes and the documentation associated with that has also added to the overall transaction.

As a result of the huge volumes of transactions, document registration times did suffer last year despite massive amounts of overtime-working three nights a week and most Saturdays throughout the year. To address this, Treasury has approved an increase in the Land Titles budget to hire 16 permanent new staff—eight for Calgary and eight for Edmonton. The six-month training period for these staff is underway but we are likely to see increased turnaround times again this summer, since the summer volumes will arrive before we can get these staff fully trained, up to speed and fully productive. Surveys is also currently training three new planning examination technologist interns—one in Edmonton and two in Calgary.

As it is with your Association, succession planning is a big concern for the Land Titles Office. I guess, on some level we are both looking for the same people with similar qualifications, skills and attitudes. We invest significant time and resources in training some of these interns over their one-year internship period. I would really appreciate it if some of you folks would quit luring them away once we get them trained.

Mr. T. (Tim) Grusie
Land Titles Office
The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and its members have continued to be big time ambassadors of the SPIN system. You should know that your support plays a major role in obtaining funding for enhancements to this system. Thanks for that support. You are an influential stakeholder group to our Government.

Last year, you used SPIN to search and download over 220,000 registered plans. I think it is safe to say that SPIN now forms a very important and integral tool in your profession. In addition to providing access to plan and ASCM data, SPIN was enhanced last year to deliver title searches as well. Later this year, SPIN will also provide online access to registered documents. We have been busy imaging hard copy documents in anticipation of this new feature, which should be implemented later this year. To date, we have captured 65 million images and still have 30 more million to capture before the archive is even complete enough to handle the majority of the current searches. At some point during the year, we will be switching from the back-end microfilming processes we currently use to back-end imaging. It will certainly speed up access to registered documents following registration.

As Mike Michaud has indicted, we are working in partnership with SRD and are very close to adding access to the field notes through SPIN.

The Calgary Land Titles Office moved to a new location at the end of January earlier this year. The office is located in the old 400 Club on the northwest corner of 4th Avenue and 7th Street Southwest and surveys is located on the third floor.

Again, I would like to thank the Association for inviting me to attend this meeting. I would also like to thank the Alberta Land Surveyors for accepting me into the Association as an Associate Member. I consider it a personal privilege to belong to such a professional organization. Thank you again.

President Halliday introduced the solicitor David Jardine.

Mr. Halliday recognized Brian Stecyk from Rose Country Communications the public relations consultant and, Judy Larmour, the historical consultant.

President Halliday introduced Mr. Bob Baker, Chairman of the Historical and Biographical Committee.

He addressed the assembly as follows:

Mr. President, members of Council, honoured guests and colleagues:

It gives me great pleasure to stand here this morning – it is actually a great pleasure to stand anywhere in the morning.

The Historical and Biographical Committee has been working diligently over the past several years researching, gathering, cataloguing, and interviewing senior members in preparation of a book: a coffee table version on the history of surveying in Alberta.

Results of these labours have been arranged in such a manner as to capture the interest and imagination of the profession and members of the public. This includes humorous bits of information
and tales of tragedy, maps and diagrams complete with pictures so everyone can understand it.

The opening chapters will provide the reader with a sense of where it all began – the roots so to speak. The first few pages will look at David Thompson and his work in Western Canada, the surveys for the transcontinental railway and the international boundary.

Many readers will relate to the stories told of horse stealing and tales of crew members perishing in prairie blizzards. One will get a feel for the conditions the surveyors of the day faced when they came across insects - most formidable being the mosquito.

In addition to the comments on insects and hardship, there is also information taken from the reports of the early surveyors on weather conditions, scenery descriptions, streams and various parts of the province and other items.

The professional reader’s interest will be captured when they learn the secrets of how certain key survey lines were surveyed and the types of monuments that were erected on the boundaries.

As you read along, you will find that the earlier surveyor’s stamina and practical sense was tested when having to deal with the disappearance of livestock, alcohol problems, crossing raging rivers, and enduring prairie fires and blizzards.

On a lighter point, there was some research I did some years ago on the files of a surveyor who was doing the 4th meridian north of Cold Lake in the early part of the 1900s. These are some parts of the stories that will be in the book. The way the surveyor described the following incident in his report to Ottawa was that on a Sunday, which the crew had off being the Sabbath, it explained that one crew member was cutting wood, another washing his clothes, one crew member was laying on his bunk reading a novel with the other sitting on a log in the middle of the camp cleaning his pistol. According to the surveyor’s report, the pistol went off accidentally and struck the crew member reading a novel in the leg. The report went on to explain to Ottawa that he had no alternative other than to lay off the person that got shot because he was unable to carry out his duties. To top it all off, the injured man had to make his way back to Lac La Biche because, as it was explained, he was no longer of any use to the crew. He had to make his own way out of there as they could not spare another member to take him out since they had to ensure that the work continued on schedule.

The reader’s interest will also be captured by the innovation of the early surveyors and the development and use of collapsible canvas boats for crossing streams. The individuals surveying in the southern portions of the province exercised their initiative and measured the circumference of the wheel of their Red River carts, to expedite laying out portions of the township subdivision in the prairie lands.

This information has been condensed into a book of approximately 350 pages in 13 chapters. These chapters cover a wide spectrum of surveys with personalities that were instrumental in the formation of the province. The chapters cover subjects such as the Dominion Land Survey System and the surveyors who were involved Aboriginal lands, river lots, surveyors involved in irriga-
tion, along with surveys of trails that happened after the township surveys and before the township system, surveying in Alberta’s north, natural resources, veterans returning from World War One and Two and how they were brought into the Association, depression years and information up until the 80s and 90s.

I think that you have to remember that before you know where you are going you have to know where you have been. I think this book captures where we have been and maybe this will provide a lot of knowledge.

There are many stories mentioned in the book that would be of interest to the professional and the ordinary person.

The Committee will be going to press shortly and would like to have an indication from those present on the number of books they will be purchasing. The Committee would appreciate that consideration be given to purchasing this book. We have put in a budget figure of 1,500 books but we would like to know if purchases will go beyond that. I would appreciate your assistance. Thank you Mr. President.

The assembly was requested to rise and observe a moment of silence in memory of deceased members:

Honorary Life Members were introduced as follows:

Retired Member J.W. (John) Christenson was introduced.

Honorary Life Members were introduced as follows:


Introductions of articled students and affiliate members took place as follows:
- John Ironstone, ALS introduced Reid Egger
- John Stephens, ALS introduced Art Miller
- Jay Abbey, ALS introduced Mark Knott
• Dennis Clayton, ALS introduced John Lohnes
• Grant Cross, ALS introduced Steven Van Berkel
• Kevin Swabey, ALS introduced Real Comeau
• Doug Lunty, ALS introduced Adam Thompson
• Stan Longson, ALS introduced Kevin MacLeod and Kevin Grover
• Jim Sweeney, ALS introduced Robert King and Don Hanson
• Scott Westlund, ALS introduced Jessica Barich and Mark Woychuk
• Ron Hall, ALS introduced Roy Pominville, Affiliate Member.
• Leanne James, articled to Ian Emmerson, ALS.
• Ryan McMahon, articled to Purdy Smith, ALS
• Don Lantz, ALS introduced Scott Dufour
• Steve Yanish, ALS introduced Lesley Ewoniak

  President Halliday introduced Association staff of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association as follows:
  Brian Munday, Executive Director;
  Dick Bassil, Registrar;
  Lyall Pratt, Director of Practice Review;
  Don George, Assistant to the Director of Practice Review;
  Sharon Stecyk, Executive Assistant;
  Dawn Phelan, Information Services Administrator;
  Michelle Woywitka, Administrative Assistant;
  Matt Parrish, Geomatics Technologist;
  Cindy Chomlak, Administrative Assistant (will be commencing employment with the Association on May 1, 2004).

  Members of the Convention & Social Committee were introduced and recognized as follows:
  Mark Kocher, Chairman;
  Wade Heck, Vice Chairman;
  Grant Beach, Exhibitor Liaison;
  Scott Brooks;
  Joanne Halliday;
  Nancy Nelson;
  Ashley Robertson;
  Des Shaw;
  George Smith;
  Mark Sutter.
Minutes of the 94th Annual General Meeting

It was MOVED by Mr. Kocher, seconded by Mr. Pals, that the Report of Proceedings of the 94th Annual General Meeting be adopted.

Motion Carried

President's Address

President Halliday addressed the membership as follows:

It has been my privilege to serve as President of the Association for the past year.
A year that has passed quickly.
As quickly as the blink of an eye.
It has been stated many times before that the issues affecting surveyors are similar not only across Canada but beyond our borders as well.

I can re-iterate, from my experience this past year, that this still holds true and I can state that through ongoing communication and the sharing of some resources, we can all be stronger associations. It can at times be tempting, when moving into a new association year, to think that a lot of the important business has already been taken care
If Honorary Life Member Jack Webb’s letter in the most recent edition of ALS News is any indication, it seems we are destined to keep taking care of the same business forever.
It makes one think that there is not much new in the world; only that which has been forgotten.

However, with that said, in this past year Council has been kept busy dealing with a number of relevant issues.
Forefront in the minds of the members of this association, along with our sister associations, is the future of our profession.
In discussing this topic at a Council strategy session in October, the message came out loud and clear that the protection of the public interest must be paramount in all that we do.

With that thought in mind, Council re-iterated the importance of their work to the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee and the Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee and encouraged them to move forward as quickly as possible.

You will be hearing from both these groups later in the meeting.
They, in turn, need to hear your thoughts on their work to date.

In considering the future of the profession, Council has provided for the creation of a new committee and has allocated a budget in order to carry the issue forward quickly as possible. Terms of reference have yet to be finalized, however you can expect a number of items to be up for discussion, including association demographics, how we attract and register new members, and the whole question of the expanded or integrated profession. The committee remains to be populated with volunteers so I would encourage you to consider allotting some of your time to it. This is an important one and one you’d definitely get as much out of as you put in.
The Association continues to benefit from excellent volunteer support. Fully 25% of our members volunteer in one capacity or another on our various committees.

Expressions of appreciation for the donation of those countless hours cannot be stated often enough.

The Executive Committee, with Brian’s assistance, has committed to reviewing all committees’ terms of reference and action items with a view to determining whether the Association’s resources, and the time of the members, are being put to efficient/effective use, especially given the thoughts around the future of the profession.

So Even though we seem destined to consider business that has passed through the Association in years gone by, I believe there is good reason for it.

That is, the topics are still relevant today or are once again relevant to the well-being of the Association and the Public we serve.

It is our ability to recognize this as fact and deal with the issues in an efficient and ethical manner that will carry us forward into our own future.

I would be remiss if I did not, once again, offer my heartfelt thanks to all of the staff in the Association office. It is not all that difficult to be successful when you have great people working for you. Your Council and the Association members certainly do have great people working for us.

In conclusion, I thank you for the privilege of serving as president this past year. I selfishly thank you for the experience that can only make me a better surveyor. I thank you for the memories that will last a lifetime.

Secretary Treasurer’s Report and Financial Statement

It was MOVED by Mr. Kinloch, seconded by Mr. Fleece that the 2002-2003 financial statements be adopted. (Appendix A)

Motion Carried

Mr. Hagen questioned why there was a difference between the budget and actual amounts for the fees and levies.

Mr. Kinloch replied that this variation is due to lack of registrations.

Mr. Hagen referred to pages 15 and 4 and stated that there is a discrepancy between the numbers.

Mr. Munday replied that a few years ago the numbers had been quite conservative in terms of how the Association budgets the number of actual members it will have. A few years ago, a system was developed to create a budgeted revenue that will reflect what we think will happen. These figures reflect what we realistically thought we would get for fees and levies. He went on to say that the difference in numbers is also due to adjustments provided by the accountant when the yearly review was done.
Mr. Hagen questioned the 72,000 variance in interest payments, which was almost the whole budget shortfall.

Mr. Kinloch replied that this is due to last year’s stock market and that the advisor does not drop their fees even when the performance is not there.

Mr. Munday added that Council and the Executive Committee did put out to tender the investment manager contract and requested ten proposals for a new investments advisor. From the four proposals received, Council decided to stay with the current investment advisor.

Mr. Hagen referred to page 15 and questioned why, in the 2002-2003 budget, there is a $22,000 deficit in the convention levy.

Mr. Munday replied that in that year, there was a deficit of that amount due to an overall increase in rates for the facilities.

Mr. Hagen questioned why publications and manuals lost $8,000.

Mr. Munday stated that this is due to the printing costs of the manuals and that this money will be recovered once these manuals are sold.

Committee Reports

It was MOVED by Mr. Haggerty, seconded by Mr. Pals, that the Committee Reports, Executive Director’s Report, Registrar’s Report, Advisory Committee Reports and Report from the Practice Review Board be received as circulated.

Motion Carried

Mr. Halliday informed the assembly that Mr. Rachynski was the early bird prize winner of one night’s accommodation for two at the Jasper Park Lodge.

Mr. Halliday introduced students Justin Plante and Ryan McKeller from the University of Calgary.

RECOMMENDATION #1
Manual of Standard Practice
(Note: The rationale document is contained in Appendix E)

President Halliday called upon Mr. Jamieson, chair of the Standards Committee, and Mr. Green, chair of the Public Lands Dispositions Subcommittee to present the first recommendation.

President Halliday noted that, as the recommendation deals with standards of practice, only active, honorary life and retired members may vote.
It was MOVED by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Jamieson, that
Part E, Section 8 and Part E, Section 9 of the Manual of Standard
Practice be deleted entirely and that Part C, Section 3.9; Part D,
Section 5 Preamble; Part D, Section 5.8; Part D, Section 5.9; be
amended as follows:

Bolded text, excluding Part/Section headings and reference
to housekeeping changes approved by Council, indicates
new text and/or changes. Italicized text, preceding the number, is
the rationale/explanation.

Part C, Section 3.9
Wellsites and Public Lands Dispositions Related Facilities
The type of monumentation found or placed for wellsites
and related facilities, and Public Land Dispositions shall be shown
on the plan. It is recommended that 30 centimetre iron spikes or
30 centimetre iron bars be placed.

Part D, Section 5 Preamble
Wellsite Surveys
This section deals with the survey of petroleum related facilities
including the licensing of wells under the “Oil and Gas Conservation
Regulations.” Surface tenure on patented lands is normally pro-
tected by caveats registered at Land Titles by the applicant,
whereas interests in Crown lands public lands are dealt with by
the Land Administration Division of Alberta Sustainable Resource
Development (SRD) Minister responsible under the Public
Lands Act.

New Heading
Environmental Conditions Affecting Well Licensing
For specifications and guidelines to enable the oil and gas
industry to identify wellsites that are considered environ-
mentally sensitive, consult Alberta Environment Fact
Sheet “Siting an Upstream Oil and Gas Site in an Envi-
ronmentally Sensitive Area on Private Land.” Alberta
Environment Fact Sheet can be found on the internet at
http://www3.gov.ab.ca/env/protenf/landrec/factsheets/
DevelopmentOnSensitiveSites-v7.pdf.

A description of the common SRD dispositions is included in Part
E, Section 8.
Guidelines outlined by SRD identifying environmentally sensitive
wellsite locations are listed in Part E, Section 7. A surveyor is
expected to be familiar with these guidelines.
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Part D, Section 5.8
Public Land Dispositions

New Heading
Public Land Dispositions Except License of Occupation (LOC) and Linear Public Lands Dispositions

This section refers to the requirements for surveys of public land dispositions, where the plans will not be registered at Land Titles. However, if the plans are to be registered, a surveyor should refer to the appropriate section of this Manual. A summary of various dispositions is given in Part E, Section 8. However, if the plans are to be registered at Land Titles, a surveyor should refer to the appropriate section of this Manual. A list of various disposition types is provided at www3.gov.ab.ca/srd/land/lad/pr.html. A surveyor should be familiar with these disposition types prior to carrying out surveys involving crown public lands.

To ensure the approving authority does not grant conflicting authorizations on the same land, it is necessary that the location of activities and dispositions on public land be accurately defined. This is accomplished by requiring applicants to provide a detailed plan with their applications showing the location of the land applied for in relation to known survey evidence.

Surveyors should be aware of the approving authority’s plan requirements, which are outlined at the following link, www3.gov.ab.ca/srd/land/lad/pr.html:

• The ‘Disposition Plan Requirements’ indicates when a survey is required and when a sketch, without a survey, is required.
• The ‘Content Requirements for Disposition Application Plans (sketch)’ indicates the content requirements for sketch plans at the application stage.
• The ‘Content Requirements for Disposition Final Plans (monumented survey)’ indicates the content requirements for survey plans at the final stage after construction.

When dealing with public land dispositions, surveyors should be guided by the following criteria when determining the boundaries of these activities:

• Where the disposition boundaries are surveyed and monumented, the boundaries shall be defined by the monuments placed for that purpose.
• Where the disposition boundaries are surveyed and not monumented, the boundaries shall be defined by the best evidence governing those boundaries.
• Where the disposition boundaries are not surveyed, the boundaries shall be defined by the best physical evidence governing those boundaries.
When conducting a survey and preparing a plan for a public land disposition, an Alberta Land Surveyor shall:

.1 Mark the positions of the boundary lines to be established by placing monuments at every change in direction and at the beginning and end of every curve. The type of monument to be placed is stipulated in the document ‘Disposition Plan Requirements,’ found on the approving authority’s website at http://www3.gov.ab.ca/srd/land/lad/pr.html.

NOTE: This is the same as the current 5.8.5 except township was changed to section.

.2 Intersect and monument all surveyed section boundaries crossed.

.3 In surveyed territory, locate and confirm sufficient monuments within, on or defining the section in which the disposition is located to allow the determination of the disposition in relation to the section boundaries. Monuments in this section refer to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act.

.4 In unsurveyed territory, locate and confirm sufficient monuments to define the theoretic section in which the disposition is located to allow the determination of the disposition in relation to the theoretic section boundaries. Monuments in this section refer to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act, or shown on a wellsight control traverse plan on file with the Director of Surveys office or Alberta Survey Control Markers integrated with the Alberta Survey Control System.

.5 Derive and reference the bearings of all surveyed lines in accordance with Part D, Section 1.2.

.6 Verify all bearings and distances to the accuracy specified in Part C, Section 1.5, with the exception of ties made under Section 5.8.10.

.7 Make sufficient field measurements to ensure there are no errors of layout or measurement.

NOTE: This is the same as the current 5.8.3.

.8 Certify the plan in accordance with Part E, Section 4, Schedule “B.”

.9 Prepare the plan following the General Requirements for Plans, Part D, Section 1 and the approving authority’s plan requirements.

.10 Tie in and show on the plan all visible public land dispositions crossed or adjacent to the survey.
Notwithstanding Section 5.8, a surveyor performing a public land disposition survey for an as-built LOC access road shall:

9.3 Derive and reference the bearings of all surveyed lines in accordance with Part D, Section 1.2.

9.4 Verify all bearings and distances to the accuracy specified in Part C, Section 1.5, with the exception of ties made under Part 5 Section 5.9.5.

9.6 Prepare the plan following the General Requirements for Plans, Part D, Section 1 and the applicable Plan Requirements for Activities on Public Lands, Part E, Section 9 approving authority’s plan requirements.

Mr. Green reviewed the motion and rationale document. He made note that the intent of the recommendation is to improve plan standards and remove duplication. He indicated that the addition of iron spikes to Part C, Section 3.9 was made to reflect the standard practice. He advised that the reference to Guide 56 has been removed from the preamble in Part D, Section 5 and that the link points to the document that should be referenced. He made note of the list of various disposition types referred to in the rewritten Part D, Section 5.8 and questioned if this list is being kept current.

Mr. Michaud, Director of Surveys, replied that he brought 200 copies of the updated chart and 30 copies of the Dispositions & Fees Regulation for the members to review. He indicated that a paragraph has been added to the dispositions chart to explain the dispositions and how they are created. He noted that the legislation is referred to for details of each disposition as the regulation provides all the necessary information.

Mr. Green reviewed the proposed text for Part D, Section 5.8 and pointed out that it deals with conflicting authorizations and reflects those items that Public Lands would like to see on sketches.

Mr. Stephens proposed an amendment that “to ensure the approving authority does not grant conflicting authorizations on the same land, it is necessary that the location of activities and dispositions on public land be accurately defined” in Part D, Section 5.8 be replaced with “to assist the approving authority in not granting conflicting authorizations on the same land, it is necessary that the location of activities and dispositions on public land be accurately defined.” The mover and seconder accepted the proposal as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Green advised that the changes to Part D, Section 5.9.3 were made to be consistent with what is in the rest of the Manual of Standard Practice.
President Halliday asked if the membership had any recommendations or questions pertaining to Recommendation #1.

Mr. David Hagen spoke against the motion and the subsequent recommendations yet to be presented, indicating that the Association is at a crossroads and that it has to be decided if a Manual of Standard Practice is or is not wanted. He suggested that it would be an abdication of responsibilities to refer everything elsewhere, such as to the Land Titles Office Procedures Manual. Mr. Hagen commented that the debate should be on whether or not the membership wants a manual of what surveyors are to do and how to do it or not. He suggested that the Manual of Standard Practice would end up being a “Manual of Real Property Reports” if everything that is covered in the legislation or manuals from other bodies was removed.

Mr. Gudim requested clarification regarding the new heading for Part D, Section 5.8. He questioned where long linear power lines would fit in as the proposed heading seems to read that linear is being excluded. He questioned if surveys of power line easements are to be covered under Part D, Section 5.8.

Mr. Michaud responded to Mr. Gudim’s question, indicating that he believes the Standards Committee wanted to exclude LOCs in Part D, Section 5.9 and that the goal was to refer to everything else under Section 5.8.

**AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Gudim, seconded by Mr. Fleece, that Part D, Section 5.8 of the Manual of Standard Practice be retitled Public Land Dispositions Except License of Occupation (LOC).**

Amendment Carried

Mr. Ross proposed that the first bullet under Part D, Section 5.8 be “The ‘Disposition Plan Requirements’ indicates when a survey is required and when a sketch, without a survey, is allowed.” The mover and seconder accepted the proposal as a friendly amendment.

Ms. Robertson observed that, in the current Manual of Standard Practice, Part D, Section 5.8 was specific to Public Land Dispositions not registered at the Land Titles Office and Section 5.9 was for LOCs. She questioned if the heading for Section 5.9 should include as-built LOCs.

Mr. Green replied that there are no requirements on how to put together a sketch plan and that this section refers strictly to work done on public lands. Ms. Robertson replied that there are some LOCs that are not as-builds.

Mr. Green suggested that if they are surveyed they should be one and the same.
MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED

Part C, Section 3.9
Wellsites and Related Facilities
The type of monumentation found or placed for wellsites—related facilities, and Public Land Dispositions shall be shown on the plan. It is recommended that 30 centimetre iron spikes or 30 centimetre iron bars be placed.

Part D, Section 5 Preamble
Wellsite Surveys

This section deals with the survey of petroleum related facilities including the licensing of wells under the “Oil and Gas Conservation Regulations.” Surface tenure on patented lands is normally protected by caveats registered at Land Titles by the applicant, whereas interests in Crown lands public lands are dealt with by the Land Administration Division of Alberta Sustainable Resource Development (SRD) Minister responsible under the Public Lands Act.

New Heading
Environmental Conditions Affecting Well Licensing

For specifications and guidelines to enable the oil and gas industry to identify wellsites that are considered environmentally sensitive, consult Alberta Environment Fact Sheet “Siting an Upstream Oil and Gas Site in an Environmentally Sensitive Area on Private Land.” Alberta Environment Fact Sheet can be found on the internet at http://www3.gov.ab.ca/env/proten/landrec/factsheetsDevelopmentOnSensitiveSites-v7.pdf.

A description of the common SRD dispositions is included in Part E, Section 8.

Guidelines outlined by SRD identifying environmentally sensitive wellsites locations are listed in Part E, Section 7. A surveyor is expected to be familiar with these guidelines.

Part D, Section 5.8
Public Land Dispositions

New Heading
Public Land Dispositions Except License of Occupation (LOC)

This section refers to the requirements for surveys of public land dispositions, where the plans will not be registered at Land Titles. However, if the plans are to be registered, a surveyor should refer to the appropriate section of this Manual. A summary of various dispositions is given in Part E, Section 8. However, if the plans are to be registered, a surveyor should refer to the appropriate section of this Manual. A list of various disposition types is provided at
A surveyor should be familiar with these disposition types prior to carrying out surveys involving crown public lands.

To assist the approving authority in not granting conflicting authorizations on the same land, it is necessary that the location of activities and dispositions on public land be accurately defined. This is accomplished by requiring applicants to provide a detailed plan with their applications showing the location of the land applied for in relation to known survey evidence.

Surveyors should be aware of the approving authority’s plan requirements, which are outlined at the following link, www3.gov.ab.ca/srd/land/lad/pr.html:

- The ‘Disposition Plan Requirements’ indicates when a survey is required and when a sketch, without a survey, is allowed.
- The ‘Content Requirements for Disposition Application Plans (sketch)’ indicates the content requirements for sketch plans at the application stage.
- The ‘Content Requirements for Disposition Final Plans (monumented survey)’ indicates the content requirements for survey plans at the final stage after construction.

When dealing with public land dispositions, surveyors should be guided by the following criteria when determining the boundaries of these activities:

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

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

.1 Mark the positions of the boundary lines to be established by placing monuments at every change in direction and at the beginning and end of every curve. The type of monument to be placed is stipulated in the document ‘Disposition Plan Requirements,’ found on the approving authority’s website at http://www3.gov.ab.ca/srd/land/lad/pr.html.

NOTE: This is the same as the current 5.8.5 except township was changed to section.
2 Intersect and monument all surveyed section boundaries crossed.

3 In surveyed territory, locate and confirm sufficient monuments within, on or defining the section in which the disposition is located to allow the determination of the disposition in relation to the section boundaries. Monuments in this section refer to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act.

4 In unsurveyed territory, locate and confirm sufficient monuments to define the theoretic section in which the disposition is located to allow the determination of the disposition in relation to the theoretic section boundaries. Monuments in this section refer to those placed in accordance with Part 2 or Part 3 of the Surveys Act, or shown on a wellsight control traverse plan on file with the Director of Surveys office or Alberta Survey Control Markers integrated with the Alberta Survey Control System.

5 Derive and reference the bearings of all surveyed lines in accordance with Part D, Section 1.2.

6 Verify all bearings and distances to the accuracy specified in Part C, Section 1.5, with the exception of ties made under Section 5.8.10.

7 Make sufficient field measurements to ensure there are no errors of layout or measurement.

NOTE: This is the same as the current 5.8.3.

8 Certify the plan in accordance with Part E, Section 4, Schedule “B.”

9 Prepare the plan following the General Requirements for Plans, Part D, Section 1 and the approving authority’s plan requirements.

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

Part D, Section 5.9
License of Occupation (LOC) Linear Public Land Disposition

Notwithstanding Section 5.8, a surveyor performing a public land disposition survey for an as-built LOC access road shall:

9.3 Derive and reference the bearings of all surveyed lines in accordance with Part D, Section 1.2.

9.4 Verify all bearings and distances to the accuracy specified in Part C, Section 1.5, with the exception of ties made under Part 5 Section 5.9.5.
9. Prepare the plan following the General Requirements for Plans, Part D, Section 1 and the applicable Plan Requirements for Activities on Public Lands, Part E, Section 9 approving authority’s plan requirements.

Motion As Amended Carried

RECOMMENDATION #2A
Manual of Standard Practice (Part E, Section 7)
(Note: The rationale document is contained in Appendix E)

President Halliday called upon Mr. Jamieson, chair of the Standards Committee, and Mr. Green, chair of the Public Lands Dispositions Subcommittee to present the Recommendation #2A. It was clarified that Recommendation #2B was withdrawn as Recommendation #1 was passed.

President Halliday noted that, as the recommendation deals with standards of practice, only Active, Honorary Life and Retired members may vote.

It was MOVED by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Jamieson, that Part E, Section 7 of the Manual of Standard Practice be deleted in its entirety.

Motion Carried

Mr. Green briefly reviewed the recommendation and the rationale document.

RECOMMENDATION #3
Manual of Standard Practice (Part D, Section 5.6)
(Note: The rationale document is contained in Appendix E)

President Halliday called upon Mr. Jamieson, chair of the Standards Committee, and Mr. Green, chair of the Public Lands Dispositions Subcommittee to present Recommendation #3. President Halliday noted that, as the recommendation deals with standards of practice, only active, honorary life and retired members may vote.

It was MOVED by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Jamieson, that Part D, Section 5.6 of the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

Bolded text, excluding Part/Section headings and reference to housekeeping changes approved by Council, indicates new text and/or changes.

Part D, Section 5.6.2
A wellsite survey plan shall include the following minimum well information: **Deleted 5.6.2**
Part D, Section 5.6.2 (new)
For technical requirements and guidelines for Well Site plans, the EUB Guide 56 (Well Licence Applications) should be consulted for direction. Guide 56 is available on the internet at http://www.eub.gov.ab.ca/bbs/products/guides/g56.pdf.

Part D, Section 5.6.1
Well name.: **Deleted 5.6.2.1**

Part D, Section 5.6.2
Surface location of well from section boundaries (assume a 20.12 metre road allowance).: **Deleted 5.6.2.2**

Part D, Section 5.6.3
Proposed bottom hole (only if different from surface) identified by LS and section.: **Deleted 5.6.2.3**

Part D, Section 5.6.3
A wells site survey plan shall include the following minimum topographical and licensing information: **Deleted 5.6.3**

Part D, Section 5.6.3.1
Lease-site elevations (well centre, a minimum of four corners and any breaks over 5 metres): **Deleted 5.6.3.1**

Part D, Section 5.6.3.2
All surface topography within 200 metres of well centre, including: **Deleted 5.6.3.2**

Part D, Section 5.6.3.2.1
Elevations of any significant water bodies: **Deleted 5.6.3.2.1**

Part D, Section 5.6.3.2.2
Sufficient information to establish the general character of the topography, including land types, and any predominant drainage patterns.: **Deleted 5.6.3.2.2**

Part D, Section 5.6.3.2.3
Where the proposal is to drill the well in a water-covered area, the depth of the water.: **Deleted 5.6.3.2.3**

Part D, Section 5.6.3.3
All surface improvements within 100 metres of well centre.: **Deleted 5.6.3.3**

Part D, Section 5.6.3.4
All occupied dwellings, permanent buildings, and wells (petroleum or domestic water wells) within 200 metres of well centre.: **Deleted 5.6.3.4**

Part D, Section 5.6.3.5
An indication that well centre is within: **Deleted 5.6.3.5**
Mr. Green reviewed the recommendation and noted that the rationale for this recommendation was the same as the previous recommendation. He then reviewed the new wording for Part D, Section 5.6.2.

Mr. David Hagen reiterated his comments from the discussion of Recommendation #1 and suggested the members would be abdicating their responsibilities to other agencies. He noted that most of Guide 56 does not apply to surveyors. He also suggested that the Manual of Standard Practice should indicate what the Association’s standard is.

Mr. Green replied that Guide 56 is the Alberta Energy & Utilities Board’s “bible” and that it is very strictly adhered to. He indicated that surveyors must follow the guide but that it changes very rapidly so this recommendation was the only logical choice.

**RECOMMENDATION #4**
Manual of Standard Practice (Metis Settlements Land Registry)
(Note: The rationale document is contained in Appendix E)

Once again, President Halliday called upon Messrs. Jamieson and Green to present the Recommendation #4.

President Halliday noted that, as the recommendation deals with standards of practice, only active, honorary life and retired members may vote.
It was MOVED by Mr. Jamieson, seconded by Mr. Green, that the following be added to the Manual of Standard Practice as Part E, Section 13: Process And Obligation To Register Plans On Metis Settlements With Metis Settlements Land Registry:

When conducting surveys on Metis Settlements, the obligation to register those plans with the Metis Settlements Land Registry is the same as the obligation to register plans at Land Titles. Clients requesting surveys on Metis Settlements should be advised that the plan has no effect unless registered with the Metis Settlements Land Registry. For information purposes only, plans may also be filed/registered at Land Titles. Plan requirements are similar to those of Land Titles with a few exceptions.

The Registry block refers to the Metis Settlements Land Registry, the plan must be on mylar and it is preferred that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ affidavit be on the plan rather than separate. More detailed plan requirements are found in Sections 86 and 87 of the Metis Settlements Land Registry Regulation. Further information can be found at http://www.metis-settlements.org.

Motion Carried

Mr. Jamieson reviewed the recommendation and the rationale document. There were no questions or concerns.

Mr. Pals, chairman of the Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee, was asked to come to the podium to make the presentation.

The assembly was advised that there was no motion on the floor; however, comments and suggestions were encouraged.

Mr. Pals drew the assembly’s attention to the genesis of this presentation.

At the 2000 AGM, under new business, the membership recommended that Council consider establishing a committee charged with preparing a white paper for presentation to the Government of Alberta with respect to establishing a statutory boundary tribunal to provide an avenue to resolve boundary uncertainties and disputes as an alternative to resorting to the court process.

Following the 2000 AGM, Mr. Ken Allred was asked to do some research on this issue and prepare a paper. In early 2001, Mr. Allred submitted his paper to the ALSA Council. He concluded that the current Section 9 of the Surveys Act is likely the only process for the resolution of boundary type problems outside the court system. He went on to say that it is clear that the breadth of this remedy was severely limited in the discussions that led up to the passing of the new Surveys Act. It is also clear that ‘survey errors’ are only a minor cause of boundary uncertainties and the provisions of Section 9 of the Surveys Act do not extend far enough to resolve the majority of boundary problems.

Section 9 Presentation

L.M. (Larry) Pals, ALS
In the 2001-2002 Association year, Council established a Statutory Boundary Tribunal committee. The Committee was asked to analyze Mr. Allred’s report, conduct additional research (research court cases, discipline files, speak with Land Titles and the Director of Surveys), and identify options for change including revisions to the Land Titles Act and the Surveys Act.

Mr. Pals drew the assembly’s attention to page 68 of the agenda package and read the following proposed definitions:

"An alleged error in survey is defined as a corner or boundary of property of record on a plan registered in a Land Titles Office that has been formally brought into question by an Alberta Land Surveyor."

"Boundary uncertainty occurs when the opinions of two or more Alberta Land Surveyors are in conflict as to the position of a corner or boundary of property."

Mr. Michaud suggested that when reference is made to the Land Titles Office that the Metis Settlements Land Registry should also be referred to.

Mr. Pals clarified that under question “when would mediation apply” it should read “if one of the Alberta Land Surveyors is deceased.”

Mr. Pals reviewed the process with the assembly. Refer to Appendix E.

Mr. Hagen questioned if the mediator should be an Alberta Land Surveyor or a member of the Alberta Arbitration and Mediation Society. He further stated that, in his opinion, an Alberta Land Surveyor would be more qualified to mediate as they have an understanding of the Surveys Act and the Land Surveyors Act and are responsible for determining the boundaries. Mr. Hagen questioned why the Committee decided to include an Alberta Land Surveyor or a member of the Alberta Arbitration and Medication Society.

Mr. Pals agreed with Mr. Hagen comments and indicated that the Committee felt that whomever the mediator is they should have formal training and, to his knowledge, there is only member of the Association who is qualified to do mediation.

Mr. Marquardt referred to page 69 of the agenda package and questioned why landowners, Alberta Land Surveyors, Council of a municipality, Director of Surveys, a Registrar to a Land Titles office are not able to question a corner but are able to request information.

Mr. Pals replied that the idea was not to eliminate the parties involved ability to request mediation.
Mr. Marquardt questioned if these parties can question the position of a corner or does an Alberta Land Surveyor have to be involved.

Mr. Pals replied that the process would have to start by having an Alberta Land Surveyor question a corner.

Mr. Nelson stated that Mr. Hagen raised a valid point as the mediator should not be deciding where the boundary is as that is the responsibility of the land surveyor involved. He further commented that this would be an alternative to the judicial process.

Mr. Stephens stated that, in his opinion, an Alberta Land Surveyor should not be the mediator as there is the potential for a predisposed opinion.

Mr. Green questioned who can request mediation and what is trying to be resolved.

Mr. Pals replied that they are not trying to deal with landowners disputing a surveyor’s invoice.

Mr. Allred stated that a mediator is a facilitator and does not necessarily have to understand the issue but it would be beneficial if they did. He further commented that anyone can be a mediator. There is no monopoly on mediation or a mediation act in Alberta that he is aware of.

Mr. Allred stated if a report was submitted to the Executive Director, this would create an ethical conflict as the mediator is under a legal obligation not to release information. Mr. Allred stressed that mediation is a process and that the process is more important than the knowledge.

Mr. Barry referred to a South African experience. The arbitrator is a land surveyor and they are responsible for making their decision from evidence discovered in the field. He stated further that few disputes go to court.

Mr. Pals stated that looking at the South African situation may be valid.

President Mr. Halliday encouraged delegates to come forward to share any experiences they may have.

Mr. Pals referred to the cost of this process.

Mr. Pals clarified that the outcome was not to have a report but to resolve the situation from start to finish.

Mr. Pals drew the assembly’s attention to Part Two of the Boundary Resolution Process.
Mr. Dobbin questioned what the process would be if a settle-
ment agreement was reached and the practitioners signed off on it
before the client/land owner had a chance to review it.

Mr. Pals replied that in Alberta there is a judge’s order and land
owners are involved in the process as the resolution could be a plan
correction or a drafting error that needs to be corrected.

Mr. Dobbin referred to a situation in New Brunswick where a
land surveyor agreed to a resolution and then did not follow through
with it.

Mr. Pals acknowledged that these types of situations may arise
as a result of the mediation process.

Mr. George questioned if the Committee had considered the
statute of limitations and consulted insurance companies.

Mr. Pals indicated that this has been explored but no resolution
has been reached.

Mr. George provided the following scenario: “surveyor estab-
lishes position and another surveyor establishes position; long time
passes; incumbent for land surveyor to resolve and have one
position; insurance seems to be reluctant to say if surveyor is
covered if going to go out to fix; how do we go about not extending
unlimited liability to a situation?”

Mr. George suggested that the insurance companies be involved
to find out what their opinions are if these changes are made.

Mr. Halliday informed the assembly that a request letter had
been sent to CCLS to clarify the insurance issues surrounding this
matter and are awaiting a response.

Mr. Janes questioned if the agreement/resolution arrived at by
the two surveyors would be referred to the Director of Surveys. He
also questioned what would happen if the Director disagreed with
the resolution.

Mr. Pals indicated that the Director of Surveys would have to
be involved in the process depending on importance of the situation
and the Director of Surveys may be required to provide an opinion.

Mr. Longson questioned what the driving force was behind this
issue.

Mr. Pals indicated that his understanding was at the 2000 and
2001 annual general meetings, it was determined that there were a
number of unresolved issues; thus, the public’s interest is not being
protected.
Mr. Longson commented that there should be a list of existing problems and questioned if the problem was really that large.

In response to Mr. Longson’s question, Mr. Pals replied that to his knowledge there is not a list of outstanding problems but that from the research the Committee has done, there appears to be a number of unresolved issues. He continued to say that if this problem is insignificant, then the Committee does not have to put any further research into this matter.

Mr. Longson commented that if this were a significant problem, then a list would have been developed. He encouraged the Committee to re-evaluate their information.

Mr. Pals stated that the purpose of this presentation is to find out if there is a need for this process. Mr. Pals proposed that a straw vote be held at the end of the discussion.

Mr. Michaud reported that there are 6-12 cases per year which are typically phone calls where the surveyor is looking for assistance or additional information. From these requests, there have been only one or two formal requests in the last five years.

Mr. Holmlund agreed with Mr. Allred’s point that mediation is a process and the process is more important than the knowledge. Mr. Holmlund discussed the mediation fees and expenses and felt that the Association should not be providing mediation training to the members free of charge.

Mr. Allred commented these issues are generally water boundary issues and there had been an indication from officials that there are a number of water boundary issues that have been questioned. He went on to say the biggest problem is the work involved to resolve these issues. Due to this fact, people tend to give up or “sweep them under the rock.” In his opinion, the Committee is on the right track as these issues need to be resolved.

Ms. Robertson indicated that the Committee decided to do this presentation to give them an indication if the Committee was on the right track for the process. She also indicated that there is still a lot of “fine tuning” to be done.

In response to Mr. Holmlund’s comment, Ms. Robertson stated that if the Association was to incur the cost to train Alberta Land Surveyors as mediators, this would save the Association money. She furthered commented that, if through each phase of the mediation process, a resolution could not be reached then “true” Section 9 candidates would be sent to the Director of Surveys office to be investigated.

Mr. Dion questioned if the Committee had explored the bornage process that is used in Quebec.
Mr. Pals replied that he had obtained some information but was not very familiar with it.

Mr. Dion reported that there is a good chapter in *Survey Law in Canada* that discusses this.

Mr. Hagen questioned what power the panel would have to change plans of a deceased member. He also questioned what would be done if the Director of Surveys stated that there was a drafting error on a plan of a deceased member. He further questioned if there was a mechanism in place for this to be corrected.

Mr. Pals replied that to date the Committee has discussed this but has not come up with a resolution.

Mr. Hagen stressed that a mechanism needs to be in place to deal with these situations.

In response to Mr. Hagen’s comments, Mr. Michaud stated that there are avenues in place to resolve boundary uncertainties or errors which are Section 9, Section 92 of the Land Titles Act and a court order as well as resurveys to correct boundary problems.

Mr. Pals requested Mr. Jardine’s opinion.

Mr. Jardine stated that this does create a liability to the land surveyor and that the limitations issue is a complicated one. He suggested that the first step would be to receive clarification from the insurers. In his opinion, this does not create a major liability issue as long as a formal process is used. He went to say that this process is a mediation/recommendation function. He suggested that the same practice review principles be used when an item is going to Council to protect anonymity if there is a concern that this is a discipline matter. Mr. Jardine commented that this is not a formal statutory process to get the necessary documents and people together to try to resolve the issue and that there are no statutory means of compelling participation. This may short circuit the process and there may be legal issues with how far you can bind someone to what they are going to do. This is a process of investigation or mediation – it does not result in changes on the ground that could result in someone suing.

Mr. Hagen asked if the Committee had discussed referring these disputes to the Practice Review Board rather than have a separate panel.

Mr. Pals replied that the Committee felt it was not appropriate to refer this to the Board.

Mr. Holmlund stated, after hearing the comments, he was now in favor of the process but indicated that the mediator should be a professional and that Alberta Land Surveyors should not be placed in this type of situation after attending a half day mediation seminar.
as would not be in the public’s best interest. He indicated that the Committee was on the right track.

As there were no more comments brought forward President Halliday conducted a “straw vote.”

From this vote, the majority were in favor of this process.

Mr. Pals stated that the Committee would continue to “fine tune” this process and urged all members to provide additional comments or questions to the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. Halliday adjourned the meeting at 3:56 p.m. on Friday April 26.

The meeting was brought back to order at 9:07 a.m.

Registrar Dick Bassil was asked to come to the podium to conduct the elections.

Mr. Bassil announced that John Landry, Pat Moloney, Rob Radovanovic and Heather Stairs would be acting as scrutineers for the election.

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

Mr. Bassil informed the assembly that the Nominating Committee has put forward the name of Al Nelson for the position of President of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2004-2005.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Pratt, seconded by Mr. Allred, that nominations cease.*

**Motion Carried**

Congratulations were extended to Mr. Nelson on his election as President.

Messrs. S.G. (Stephen) Green, V. (Vic) Wolchansky were announced as candidates for the position of Vice President of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2004-2005. Mr. Bassil called for further nominations.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Pals, seconded by Mr. Marquardt, that nominations cease.*

**Motion Carried**

Messrs. Green and Wolchansky were invited to address the assembly.
Mr. Bassil informed the assembly that the Nominating Committee has put forward the name of Larry Pals for the position of Secretary-Treasurer of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Wolchansky, seconded by Mr. Kinloch, that nominations cease.*

Motion Carried

Mr. Bassil announced that D.C.J. (Clayton) Bruce, G.D. (Grant) Cross, and B.G. (Barry) Fleece were candidates for the position of Councillor for 2004-2005. Mr. Bassil called for further nominations.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Hudema, seconded by Mr. Woolgar, that nominations cease.*

Motion Carried

The four candidates were invited to address the assembly.

Mr. Bassil advised that only honorary life members and active members may vote.

The scrutineers collected the ballots and retired from the room with the Registrar to count the ballots.

President Halliday invited Mr. Hudema, Chairman of the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee, to make the second of the two presentations. President Halliday reminded the membership that there is no motion on the floor and that the Ad Hoc Committee would like the membership’s feedback and ideas.

Mr. Hudema provided a history of the Ad Hoc Committee’s establishment and progress. He advised that the membership passed a new business motion, at the 2002 annual general meeting, to have Council set up the committee and assign them the task of reviewing how monuments placed under Part 3 at Part 2 positions could have governing status. He noted that the original motion from the Practice Review Board, basically, wanted the same thing. Mr. Hudema advised that Council established the Ad Hoc Committee at the start of the 2002/2003 term and that the Ad Hoc Committee started reviewing existing legislation and determined the path to follow. He indicated that the Ad Hoc Committee determined that the existing Act’s procedures are correct and that nothing was wrong with the procedure stated. He noted that questions regarding how to guarantee posts were placed correctly, how the public knows what monument to rely on and what should be done in case of a conflict had not yet been addressed or answered. Mr. Hudema advised that, during the first year, the Ad Hoc Committee developed a procedure that included a time limit. He explained that the intent was that a monument would receive governing status if no objections had been raised within the ten year limit.
Mr. Hudema indicated that the Ad Hoc Committee decided to bring forward their draft proposal to the 2003 annual general meeting for the membership’s review and comments. He noted that it was also forwarded to the Association’s solicitor, the Practice Review Board and the Standards Committee for comments. Mr. Hudema advised that the Board and Standards Committee provided their comments and a 25 page response, which was extremely helpful, was received from Mr. Jardine, the Association’s solicitor.

Mr. Hudema indicated that questions regarding the ten year period, such as how to make sure the proper timing was maintained, were raised and it was found that the ten year period could create a lot of problems. The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed all of the comments received and looked for answers and different procedures that could be used.

Mr. Hudema explained that Manitoba’s Act has a procedure where, when doing a re-establishment, if it does not fit with the existing physical features, a notification is sent out to affected land owners for their review and comment. He advised that he spoke with Mr. Gary Fraser, Manitoba’s Inspector of Surveys, in December 2003 with regards to their Act. Mr. Hudema noted that Mr. Fraser had advised him that the notification was not often sent out. Mr. Hudema advised that the Ad Hoc Committee felt that a notification procedure, like the one used in Manitoba, would work to help resolve issues quicker. He commented that the Ad Hoc Committee’s thought was that the notification would go out in pre-establishment form to allow the affected land owners time to respond. He noted that the Ad Hoc Committee had not set a time period, although 30 to 45 days had been discussed. Mr. Hudema clarified that the notification was added to the draft wording with respect to all placements and re-establishments. He commented that, after recent discussions with members and the presentations made at the regional meetings, it became obvious that there were concerns regarding the notification procedure.

Mr. Hudema advised that another concern raised was in regards to the procedure for confirming monumentation. He noted that the Association’s solicitor made it very clear in the legal opinion that a clear and transparent procedure would be required to ensure that, if it was raised in court, it would be clear as to what should have been or was done. Mr. Hudema indicated that notification and confirmation were the two main procedures that the Ad Hoc Committee looked at during the 2003/2004 term. He noted that he would not review the entire wording for confirmation. However, he outlined the general procedure as follows:

When placing a monument, such as a north quarter pin, the monument would be placed and the plan would be registered. The responsibility for confirmation falls upon the second surveyor who, as is currently done, would have to retrace the survey and evaluate the evidence. If the second surveyor received the same answer, within allowable tolerances, the monument would be considered
confirmed and would be accepted. If the second surveyor did not receive the same answer, within allowable tolerances, he/she would have to work towards resolution of the discrepancy utilizing procedures that are currently in place.

Mr. Hudema commented that the Ad Hoc Committee would have to look at work done by the Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee to determine if anything should be incorporated into the proposed rewording for the Surveys Act.

Mr. Hudema explained that the Ad Hoc Committee felt that it was necessary to include re-establishments and to give re-established Part 2 posts status as well. He commented a monument being considered for governing status cannot be established from one that does not have governing status. He indicated that the procedure following re-establishment basically follows what currently exists in the Act and stressed that the Ad Hoc Committee was adamant that notification on re-establishments has to be included. He explained the Ad Hoc Committee’s reasoning as being that, unfortunately, surveyors are not always diligent in making sure they talk to land owners to find out if they have any additional knowledge. He commented that a lot of problems could be solved up front rather than having them arise after the plan was registered. He admitted that there would be a delay in the ability to register the plan as quickly but suggested that, overall, time and money would be saved.

Mr. Hudema advised the assembly that the Ad Hoc Committee’s intent has been to get the changes proposed to the legislation approved at next year’s annual general meeting. He indicated that he would like to get feedback here. He noted that members are welcome to contact any member of the Ad Hoc Committee as well.

President Halliday encouraged the visiting delegates to provide their input.

Mr. Hagen agreed with the problem that is trying to be solved but commented that he thinks that, if adopted as written, the proposed wording would open up and create a lot more problems. He agreed that placed monuments have to get status but suggested that the notification clause would be “like poking a hornet’s nest.” He expressed the view that there would be “gridlock” and people would try to not make decisions. Mr. Hagen ended his comments by indicating that he does not know how Section 39(2)(b)(iv) could be done. He suggested that a final arbitrator would be required.

Section 39(2)(b)(iv) text:

*should the initial surveyor disagree with the second surveyor, both surveyors shall present their findings to such designate as appointed by the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association who shall review each surveyor’s report and rule on which position is determined to be correct. The ruling shall be final.*

Mr. Stephens commented that this procedure would be unwieldy and is truly unnecessary. He noted that one quarter post...
Mr. Stephens indicated that, at the Edmonton regional meeting, he sat with a colleague who indicated he had placed eight quarter posts, which would require that he notify 64 people. Mr. Stephens observed that advising and consulting the public is only part of what surveyors do and that surveyors do not need the public telling them how to conduct their affairs. He stressed that we [surveyors] are the professionals and that we do not need to be questioned as to if we have done our work as per the Act, regulations, Manual of Standard Practice, etc. He noted that he is not advocating hiding anything but that he does not see the benefit to the public or anyone here.

Mr. Aumundrud questioned if the Manitoba Act indicates checking with property owners only if the monument being placed would not be consistent with existing development. He commented that if a pin was put in and it fit with the fence post he “would be happy.” He suggested that property owners should be consulted if the pin did not fit.

Mr. Hudema replied that it has come through the Practice Review Board that that does not always occur, although it is what should occur. He commented that two or three pins are being found at established corners and that these situations, which should not happen, have to be dealt with.

Mr. Partridge questioned what would happen if he established a monument, which achieved governing status, and then subsequently the original monument was found.

Mr. Hudema replied that the Ad Hoc Committee considered the situation Mr. Partridge outlined, which is causing a lot of problems currently. He stated that plans have used north quarter posts or centre of section posts that do not have governing status. He indicated that plans have been found that use these monuments that do not govern and that the pins encroach into adjacent quarters. Mr. Hudema reiterated that the Ad Hoc Committee has discussed Mr. Partridge’s concern and admitted that the wording needs more work in regards to this issue. He commented that he feels the Ad Hoc Committee is getting very close to a procedure that would work.

Mr. Haggerty wondered if the Ad Hoc Committee considered separating out posted and non-posted corners. He commented that he has a problem with situations where there may be a pin but it is just not where it should be.

Mr. Hudema replied that it is the surveyor’s responsibility to make sure they have enough evidence to ensure monuments are placed correctly in the position they were intended to be. He noted that everything proposed, regarding the straight surveying aspect, is basically identical to what is in the Act now. He also noted that the proposal is to have an initial survey done and one confirmation done as well so that the third surveyor, who finds the monument
confirmed, can use the monument without having to resurvey the line.

Mr. Westlund requested that Mr. Hudema explain what Section 39(2)(b)(v) means.

Section 39(2)(b)(v) text:
If the initial surveyor is not practicing, the second surveyor shall proceed as if he is doing the initial survey.

Mr. Hudema replied that he would get back to Mr. Westlund as he could not provide the answer at that time.

Mr. Marquardt questioned how, if he was the third surveyor, he would know that the monument has been confirmed. He also requested the Director of Surveys’ input.

Mr. Hudema replied that the Ad Hoc Committee’s intent was that the second surveyor’s plan would have the monument marked as “confirmed” or some abbreviation thereof.

Mr. Marquardt clarified that it looks like Part 3 monuments would be blessed with Part 2 status and asked for Mr. Michaud’s comments.

Mr. Michaud stated that he has two concerns. The first concern, he advised, is in regards to changing or moving boundaries. He commented that he believes the legislation tells surveyors that all of the corners being talked about today are defined and established in Part 2. He noted that some are not monumented. He continued by suggesting the north quarter on the blind line was established in the 1892 original township survey and that 99 out of 100 monuments are in the right location. He expressed concern with how a monument governs a boundary if there had been a blunder. Mr. Michaud advised that his second concern pertains to the concept of best evidence. He questioned how, if the Ad Hoc Committee’s suggestion is followed, best evidence would ever apply. He also questioned how, if the second surveyor has confirmed a monument, the third surveyor could disregard pits and mound evidence found that had not been located by the first two surveyors.

Mr. Michaud questioned what is trying to be fixed. He indicated that he has heard that the public may be concerned but that his office has not has not been given that impression. He commented that he does not see a problem with what surveyors are doing on the ground today or that the public does either. He suggested that surveyors may be seeing a problem with confirming evidence and questioning how much effort they should go to confirm positions. Mr. Michaud advised that confirmation of evidence is a professional responsibility. He noted that, in some cases, it may be necessary to go the “full length” whereas that may not be required in other cases and that the decision is the professional’s responsibility. He suggested that surveyors are getting hung up on how much money and time is spent
confirming evidence when each situation could be evaluated separately.

Mr. Hudema, in response to Mr. Michaud’s comments, advised that a number of problems are arising. He noted that Mr. Kluthe, the Association’s former public member on the Practice Review Board and current public member on Council, has outlined his concerns regarding the public’s perception that a monument governs when it really does not. Mr. Hudema commented that there are subdivisions being developed, with placed monuments that are being used, and that it is unknown how those monuments are being confirmed. He noted that his firm has found a number of monuments, outside of the accepted standard of survey, that have been used. He expressed the view that, as a professional who determines boundaries and is charged under the Act to keep those boundaries as accurate as possible, it is necessary to be proactive and not reactive. He commented that he thinks the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommended changes to the legislation would assist everyone and would give the public what they actually perceive in the case now.

Mr. Green advised that he also serves on the Ad Hoc Committee. He commented that there are only a limited number of Part 2 monuments that will have to be re-established as they are going to erode. He noted that the re-establishments would be Part 3 monuments, which would leave nothing to build on. Mr. Green also addressed Mr. Westlund’s earlier question and indicated that the intent of Section 39(2)(b)(v) is that the second surveyor would actually be considered the initial surveyor and that another surveyor would have to do the confirmation.

Mr. Nelson advised that he would not be speaking for or against the proposed wording. He suggested that it is a fact of life that land owners and others rely on those monuments, which is the issue to be addressed. He commented that the concept that a monument placed by a land surveyor that does not govern is contradictory and indicated that some method is required to label those monuments and give credence to what is there.

Mr. Holmlund indicated that he understands what the Ad Hoc Committee is trying to do but suggested that it seems they are trying to correct a number of problems by doing something that may not be correct in the eyes of the law. He advised that he has heard that the Practice Review Board has found a number of instances where re-established monuments were found in the wrong place or two or three monuments were found close together. He commented that he does not think the proposed changes to the legislation would correct that practice and he suggested that it is actually a separate issue. Mr. Holmlund expressed concern about what is happening to Part 2 monuments and “magically” turning Part 3 monuments to Part 2 monuments. He indicated that the issue of boundaries is being missed and commented that the hierarchy of evidence determines where the boundary is. He continued by noting that the original township survey put monuments in the ground and that was the line
used when people settled and put in fences and improvements, which govern if the monument is no longer there. Mr. Holmlund noted that only a Judge’s Order can determine where the line is if there is a discrepancy or dispute. He commented that he does not think it is appropriate for surveyors to put legislation through that will magically turn some corners into Part 2 monuments. In regards to Mr. Stephens’ comments, Mr. Holmlund noted that he has heard that over 8,000 plans were registered last year. He suggested that if there were 10,000 plans with one monument on each to be re-established and eight land owners were affected by each monument there would be 80,000 notifications to be sent out, which would take time and money. He observed that a whole new industry could be created for surveyors.

Mr. Hudema replied that the notification proposal was brought in this year and that, although it is a major item, he is not positive what is in the draft is right. He commented that adjustments would be made if required, which is what committee work is for. He advised that the overall concept has been discussed with the Association’s solicitor and that they have been advised that if the changes to the Act are passed, the ability to do what is proposed would be permissible. He questioned Mr. Jardine if this was correct.

Mr. Jardine, the Association’s solicitor, responded that, subject to a Charter challenge, the legislature can decide to re-vamp the survey system. He indicated that if the Association convinces the legislature to change the entire hierarchy of evidence, it could be done. He noted that the courts would be bound to apply the legislation that the legislature has passed. He reiterated that it is possible to change the law and what is or is not evidence. He stressed that he is not speaking as to whether or not this should be done or what the consequences could be.

Mr. Jardine advised that the Act, as presently structured, offers the option of utilizing Section 9 or doing a resurvey. He noted that there is a fairly extensive listing of how to go about this with very formal procedures. He suggested that one question to be addressed, if adding a new way to make changes to boundaries, is how formal that procedure would have to be. He commented that one of the biggest nightmares in any legal proceeding is having a large number of notices as there are difficulties with how they are sent out and how to prove they were received. He questioned what would happen if, three months later, the land owner says they did not receive the notification. Mr. Jardine commented that, speaking practically, he would receive the notice in the mail and not do anything with it as he would not know what it was. He stressed that the notice would have to tell the recipient what it is about. He noted that indicating a pin is being moved three centimetres is very different from indicating a pin is being moved three centimetres and the property boundary is being changed. Mr. Jardine reiterated that the Ad Hoc Committee would have to consider how to do a notice that advises what is being done and that it would have to include a provision dealing with how the property is being changed. He noted...
Mr. Hudema responded that the first plan would have to be registered and noted that currently plans are to be filed within 90 days of placing monuments. He suggested that this may have to be looked at and that if there is a right-of-way survey that re-establishes monuments, a monument plan may be required if the plan will take longer to get registered.

President Halliday adjourned the meeting at 10:35 a.m. for a coffee break. He reconvened the meeting after the coffee break at 11:02 a.m.

Mr. Kocher took the opportunity to congratulate Mr. John Holmlund for climbing Kilimanjaro. Mr. Kocher also commented that everyone has been having a great time and indicated that he wished to share the praise he has received with all of the members of the Convention & Social Committee.

Registrar Dickk Bassil was asked to announce the election results.

Mr. Bassil advised that Mr. Stephen Green was elected as Vice President and that Messrs. Clayton Bruce, Grant Cross and David Marquardt were elected as councillors.

*It was MOVED by Ms. Stairs, seconded by Mr. Moloney, that the ballots be destroyed.*

Motion Carried

President Halliday addressed the assembly as follows:

Congratulations to Stephen Green, your new vice-president, Larry Pals, your new Secretary-Treasurer, and to Clayton Bruce, Grant Cross, and David Marquardt, your new councillors.

I would like to thank everyone who put their name forward today. Even if you were not elected, I thank you for agreeing to volunteer to play a very important role with the ALSA. I encourage you and others to run next year when I give you a call this December.

Speaking of volunteers, I would also like to ask you to take a couple of moments to volunteer for a committee next year.

President Halliday then asked Mr. Hudema to return to the second podium to carry on the discussion from prior to the coffee break.

Mr. McWilliam commented that he has heard remarks from certain members that give him some concern as it appears that they think there is an intent to change boundaries. He objected to that.
He commented that he does not think there is any intent by the proposal to change boundaries and that the intent is to connect certain boundaries to Part 3 monuments, which are being placed by surveyors on a daily basis. Mr. McWilliam noted that the public sees these monuments, and sometimes pays for their placement and likes the thought of being able to depend on them as defining their boundaries. He commented that the Surveys Act contradicts that and that the Act relates those corners, placed under Part 3, to the remote boundaries. He indicated that surveyors try to establish those boundaries by Part 3 surveys today but that the reality is that, through human error, there is a tendency to place monuments within the small error allowed by the Surveys Act. He continued by noting that another land surveyor could come along and discover or even double the error and that corners continue to be marked. He noted that the public is confused as they have the perception they can depend on these monuments. Mr. McWilliam summarized his comments by indicating that the intent, which came from a majority of the membership at previous annual general meetings, is very good. He suggested that we have not gone down the right path but that he thinks everyone can agree there is a weakness that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Allred commented that he agrees with Mr. Holmlund and that it seems everyone is somewhat confused by the debate as two issues have been mixed together. He suggested that the first issue is a post placed incorrectly at the north quarter blind line where the original Part 2 monument is not disputed. He then suggested that the second issue is an original Part 2 monument not in place and the re-established one may be subject to challenge. Mr. Allred argued that the north quarter monument is unquestionably the best evidence of the north quarter even it does not agree with newly established Part 2 monument. He commented that it should not be moved, even if it is out by a considerable amount from the re-established Part 2 monument.

Mr. Hudema agreed that, when one of the original Part 2 monuments utilized to place the north quarter has been destroyed, the north quarter has to be considered as part of the re-establishment. He commented that it may not necessarily be the best evidence but that it has to be considered and that he assumes any good surveyor would do this.

Mr. Allred reiterated his concern that the debate is mixing up two scenarios.

Mr. Woolgar commented, with respect to the confusion and difficulties the members seem to be discussing, that he has never met a land owner that did not understand that when a monument is placed at the north quarter, the centre of section or LSD that that is where they are going to build. He commented that the confusion has been created in this room.
Mr. Kluthe indicated that the situation is becoming unnecessarily muddled. He noted that there is only one boundary to a parcel, new boundaries can be created by subdivision and only a land surveyor is licensed to determine boundaries. He commented that the public has a right to expect that boundaries have been established correctly but that they also have the right to dispute the boundary location. He also commented that he does not see the need to notify 15 land owners as the land surveyor has the right to determine the boundary and that he, as the public, has to accept that boundary unless they choose to challenge it. Mr. Kluthe advised that the public has indicated to him that it is the best determination of where the boundary is as of that time and that they expect that place to be where the surveyor has placed the monument.

Mr. Finner, speaking on behalf of the Practice Review Board, advised that their initial recommendation to Council had a somewhat narrower focus as they wanted to deal with corners that were not monumented under Part 2 and that it was not the Board’s intention that re-establishment of all evidence or quarter section evidence would be included. Mr. Finner noted that when the Ad Hoc Committee asked the Board to review the proposed wording last summer. The Board recommended re-established evidence be left out of the focus for this. He advised that the Board has found a double standard concerning those non-monumented positions under Part 2. He indicated that many practitioners do accept established monuments that have taken place under Part 3 as the north quarter or centre of section. He noted that there are equally as many practitioners that feel they have to go back to the midpoint. He advised that this was the basis of the Board’s original recommendation to Council.

Mr. Hudema replied that the Ad Hoc Committee did seriously look at the responses received from the Standards Committee and the Practice Review Board but that, at the time, still felt it was important to include re-establishments. He clarified that he was referring to re-establishments under Part 3, not under Part 2.

Mr. Pratt commented that he believes it was Mr. Maltais who, at the Edmonton regional meeting, looked at Section 44 of the Act and suggested that the intent of that section may be that those corners would govern. Mr. Pratt suggested that the proposal is a massive change to legislation and that the Ad Hoc Committee may want to look at the legislation’s original intent. He also suggested they should look at establishment of previously non-monumented corners under Part 3 and that since a monument must be placed, maybe it takes on some official status.

Mr. Hudema responded that the Ad Hoc Committee has looked at that and that it is a gray area because it does not specifically state that the monument shall govern, as it does in Part 2. He commented that this lack of specification is the basis behind making the changes that the Ad Hoc Committee is proposing.
Mr. Gillmore commented that if the Association proceeds along this path and he has to go through this procedure, he will not place the post to split the blind line, as he does not think he is legislated to do so, and then nobody wins. He also commented that, with respect to the notification, if he has gone out and placed the split of the blind line and done what he feels is a good job and the farmer disagrees, he would not move the post just because the farmer did not like where it is. He noted that if he put it in, he is confident in where he put it.

Mr. Hudema noted that it has to be kept in perspective that when a surveyor is planting the north quarter or centre of section it is more or less a courtesy notification that the post has been placed. He also noted that the position could not be disagreed with as it had not been placed before.

Mr. Pratt questioned if, before the discussion wrapped up, he could be given an idea of where the recommendation is going to from here and what would happen in the next year. He questioned if the Ad Hoc Committee would be on a path to legislative change or on a path to more investigation.

President Halliday replied that substantial work is left to be done on the issue and noted that, before a change to the legislation is anticipated, the Ad Hoc Committee would be back in front of the group.

Mr. Hudema asked that a straw vote be held regarding whether or not the concept was correct. He advised that he has heard what the membership has had to say regarding notification and that the Ad Hoc Committee will consider those comments quite closely. He suggested that it would be foolish for the Ad Hoc Committee to spend their time trying to push something that is not going to work. Mr. Hudema clarified that a positive vote would indicate the members think the general concept is workable, taking into account the discussion held today, and that the Ad Hoc Committee should carry on.

A straw vote was then held. President Halliday commented that there seems to be a fairly even split.

Mr. Hudema commented that a 50/50 split is not strong enough to send a recommendation to the annual general meeting. He requested that those members that think the Ad Hoc Committee has not gone in the right direction send him, via e-mail or fax, some indication of where they believe the Ad Hoc Committee should be going.

President Halliday thanked Mr. Hudema for making the presentation on behalf of the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee.

Dr. Mike Barry was asked to come to the podium.
Good Afternoon ladies and gentleman, Mr. President and members of Council;

I would like to thank the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for inviting me to address you this afternoon and also thank you for your ongoing support of the Department. I would like to especially thank those members who sit on the Geomatics Liaison Committee, which I chair - the departmental committee which liaises with the four western associations and the Association Canada Lands Surveyors. Thank you for providing a booth at this meeting and for the ongoing support of our students.

Geomatics is flying as an industry at the moment. Geomatics Canada estimates that the annual turnover in geomatics related business is 32 billion dollars annually - Canada generates nine billion.

Out of 30 students in third and fourth year, 28 of those who had summer jobs were employed in the survey field. As a former employer, I am aware that students tend to draw on resources and time and do not tend to generate a lot of income so the training and skills the profession provides is appreciated.

The Department prides itself on being one of the top departments in the world, if not the top, depending on the criteria used. In terms of student numbers, as an undergraduate program, the Department in Calgary is flying. There are 175 undergraduate students in second, third and fourth year. It is encouraging to see that a lot of students are viewing surveying as a viable career as there are a lot of jobs out there. It forms the back bone of geomatics and we are seeing that in the technical electives a lot of students are choosing courses that will set them on the path to surveying and cadastral surveying specifically. There are approximately 80-85 students in the post-graduate program of which 50% M.Sc., 35% Ph.D. and 19% facility members. That makes us one of the leading departments in the world.

What remains a challenge for us is producing a large output in cadastral related research. Presently we only have three students enrolled. We should look at multiplying that by five to ten students if we want to stay at the forefront. I want to emphasize that as a profession if we do not stay ahead of research then other people will generate ideas for us. Universities have two functions – one is to teach and educate and the other one is to form ideas.

On the managerial side, Dr. El-Sheimy was the interim head for one year and, in July, Dr. Elizabeth Cannon will take over as head of the Department. I will remain as a associate head of the undergraduate program and Sue Scone as the associate head of the graduate program.

The Department is celebrating its 25th anniversary on the 28th and 29th of October. A banquet will be held which will coincide with the student’s award night. Tickets are $100 each with $50 going to the scholarship legacy fund for second, third and fourth year students which will run for the next five to ten years to celebrate the 25th anniversary. We encourage and welcome you all to attend this event. On the 29th there will be an open house with tours and demonstrations and lost peg competitions.

On another note, the Department along with other players within the geomatics industry have produced six posters – 80,000
will be generated. I am impressed with the way the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association allocates its time and resources to marketing, which is critical. Thank you very much for that.

In closing, thank you very much for inviting me and for allowing us to participate. I look forward to seeing many of you at our 25th anniversary. Thank you

Mr. Ingraham came forward and addressed the assembly as follows:

Thank you Mr. President, members of Council, ladies and gentlemen:

It is my pleasure to represent NAIT at the Annual General Meeting and I thank you for inviting me. I would like to thank the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association on behalf of NAIT.

We have had a very close working relationship with the Association again this year, as in past years; they have provided a lot of input into the program. The Association’s members are very active on the advisory committee and NAIT is an advisory driven program.

In addition, the Association has provided a number of scholarships which has helped in attracting students and subsequently with their completion of their diploma. As Mike alluded to, the Association has been tremendous in providing employment – both summer jobs and permanent employment for our graduates. This has had a tremendous impact on the program. About 15 years ago, the program had about 15 students. We now take in 30 students and we generally have 50 applicants – this year we have 63. I think the employment opportunities in addition to the nature of the business have had a tremendous effect on this particular aspect of our program.

With respect to what is going on at NAIT, we have had some evolution problems with the astonishing rate of technology. This year, our program head and one of our instructors in conjunction with the industry tried a new approach to RTK instruction. We had a one week experience where we rented equipment and entered into an agreement with the company to provide technical expertise and we provided some instructional backup in the venue. We were able to obtain ten rovers and a base station so that each student could have a hands on experience which does not occur with costs of RTK equipment in most institutions. That was a positive experience which we will be repeating.

In closing, at NAIT we value the relationship with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and we are prepared to assist with keeping the relationship vibrant. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hebb addressed the assembly as follows:

Thank you Mr. President. Good afternoon Association members and welcomed guests:

I am very proud to be representing SAIT this afternoon and I am pleased to be asked to speak on behalf of SAIT.
The year has flown by at SAIT, it seems like we just took in these students last fall not two years ago. We are happy that 28 students have graduated from the program this year. We have 17 students graduating from the survey stream. I am not sure if everyone is aware of this but after the first semester SAIT students are broken down into surveying and mapping streams. We are pleased to announce 100% employment for these students which we could not do without the support from industry.

Our goal is to have 40 students enrolled in the fall and we have received far more applicants. I think we are full and have a waiting list.

Last year, there was great support from industry on industry nights. It has been an excellent experience for the students along with the instructors. It appears that first year students are working during the summer which makes a big difference when they come back in the fall to have that experience behind them.

Last year, one of the students revived the geomatics club at SAIT. This club mixes first and second year students together and creates mixer nights to bring people in from private industry and guest speakers. It has been great to see the support there as well.

This year, we are trying to revamp our continuing education calendar to try and keep current with industry and try and support industry as much as we can from an educational stand point. We have looked at a survey assistant fast track program which would be a three week training program for a rod person. We have talked about it at our advisory committee meetings and we hopefully will run this program in either summer or fall to cover some of the basics for an assistant on a survey crew.

With the survey certificate that we offer at SAIT in the evening and weekends it has typically been an office position for someone to come in and receive about 160 hours of training to put them into a CAD position in a survey office. We have added a third option which is a field option. Instead of doing the CAD side we will add in GPS, advanced total stations and GPS theory to try and train people for the field.

In closing, I would like to thank industry for all of their continued support, the great experience that the students get with work week in the fall, it never seems to be a problem placing them, and we appreciate all the support with jobs.

We are always looking for people to sit on the SAIT advisory board. The meetings take place in March and April. If anyone is interested in sitting on the board they can contact myself of Paul Delorme at SAIT. Thank you very much.

President Halliday addressed the assembly as follows:

My job, and Council’s job, is made much easier by the dedication of its committee volunteers. We have been very fortunate that they have volunteered their time to the Association and I would like to take this opportunity to thank them and present a small gift of appreciation to the committee chairs.
Of a total membership of 504, including honorary life members, honorary members, retired members and articulated students, we have 124 members who serve the Association on Council, committees and other ALSA activities - that’s 25%. In my opinion, that’s a remarkable commitment!

Once again, I would ask you to sign up to join an Association committee for 2004-2005. Without the volunteers, the Association cannot move ahead. The volunteer sheet is on page 96 in the information package and at the back of the room.

The following committee chairs were asked to come forward to receive their gifts of appreciation:

Convention and Social – Mark Kocher
Editorial Board – David McArthur
Historical & Biographical – Bob Baker
Legislation Ad Hoc – Terry Hudema
Practice Review Board – Chad Finner
Professional Development – Colin Jeschke
Public Relations – Duncan Gillmore
Registration – Peter Brown
RPR Ad Hoc Committee – David Hagen
Standards – Al Jamieson
Public Lands Dispositions Subcommittee – Stephen Green
Section 9 Ad Hoc – Larry Pals

Gifts were also presented to members remaining on Council.


President Halliday called upon incoming President Al Nelson to take the Oath of Office:

I, Al Nelson, do solemnly and sincerely swear, that I will execute the duties of the office of President of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association to the best of my ability, and in accordance with the laws of the Province of Alberta; and uphold the traditions established by my predecessors.

This function I will perform without affection, partiality, or prejudice to any member of this Association; or any member of the public. The importance of the rights of the public and minorities; and the protection of these rights; will always be considered paramount in all matters brought before me. I will treat all confidential information presented to me as privileged; and will maintain the honour and dignity of this office as if it were my own; so help me God.

Mr. Nelson asked the retiring members to step down and the returning and newly elected members of Council to return to the
head table and take the Oath of Office as follows:

I, [state your name], do solemnly swear, that I will fulfill the duties and responsibilities of Councillor of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association to the best of my ability, and in accordance with the laws of the Province of Alberta; and uphold the traditions established by my predecessors.

As Councillor, I will serve without affection, partiality, or prejudice to any member of this Association; or to any member of the public.

I will treat all confidential information presented to me as privileged; and will maintain the honour and dignity of this office as if it were my own; so help me God.

Mr. Nelson presented Mr. Halliday Past President with the past present's plaque and pin signifying that he had faithfully served as President of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association. Mr. Halliday presented Mr. Nelson with the gavel.

Mr. Nelson addressed the membership as follows:

I would like to welcome and congratulate the new members of Council. I would like to congratulate the other members that ran for office and your participation is appreciated.

Becoming a land survey for me was a very proud moment in my life. This profession, this Association and the skilled members who make them what they are have been very kind to me. This new privilege of serving as your President representing my peers is another great honour for me and one that I will not take lightly. Examples of dedication, leadership and professionalism that are set by such people as President Jim Halliday are one that I will do my very best to emulate. There are big shoes to fill by Jim and Dave.

I would like to congratulate all the award recipients for their personal and professional achievements and for their commitment to the profession for which they have been recognized. To those of you that have achieved the milestone of receiving your commission at this AGM – congratulations and welcome to this Association. We are looking forward to your participation and the wisdom you will bring to us.

The previous Council has set some important things in motion. There is a challenge to review all committee’s terms of reference with the view to ensure appropriate priorities, to allow for our volunteer members to make the best use of their very valuable time and to possibly eliminate unnecessary overlap with other committees. That is a significant job. The terms of reference for some of the committees is massive and it is a great burden on some of our member with the amount of work they undertake to do on a volunteer bases over the course of a year.

The second item is the future of the profession. A committee has been formed and Council has approved a budget for it. It is a very important issue that we have been struggling with for some time.
through various committees under different names. We will take a very distinct run at that again. The issue has been evidenced by sister associations and other provinces regarding the declining entry standards and licensing. We would like to treat these difficulties as opportunities to deal with our future and I think we are well positioned to enter into that.

On a personal level, I would like to streamline the Executive Committee to possibly spend less time dealing with detail which means I will be charging Council with having their homework done. Perhaps giving them less direction from the Executive Committee merely ensuring that the information is sufficient for their consideration. I would like to try and use communication technology to streamline some of the meetings that might not take all day. This saves our members time and expenses as well.

I would like to recognize the work that our staff has done. I have received a lot of comments from this AGM. People have said that they have had a little more time to enjoy all the attributes of Jasper and I think a good portion of that, besides credit from Mr. Halliday, comes from all our staff and all their diligent work that they have done organizing this so it runs smoothly and efficiently. With that, I will undertake to you that if I can orchestrate next year’s AGM, which is also in Jasper, to give you more time to enjoy it and still get our business done. I will do everything in my power to do that. Thank you very much.

The membership participated in an unrecorded open forum.

President Nelson announced that new business recommendations must be in writing and signed by the mover and seconder. New business resolutions are not binding on Council but Council is obliged to consider the matter, if passed by the membership.

When members are voting, they are voting to have Council consider the matter. It does not necessarily mean that the decision will be implemented by Council.

**NEW BUSINESS MOTION #1**

*It was MOVED by Mr. Allred, seconded by Mr. Woolgar, that Council consider preparing a position paper on adverse possession for submission to the Government of Alberta and/or other bodies such as the Alberta Law Reform Institute.*

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Allred spoke to the motion by indicating that the motion is purposely vague as he has his own opinions on the subject. He commented that it is an important issue that should be studied and the Association’s position should be made known as surveyors are the ones most closely involved with boundary issues. He recognized that many do not really understand adverse possession as well as they should and he included himself in that group.
Mr. Allred advised that the most recent report from the Alberta Law Reform Institute on this topic is a good read, somewhat tedious, but a very educational document. He commented that after reading the report, his comprehension of the subject was amplified, something he misunderstood was clarified and his concerns regarding adverse possession in Alberta were heightened. He stressed that he does not want his concerns to dictate the direction of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. Mr. Allred advised that he would be pleased to offer to prepare the first draft of a Ken Allred position paper on the subject with the intention of stimulating an understanding, further discussion and, hopefully, an Association position paper. Mr. Allred stated that the Association has a responsibility to the government and the public to put forward its considered position on this issue, whether it be pro or con or somewhere in between. He commented that those in government and the legal profession need the Association’s opinion in order to make a decision that is correct for the citizens of Alberta on this important and sometimes controversial issue that often has a major impact on private boundaries in Alberta. He commented that, to quote the new ALSA Vice President, “we need to maintain that voice at the table” and that we have an important point of view but that often we do not use our voice to articulate this point of view. Mr. Allred encouraged the membership to support this motion as it is an important issue and an issue that needs to be objectively addressed.

Mr. Woolgar commented that it is not in the Association’s best interest to have legislation passed or altered or changed without our professional input to help guide and protect the public. He indicated that he feels this is a good opportunity for surveyors to become involved with adverse possession and that he thinks it will help understand a bit more about adverse possession.

NEW BUSINESS MOTION #2

It was MOVED by Mr. Main, seconded by Mr. Chris Chiasson, that Council consider encouraging discussion between the Special Areas Board and Public Lands to develop a unified system of dispositions which are readily available to the public.

Motion Carried

Mr. Main alluded to comments he made during the unrecorded session of open forum. He commented that there is a stumbling block when working in special areas to gain access to and indicate where these documents are to indicate where these individual interests may lay. He suggested that it would be a good step to somehow encourage them to make these documents available. He commented that he realizes the time and resources of the Special Areas Board are probably quite limited and suggested that, perhaps, an option to give them would be to at least consider filing those with the Land Titles Office. Mr. Main recognized that there may some challenges there for the Board because of perceived jurisdictional problems. He suggested that one of the challenges may take the form that the disposition numbers are indeed duplicated between the two sys-
tems so there may be an MSL12345 in both systems and they may need to consider going from a six digit number to an eight or ten digit number. Mr. Main reiterated that he feels the Association should do what it can to foster the availability of these documents to the public.

President Nelson indicated that there were no further items for new business.

Mr. Nelson announced that $6,000 was raised for the J.H. Holloway Foundation from the silent auction.

Wayne Leeman was invited to make parting remarks on behalf of guests from other provinces.

Thank you Al. I would like to share thanks on behalf of the visiting delegates from across Canada as well as those neighbouring states to the south of your province. We greatly appreciate the invitation that you have extended to us to not only attend but participate, as we see fit, in your 95th Annual General Meeting.

We value the venue you have chosen – it is quite breath-taking to be honest with you. The facilities at the Jasper Park Lodge and Jasper National Park are simply rich in landscape, history and facility. I cannot think of a better venue to bring out the best in people whether we are working or playing.

We appreciate the business aspect of your program including the seminars and found the topic matter interesting and informative and enjoyable. We have enjoyed the social component – it is not only fun but it is great to have the opportunity to play, if you will, to enjoy life with not only old friends but new friends that we have made along the way.

On a personal note, I have met some people that I knew before and found it heartwarming that many of you have your roots in Manitoba and are starting your life and now are contributing in a very significant way to be development of Alberta.

We appreciate Past President Jim for the work he has done along with his team. Thank you to everyone from the President’s forum, social evening, seminars, business portion and the social aspect which includes Joanne. Your hospitality has been second to none.

I have been approached by our partners that have travelled with us on this journey and they have asked me to share with you their thanks for the program that was put together by Joanne and Nancy and their team and a special thank you on their behalf. We will miss having Jim and Joanne on the tour but all good things come to an end from time to time. We look forward to Al and Nancy in their contribution and representative of your province. Thank you very much and greatly appreciated.

President Nelson declared the 95th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association closed at 2:52 p.m.
List of Appendices

Appendix A
Financial Statements for the Year Ending April 30, 2003

Appendix B
Executive Director's Report

Appendix C
Registrar's Report

Appendix D
Committee Reports

Appendix E
Rationale Documents

Appendix F
New Members

Appendix G
Twenty-Five Year Pin Recipients

Appendix H
Presentation of Honorary Life Membership

Appendix I
Presentation of Professional Recognition Award

Appendix J
Presentation of President's Award

Appendix K
List of Exhibitors and Sponsors
**Financial Statement**  
*for the year ending April 30, 2003*  

Statement of Financial Position as at April 30, 2003  
as prepared by Peterson Walker, Chartered Accountants  
and approved by Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and short-term</td>
<td>$1,399,998</td>
<td>$1,502,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments—Note 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>180,222</td>
<td>150,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses (note 4)</td>
<td>24,859</td>
<td>18,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,605,079</td>
<td>1,671,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in RPR Index</td>
<td>68,669</td>
<td>103,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving Fund (note 5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Assets</strong></td>
<td>1,673,748</td>
<td>1,775,176</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><strong>Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and</td>
<td>60,485</td>
<td>$73,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accrued liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>16,592</td>
<td>15,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions (note 7)</td>
<td>231,295</td>
<td>263,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308,372</td>
<td>352,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to RPR Index</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving Fund (note 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in capital assets</td>
<td>68,669</td>
<td>103,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally restricted</td>
<td>1,295,967</td>
<td>1,319,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,364,636</td>
<td>1,422,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$1,673,748</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,775,176</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lease Commitment</strong> (note 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix "A"
## Statement of Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2003</th>
<th>Budget 2003</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and levies</td>
<td>$193,924</td>
<td>$210,040</td>
<td>$(16,116)</td>
<td>$218,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and other</td>
<td>11,605</td>
<td>83,468</td>
<td>$(71,863)</td>
<td>63,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument division contribution</td>
<td>660,373</td>
<td>622,015</td>
<td>38,358</td>
<td>611,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate based cadastral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$865,902</td>
<td>915,523</td>
<td>(49,621)</td>
<td>916,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and committees <em>(schedule 1)</em></td>
<td>142,362</td>
<td>160,850</td>
<td>(18,488)</td>
<td>139,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic practice review <em>(schedule 2)</em></td>
<td>284,559</td>
<td>301,145</td>
<td>(16,586)</td>
<td>286,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expense <em>(schedule 3)</em></td>
<td>401,093</td>
<td>453,996</td>
<td>(52,903)</td>
<td>379,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on write-down of capital assets</td>
<td>23,572</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,572</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate based cadastral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$851,586</td>
<td>915,991</td>
<td>(64,405)</td>
<td>829,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internally Restricted Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue (expenses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary recoveries</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary expenses</td>
<td>(20,449)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15,721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>(16,799)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(22,265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>(34,343)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(3,473)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,336)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(72,264)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(37,005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue (under) Over Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$ (57,948)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 50,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statement of Changes in Net Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Balance at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Revenue (Over (Under) Expenses</th>
<th>Net Additions to Capital Assets</th>
<th>Balance at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$61,272</td>
<td>$(12,052)</td>
<td>$(49,220) $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>103,573</td>
<td>(46,956)</td>
<td>12,052</td>
<td>68,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invested in Capital Assets</strong></td>
<td>103,573</td>
<td>14,316</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internally Restricted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>919,011</td>
<td>(16,799)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>875,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(17,649)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>(34,343)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>(3,473)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Surveying in Alberta Publication Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Centennial Fund</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial AGM Fund</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Presenter Revolving Fund</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Survey Textbook Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,422,584</td>
<td>$(57,948)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,364,636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note 9*
## Statement of Cash Flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Provided by (Used In)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue (under) over expenses</td>
<td>(57,948)</td>
<td>50,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges not affecting cash:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>23,384</td>
<td>33,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on write-down of capital assets</td>
<td>23,572</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net changes in non-cash working</td>
<td>(81,121)</td>
<td>39,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital items <em>(note 10)</em></td>
<td>(92,113)</td>
<td>123,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investing activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds on sale of capital assets</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of capital assets</td>
<td>(13,886)</td>
<td>(29,190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in RPR Revolving Index Fund</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>(589)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash (Decrease) Increase</strong></td>
<td>(102,836)</td>
<td>94,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at beginning of year</td>
<td>1,502,834</td>
<td>1,408,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH AT END OF YEAR</strong></td>
<td>$1,399,998</td>
<td>$1,502,834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes to Financial Statements

**for the year ended April 30, 2003**

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

2. **Significant Accounting Policies**
   **General:** These financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles.

   **Donated Services:** The work of the Association is largely dependent on volunteer services contributed by its members. The value of donated services is not recognized in the financial statements.

   **Capital Assets:** Capital assets are recorded at cost and amortized over their estimated useful lives using the declining balance method at the following rates:

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

   Full amortization is taken in the year of acquisition and none in the year of disposal.
Revenue Recognition: The Association follows the deferral method of accounting for contributions. Contributions are included in revenue in the year they are received or receivable, with the exception that contributions to fund a specific future period’s operating expenses are included in revenue in that later period.

3. Cash and Short-term Investments
Cash and short-term investments include $1,295,967 (2002—$1,319,011) which have been designated for specific programs that are described in Note 9.

4. Prepaid Expenses
Prepaid expenses are comprised of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>$7,092</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent deposit</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>5,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s travel costs</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>1,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff dues</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$24,859</td>
<td>$18,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Investment In/Due to RPR Index Revolving Fund
The investment in RPR Index Revolving Fund represents the Association’s net equity in the fund. The fund is reported as a liability at the end of the current year because the Association is committed to provide further financial support to the fund.

6. Capital Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accumulated</td>
<td>Net Book</td>
<td>Accumulated</td>
<td>Net Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Book Value</td>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Accumulation 100</td>
<td>Book Value</td>
<td>Accumulation 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>$ 59,740</td>
<td>$34,910</td>
<td>$24,830</td>
<td>$26,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>14,603</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>9,035</td>
<td>7,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>21,832</td>
<td>11,768</td>
<td>26,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer software</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>109,641</td>
<td>63,152</td>
<td>46,489</td>
<td>60,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey equipment</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive equipment</td>
<td>54,604</td>
<td>41,493</td>
<td>13,111</td>
<td>32,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>16,087</td>
<td>10,393</td>
<td>5,694</td>
<td>6,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>78,169</td>
<td>55,989</td>
<td>22,180</td>
<td>42,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$187,810</td>
<td>$119,141</td>
<td>$68,669</td>
<td>$103,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Deferred Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees and levies</td>
<td>$231,295</td>
<td>$239,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate based cadastre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$231,295</strong></td>
<td><strong>$263,165</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

8. Lease Commitment

The Association has committed to an operating lease on its premises which expires June 30, 2005. Minimum annual lease payments are $25,950 plus common area costs.

9. Internally Restricted Funds

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

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

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

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

**Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund**—This fund is used to reimburse members who are either acknowledged delegates, invited speakers or participants at conferences or meetings outside of Alberta.

**History of Surveying in Alberta Publication Fund**—This fund was established to cover all or a part of costs associated with publishing a history of surveying in Alberta.

**Provincial Centennial Fund**—This fund was established to promote the surveying profession’s involvement in Alberta during the past 100 years. Any money not allocated to a specific project as at December 31, 2005 shall be transferred to the Financial Stabilization Fund.
Centennial AGM Fund—This fund was established to reduce the ticket price of events so that more members may attend the centennial AGM, bringing in high profile guest speakers and putting together displays or other materials associated with promoting the Association’s centennial.

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

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

10. Cash Flow Information

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>$(30,204)</td>
<td>$88,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>(6,697)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and</td>
<td>(12,978)</td>
<td>(37,634)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accrued liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>(4,428)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions</td>
<td>(31,870)</td>
<td>(6,652)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$(81,121)</td>
<td>$39,901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Schedules

Schedules 1, 2 and 3 compare actual revenue and expenses for the year to budgeted amounts. The budgets were prepared by management and approved by Council.

12. Use of Estimates

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

13. Financial Instruments

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

The Association does not believe it is subject to any significant concentration of credit risk. Cash and short-term investments are in place with major financial institutions. Accounts receivable are generally the result of services to members.

14. Comparative Figures

Certain of the 2002 comparative figures have been reclassified to conform with the current year’s presentation.
### Schedule 1

**Council and Committees for the year ended April 30, 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2003 Actual</th>
<th>2003 Budget</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>2002 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>$32,491</td>
<td>$34,500</td>
<td>$(2,009)</td>
<td>$34,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and examination</td>
<td>22,486</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>26,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>20,296</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>12,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s travel</td>
<td>20,115</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>(3,385)</td>
<td>25,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPR</td>
<td>9,082</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>(2,918)</td>
<td>8,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Board</td>
<td>8,740</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>(6,260)</td>
<td>10,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>5,216</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>3,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and biographical</td>
<td>5,018</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(982)</td>
<td>2,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>4,072</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>2,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention and social</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>(1,082)</td>
<td>1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(1,133)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(362)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomatics Engineering Liaison</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>(1,743)</td>
<td>2,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate based cadastre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$142,362</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(18,488)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$139,491</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule 2

**Systematic Practice Review for the year ended April 30, 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2003 Actual</th>
<th>2003 Budget</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>2002 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>$249,124</td>
<td>$255,860</td>
<td>$(6,736)</td>
<td>$242,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>9,402</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>7,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and transportation</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>5,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and plans</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>(1,370)</td>
<td>6,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5,625</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>3,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>12,285</td>
<td>(9,809)</td>
<td>17,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and dues</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>1,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(1,861)</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field supplies</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(1,470)</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rentals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$284,559</strong></td>
<td><strong>$301,145</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(16,586)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$286,997</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Administration Expenses
for the year ended April 30, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2003 Actual</th>
<th>2003 Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>2001 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>$175,476</td>
<td>$213,811</td>
<td>$(38,335)</td>
<td>$168,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building operations</td>
<td>$60,117</td>
<td>$60,117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$61,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>$20,908</td>
<td>$19,844</td>
<td>$1,064</td>
<td>$15,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and courier</td>
<td>$14,047</td>
<td>$19,100</td>
<td>$(5,053)</td>
<td>$16,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract work</td>
<td>$13,860</td>
<td>$23,500</td>
<td>$(9,640)</td>
<td>$17,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and donations</td>
<td>$13,750</td>
<td>$13,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies and photocopying</td>
<td>$13,378</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$(622)</td>
<td>$13,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>$12,993</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>5,993</td>
<td>$8,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment management fees</td>
<td>$12,239</td>
<td>$11,374</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery</td>
<td>$11,396</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>$11,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>$10,569</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>$9,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>$7,109</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$(3,891)</td>
<td>$5,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$5,979</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$(421)</td>
<td>$5,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges</td>
<td>$4,310</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>$3,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCBE levy</td>
<td>$3,960</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>$3,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$3,633</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>$2,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>$3,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>$3,491</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>$3,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence and travel</td>
<td>$2,872</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>$2,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and subscriptions</td>
<td>$2,655</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>$2,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, Internet and database</td>
<td>$1,514</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$(1,986)</td>
<td>$3,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$1,416</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$(84)</td>
<td>$2,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training and library</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$(2,815)</td>
<td>$3,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate and stamps</td>
<td>$736</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$(564)</td>
<td>$1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$(1,800)</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule 3**

**Total Administration Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003 Actual</th>
<th>2003 Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>2001 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$401,093</td>
<td>$453,996</td>
<td>$(52,903)</td>
<td>$379,625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Director's Report

It is often said that, “those who fail to learn from history are condemned to repeat it.” With that in mind, I have taken a particular interest in the history of surveying in Alberta and in the Association in the last year. This is no doubt due to the fact that I have had the opportunity to read the first several chapters of Judy Larmour’s forthcoming book on the history of surveying in Alberta. It has been fascinating to read the many stories and tales that she has uncovered. I have learned that as far back as the 1910s and 1920s, Alberta Land Surveyors were raising concerns about monumentation destruction, reciprocity in entry standards. Some issues never really go away.

As part of Judy’s history book, the Historical and Biographical Committee hopes to launch a new virtual museum which will be available on the web. I have been working on this project and it has been fascinating to learn what the Association was dealing with so many years ago now. It has also been neat to find out more about the first members of the Association who, until recently, were just names on a page to me.

A few years ago, I asked Sharon to compile a collage of pictures of our past presidents that we could hang in our boardroom. With a little bit of time and effort Sharon was able to compile this gallery but we were missing about seven pictures. Shortly after that, I came across an ALS News magazine from the mid 1970s asking the membership if they had pictures of these same seven past Presidents. It was obvious that this had been an uncompleted project for a long time. I am pleased to say that we are now missing only one past president’s picture – that being E.D. Robertson who was president in 1932. I want to thank Hon. Life Member Jack Webb for providing us a picture of Abel Seneca Weekes. I want to thank Judy Larmour for uncovering a picture of past President A.C. Talbot. Sharon did some digging and learned that T.W. Brown was a graduate of the University of Toronto. Thanks to her effort, she contacted The University of Toronto and they supplied us with his graduation picture. We were missing the picture of R.H. Cautley the younger brother of the more well know R.W. Cautley. Thanks to Allan Main for contacting all the Cautley’s in the Edmonton phone book and finding R.H. Cautley’s grandson. We are now able to add R.H. Cautley’s picture to our Past-Presidents gallery. In Jack Holloway’s History of the Association from 1910-1960, there is a brief reference to a G.W. MacLeod. It noted that he was both an Alberta Land Surveyor and an engineer. With APEGGA’s tremendous assistance, we were able to learn that George Waters MacLeod was a lieutenant colonel in the Royal Canadian Regiment during World War I. David Haas of the Royal Canadian Regiment provided us with Lieutenant Colonel MacLeod’s picture and obituary.

Through my historical research, I have learned that the Association has undertaken a number of strategic planning exercises. History has shown us that some were successful and some were not.
In October 2003, Council conducted its own strategic planning exercise in response to the new business motion at last year’s Annual General Meeting. Council asked me to facilitate this session and I was pleased to do so. As has been outlined in Council Report, Council identified boundary uncertainties and membership demographics as the two priority items.

It is always easier to recognize a problem than it is to solve it. With the membership working flat out, it has been difficult this year for members to devote their usual volunteer time and efforts to our standing and statutory committees let alone any new committee. Council has, therefore, instructed each Committee chairman to prepare a point by point review of their terms of reference. It is intended that Council will review and prioritize all Committee’s terms of reference so that it can ensure that the most important issues, such as boundary uncertainties and membership demographics, can be discussed and solutions developed.

It became even more apparent to me this year that, like the membership, the Association staff is working flat out and our resources are taxed. Over the last several years, Council has established a number of ad hoc committees. The Committees are doing some great work but each one of them requires their own set of minutes, agendas and other pieces of administrative support. I, as much as anyone, want to ensure that the membership and the public continue to receive the same level of support that they have come to expect from the Association office. I put forth a proposal to Council to hire an additional full time staff person and that proposal was accepted. Because of several factors, the increased cost of the Association will be minimal. The Association currently has seven full time staff. Matt Parrish, our Geomatics Technologist, joined us upon his graduation from COGS last May. The Association also has two part-time staff members: Dick Bassil, Registrar, and Shirley Klein, Bookkeeper.

At last year’s AGM, there was a great deal of discussion on putting the property to mitigation document into the Manual of Standard Practice. I have reported in various ALS News articles about the number of phone calls that we receive from landowners about the right to enter and property damage. I am pleased to report that I have noticed a marked decrease in those types of phone calls. While they have not disappeared altogether, the trend is certainly in the right direction.

I still receive a number of phone calls (more than I really want) about non-land surveyors who may appear to be engaging in the practice of land surveying. Often, I may get little more than anecdotal information. In these cases, I usually send a letter on behalf of the Association advising the non-land surveyor that we are paying close attention to their activities. If we do receive evidence of breach under the Land surveyors Act of a non-land surveyor engaging in the practice of land surveying or an Alberta Land Surveyor allowing a non-member to practice, then the appropriate action is taken by the Association.

There never seems to be a shortage of things to do to keep all of us quite busy. As you will have read about elsewhere, we will be entering into a lease for new office space for some reason, our current
landlord declined to put in a proposal for us to renew our current space. At about the same time this was happening, I was also trying to secure space with the Calgary Hyatt for our 2007 AGM. They too declined to offer us the space that we require. We are now looking at an alternative and expect to be able to make a recommendation to Council shortly after this year’s AGM.

I have tried to highlight only a few of the issues. There are many more as you will no doubt be aware of as you read Council Report and ALS News. I continue to enjoy working for the members of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. I enjoy continually discovering new things and trying to learn the lessons our history has taught us.
Appendix “C”

Registrar's Report

Educational Information for Active Members, Articled Pupils and Affiliate Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Commission</th>
<th>Articled</th>
<th>Affiliate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Association is not aware of the educational institutions that some members attended. Some members attended more than one educational institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Type</th>
<th>Active Members</th>
<th>Articled Pupils</th>
<th>Affiliate Members</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Life</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Practitioners</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently in the Association

(40 - 49) Born between Jan. 1/1953 and Dec. 31/1962
(50 - 59) Born between Jan. 1/1943 and Dec. 31/1952
(60 - 69) Born between Jan. 1/1933 and Dec. 31/1942
(70+) Born before Jan. 1/1933
Information Not Available
Committee Reports

**Convention and Social**

Through five meetings this year, the Committee has dealt with the terms of reference as provided by council. In particular, the Committee has:

1. Organized the 95th Annual General Meeting in Jasper, at the Jasper Park Lodge from April 22 to 24th, 2004. This is the first time in Jasper in three years, and it should be a fun and exciting meeting. The theme night in particular should be a great deal of fun. We look forward to seeing everybody in Jasper.

2. Liaised with the Professional Development Committee regarding seminars for the 2004 AGM. One seminar is on Intellectual Property. The other seminar, presented by Alberta Sustainable Resource Development, is on Public Lands Dispositions. These are to be held on Thursday April 22, at the Jasper Park Lodge.

3. Organized and held a successful golf tournament August 15, 2003 at the Lacombe Golf and Country Club. The event was again sold out. This year brought an improved prize distribution process. We’ll see you all back again in 2005 at Lacombe.

4. The Committee has begun planning for the 100th AGM, set for Calgary in 2009. The general theme will be looking back on the first 100 years of the ALSA. Some interesting ideas have been bandied about, and more progress will be made by future committees.

5. The Committee has begun planning for the 101st AGM, tentatively set for Jasper in 2010. The general theme will be looking forward on the next 100 years of the ALSA.

**Committee Members**  
**Chairman:** Mark Kocher  
**Vice Chairman:** Wade Heck  
**Past Chairman:** Bryan Bates  
**Council Liaison:** Jim Halliday  
**Exhibitor Liaison:** Grant Beach  
**Members:** Scott Brooks, Joanne Halliday, Wade Heck, Nancy Nelson, Ashley Robertson, Des Shaw, George Smith, Mark Sutter
Discipline
The Chairman and Committee fulfilled all of the statutory requirements of it on all of the four complaints received at the time of the writing of this report.

We also fulfilled our terms of reference to develop and maintain an adequate educational program to orient and instruct Committee members in the discipline process when the Association held a seminar on the discipline process in May 2003. Although fairly well attended, participation at this seminar is absolutely critical to any member wishing to serve the discipline process. As Chairman, I believe it should become mandatory within the first two years of a member’s five year term on the Committee.

At the time of writing this report:

1. One complaint has been investigated, a hearing held, and a decision reached, and it was reported on in ALS News.

2. One complaint has been investigated, a hearing held, a decision reached, and the member that was subject of the complaint has been served with the decision. It is now in the statutory appeal period within our Act.

3. One complaint was received by the Registrar and was placed in the mediation process allowed within our Act. At the time of writing this report, mediation is still ongoing.

4. One complaint was received by the Registrar that has been forwarded on to myself and is currently under investigation.

This concludes my report for the current year.

Committee Members
Chairman: Dave McWilliam
Vice Chairman: Ken Allred, Don Jaques, Alex Hittel, Larry Pals
Members: John Wallace, Bruce Beairsto, Daniel Lachance, Bruce Gudim, Terry Hudema, Bill Hunter, Con Lenius, Doug MacAulay, Tim Martin, David Thomson, Wayne Wesolowsky

Editorial Board
The Editorial Board’s purpose is to develop a textbook designed for students in surveying in Alberta and to be used as a reference book for Alberta Land Surveyors and other professionals. The Board had eight meetings during the year, including three face-to-face meetings with the author group. Initially, an RFP was sent out and four separate proposals were received. The proposals each had strengths and weaknesses and the Board felt that no one proposal covered all the content that was envisioned. The Board also felt that the possibility of the groups collaborating could provide the Board with an even stronger technical and practical content. We supported the leads of the groups identified in the proposals discussing this possibility either independently or by meeting with the Board. This
was successful in that the groups decided to work together on the book.

The Board also took the occasion to develop a “straw man” outline of the proposed book using the information from the different proposals. This initial straw man was used to further develop the outline by the author group the book. The author group is led by Dr. Alec McEwen as Editor, Marie Robidoux LLB, CLS, Ken Allred, ALS, Dr. Robert Radovanovic, ALS, Khaleel Khan, CLS. These lead authors will call on ALS practitioners to assist in the writing of their chapters. The proposed book will have six chapters: Surveying Profession, Real Property Law, Parcel Boundaries, Land Registration, Official Surveys, and Other Surveys. Each chapter will also be supplemented with case studies. The timeline for the book calls for a draft final manuscript to the Board by March 15, 2005 with a final manuscript by July 15, 2005.

A recommendation was sent to Council on February 9 and has been accepted by Council to proceed with the book given the proposed outline and budget.

Committee Members

Chairman: David McArthur
Vice Chairmen: Fred Cheng
Council Liaison: Bill Lovse
Committee Members: Greg Hebb (SAIT), Terry Ingraham (NAIT), Dr. Mike Barry (UofC)

Executive

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

In addition to making recommendations to Council, the Executive Committee was charged with investigating and researching other issues.

In early 2003, the Executive Committee received a number of resumes in response to a newspaper advertisement for public member. The Association received between 30-40 resumes and was truly impressed with the candidates who were prepared from Medicine Hat was appointed public member of the Practice Review Board and Lawrence Kluthe was appointed public member on Council.

Secretary Treasurer Monroe Kinloch and Executive Director Brian Munday reviewed the Association’s requirement for office space. It was pointed out that the Association’s current lease for office space ends in 2005 but that July or August 2004 would be the preferred time to move if the Association was to move at all. Messrs. Kinloch and Munday looked at 17 or 18 buildings and, in the end, the Association entered into a lease for space at the Phipps McKinnon Building in downtown Edmonton.
The Executive Committee, on behalf of the Association, has continued to make a number of presentations to various groups concerning issues such as buried facilities legislation and the preservation of survey monuments.

The Executive Committee continues to keep a careful watch on the Association’s finances. While post sales have been exceptionally strong, the Executive Committee had been concerned about its rate of return on investments. The Executive Committee sought proposals from firms to manage its investments. Several proposals were received, carefully reviewed, and in the end, it was decided to remain with our current investment advisor TAL Private Management Limited. At the end of each month, the Executive Committee carefully reviews the Association’s financial statements and ensures that value is being received.

**Committee Members**

*President:* Jim Halliday  
*Vice President:* Al Nelson  
*Past President:* Dave McWilliam  
*Secretary Treasurer:* Monroe Kinloch

**Historical & Biographical**

The Committee met a total of five times over the course of the year with little time wasted in swinging into action dealing with the action items that were carried over.

The major item on all meeting agendas during the year related to the preparation of the “History of Surveying in Alberta” book. The 2005 Annual General Meeting in Jasper was established as the date when the book would be available for circulation.

Early in the year, the author, Judy Larmour circulated a draft of chapters 4 & 5 for the members’ review and comment. The chapters outlined historic events that had happened to surveyors on various projects in surveying for irrigation, roads and township subdivision. The members were there to clarify and enhance the chapters and presented a number of suggestions. The benefits of self-publishing versus contracting a publisher was reviewed with Ms. Larmour agreeing to approach the limited number of publishers in Alberta. The Committee at their next meeting reviewed chapters 1 to 8, which were given an excellent rating by the members. A number of suggestions were offered for the author’s benefit to clarify some historic events. It was agreed that references to measurements would be given in imperial units in events that happened prior to the adoption of metric.

The author reported that she had received some preliminary interest for publishing from an Alberta firm. Other publishing firms were considered as being potential publishers but were eliminated on cost or not being able to deliver within the time frame. It was suggested that the book should be given a name that has to give some significance to cataloguing and lay persons gave the members the opportunity to present a number of “eye catching” titles.

The Committee was informed that there had been no response to the circular seeking a curator to monitor the collection policy that was approved by Council. Mr. Olsson agreed to act in the capacity
of curator as an interim measure. Information on a virtual museum website was presented with the suggestion that this would be an avenue to make this information available to the public.

A draft of chapter 9 was presented for review and comment at a third meeting. Members responded with their comments, which were forwarded onto the author for consideration in a revision. Ms. Larmour reported that a publishing firm had expressed an interest in the book. The firm had agreed to read a couple of chapters to determine the seriousness of their interest. The Executive Director agreed to meet with the firm to sort out the details should an interest be expressed.

Information from a firm offering to establish a virtual museum for the Association was circulated to the Committee for consideration. Following a review of the information, it was agreed that it was too expensive for what would be the final product. Mr. Munday commented that he would attempt to create our own virtual museum as an alternative to contracting to a private source. The Committee was given the opportunity to review a sample of a virtual museum prepared by Mr. Munday at a subsequent meeting. The information was well received by the members.

Committee Members

Chairman: Bob Baker  
Vice-Chairman: Allan Main  
Council Liaison: Les Frederick  
Members: Warren Barlow, Reid Egger, John Haggerty, Murray Ingalls, Gord Olsson, Mark Selander, Charlie Weir

Legislation Ad Hoc Committee

In 2003-2004, the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee held five telephone conference call meetings. The proposed legislation presented as part of the Committee’s 2002-2003 Report was forwarded to ALSA’s solicitor, as well as ALSA’s Standards Committee and Practice Review Board for their comments. The Committee reviewed the responses and decided amendments were required to satisfy concerns raised by these bodies as well as by the membership.

The proposed ten-year time limit proposed and the determination if the public was aware of the monumentation were the major concerns. In an attempt to find solutions, other legislation was reviewed which showed the Manitoba Surveys Act to have a procedure which, in the Committee’s opinion, could be adopted to suit the process in Alberta. The Chairman held a meeting with Gary Fraser, MLS, Examiner of Surveys on December 2, 2003 to discuss the Manitoba system which was very informative. The Committee greatly appreciated his input.

The current draft has removed any reference to time and has added the requirements for notification to affected land owners as a solution to concerns raised. The Committee is still of the opinion the current draft wording needs additional work before a recommendation can be made. It would again be the Committee’s opinion that ALSA’s solicitor, the Director’s office and other ALSA committees and membership review the current draft and provide comments.
The Committee would also appreciate some time at the AGM to have an open forum to discuss the current wording.

The proposed changes to the Surveys Act are listed on page 101.

Committee Members
Chairman: Terry Hudema
Council Liaison: Les Frederick
Committee Members: Don George, Stephen Green, Craig McBride, Lee Morden, Garry Schirrmacher, John Van Berkel

Nominating

As most past chairmen can attest, the task of filling a “slate” with enough candidates, to actually have an election, is not as easy as it might seem. Undaunted, I began my telephone calls in October of 2003 knowing that I already had two land surveyors that had volunteered to run for two of the six positions to be filled.

By January 5, 2004, after having made no less than 60 phone calls, I still only had three volunteers for the six positions, not to mention the desirability of actually having an “election” and not an “acclamation!”

The deadline for submission of the “slate” was January 9, 2004. After escalating my stress level, not to mention my blood pressure, I began to use stronger methods and, in the next four days, managed to put together a full slate with an election for every position to be filled except that of Secretary Treasurer, for which I have only one candidate. The following members have allowed their name to stand for the indicated positions:

For President: Al Nelson
For Vice President (one to be elected): Stephen Green and Vic Wolchansky
For Secretary Treasurer: Larry Pals
For Councillors (three to be elected): Clayton Bruce, Grant Cross, Barry Fleece, David Marquardt

Thank you to our members who have allowed their name to stand, for it is these individuals who will run our Association for the upcoming year – an Association that operates for the benefit of the public, and our membership as a whole.

To all the members who seldom participate, I encourage you to do so. “Ask not what your profession can do for you, but what you can do for your profession.”

A “word of advice” to all of our members contemplating service in one of our elected roles: “Consider volunteering earlier than a few days or hours prior to the next deadline, for it will help reduce the stress placed on the next Chairman of the Nominating Committee.”

Committee Members
Chairman: Dave McWilliam
Committee Members: Ken Allred, Larry Pals
The Practice Review Board (PRB) has welcomed a new public member this term in Mr. D. Russell Barnes, following the departure of Mr. Lawrence Kluthe who had served on the board for so many of the previous years. The Board welcomed four new members with the departure of four others whose terms were completed. Another four members have carried on since the previous term. We will be looking for about three new appointments for next term as we have that number of members leaving the Board.

Systematic Practice Review (SPR)

The Practice Review Board (PRB) has met five times thus far in the present term, commencing with our July 16, 2003 meeting. In addition, we held a conference call on December 3 to deal with various correspondence on active files. We have one more meeting scheduled for this term on April 14, 2004.

Over this past term, the Board has considered 25 new Phase 2 reviews with another four or five slated for the April meeting. From these, four follow-up reviews have been requested, so far. We have had three practitioners voluntarily attend the Board meeting while their practice review was being considered.

The Board did not conduct any formal hearings during this term, and, although there have been no files referred directly to the Discipline Committee, the PRB did lodge one complaint with the Registrar in January, regarding a practitioner’s failure to respond.

All of the Phase 2 files of SPR have now been initiated and will be considered by the Board over the next few meetings. The Phase 3 program will commence very early into the next term of the Practice Review Board.

Interpretive Bulletins

The Practice Review Board has not published any Interpretive Bulletins in the present term.

PRB Vice Chairman, Bernie McKenna prepared an article for the September 2003 issue of ALS News and PRB member Bill Halma prepared one for the December issue. PRB member Brent Murray has an article prepared for the March issue, as well.

Committee Members

Chairman: Chad Finner
Vice Chairman: Bernie McKenna
Public Member: D. Russell Barnes
Committee Members: Clayton Bruce, Bill Halma, Brent Murray, Paul Westersund, Dwight Wiberg, Murray Young

Professional Development

The Professional Development Committee met seven times during the 2003/2004 term. Two of the meetings were held in Red Deer, the remaining five meetings were held as conference calls.

The mandate of the Committee is to meet the educational needs of the membership. To meet the mandate the following seminars were scheduled:
Three Getting It Right seminars were scheduled in Calgary (March 2004), Edmonton (November 2004), and Grande Prairie (May 2004). The Edmonton seminar was cancelled due to the low number of registrants.

The Service Best seminar (November 2003) was held and well received by all attendees.

The Condominium Act seminar (January 2004) was held as a videoconference between Calgary and Edmonton. The seminar had over 100 participants, with a large delegation from City of Calgary.

The Exam Preparation Seminar (March 2004) will be held in Red Deer.

Two half-day seminars are scheduled for the 2004 AGM. One seminar is based on Intellectual Property Liability; the other is a presentation on Public Lands Dispositions.

Three other seminars are currently being prepared. The first is a GPS seminar leaning towards the assessment of results and compliance with the Manual of Standard Practice. The second seminar will be on Real Property Reports and based on input from the Practice Review Board. These two seminars are planned for presentation next term. The third seminar is in the initial stages of development and will focus on the interpretation of the definitions from Alberta Environment.

Five new Getting It Right presenters will be trained in August 2004. The five new presenters are necessary to broaden the number of presenters available and to replace two presenters who have withdrawn. The presenters and participants manual are being updated and will be part of the training program for the presenters.

A recommendation was made to Council regarding Recommendation #3 from the 1996 AGM (regarding continuing education program). The Committee recommended implementing a voluntary point-tracking program, however Council defeated the motion.

Due to the low responses from the AGM and online questionnaires, the Committee has begun the implementation of a five-year plan. A cross section of seminars of interest to the membership was laid out encapsulating all facets of the survey profession. It will allow for longer term planning, producing, and delivery of quality seminars to the membership. Any seminars requested by the membership or other committees will be worked into the plan or supersede it if required.
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Chairman: Colin Jeschke
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Public Relations

The following is a brief summarized report of the Public Relations Committee over the past year:

1. **Home Building/Development Article:**
   An article titled “Are You Paying Too Much” was prepared, completed and released to the media in June, 2003. The budgeted cost was $150.00. To our knowledge, no media outlets picked up this release. An article titled “Buyers and Sellers need to know Boundaries” has been completed and will be released to the media in March of 2004. The budgeted cost is $150.00.

2. **Energy Article:**
   An energy article has been prepared by Rose Country Communications titled “Easement Brochure Saves Dollars and Lives.” The budgeted cost is $150.00.

3. **Utility Article:**
   This is an ongoing item.

4. **Develop Energy Brochure:**
   An energy brochure has been prepared by Rose Country and will be reviewed and discussed by the Public Relations Committee at their March 11, 2004 meeting.

5. **Attend AUMA/AAMD&C:**
   The AAMD&C trade show is scheduled for March 29, 2004. Lew Rodney of the Public Relations Committee will be responsible for obtaining volunteers to operate the booth. Mr. Maloney and Mr. Roop volunteered to operate the booth at the AUMA Trade Show in Calgary. They reported that it went very well. They informed the committee that several people were interested in winning the hand-held GPS unit donated by First Order Measurement Solutions Inc.

6. **Promote Meetings with the Cities of Edmonton and Calgary:**
   This is an ongoing item. The Committee felt that meetings held in the past between interested surveyors and the cities of Edmonton and Calgary were beneficial. Both meetings are scheduled for the spring of 2004.

7. **Publish Three Real Estate Articles:**
   An article was completed by Rose Country Communications and released to the media in June 2003. To our knowledge, no media outlets picked this article up. There is an article on this topic scheduled to be released in March, 2004.

8. **Promote and Maintain the RPR Index System:**
   This is an ongoing item. The Committee discussed this extensively at their meeting on February 12, 2004. Ross Woolgar suggested that the Committee wait until the polling is completed by Rose Country before any action is taken. All Committee members agreed.
9. Participate in Scouts Alberta Extreme Adventure Program:
   This is an ongoing item. Mr. Scott Partridge is responsible for this item. He informed the Committee that he will be meeting with Doug Campbell of Scouts Canada, and will report back to the Committee at the March 11, 2004 meeting.

10. Investigate and Develop Geocaching:
   Geocaching is an activity whereby coordinates are published to the public, and people attempt to find the coordinates using hand-held GPS receivers. The Public Relations Committee became involved with geocaching because they felt that where the activity was related to surveying, it would be an ideal opportunity to promote the profession of land surveying to the general public. The locations for the coordinates would have a surveying theme, and therefore, the Land Titles building at Fort Edmonton Park, and the Peter Fidler statue in Elk Point, Alberta are examples of locations that have been chosen and coordinates have been obtained by volunteer members of the Committee.
   
   An article titled “GPS and Geocaching with the Scouts,” written by Scott Partridge was published in September, 2003 edition of ALS News.
   
   On a general note, the Public Relations Committee, in response to a request from the current Council, discussed ways in which the profession of land surveying could be promoted to Junior and Senior High School students. Committee members agreed that the traditional role of the guidance counselor in educational institutions has changed substantially, and while career counselling is still one of the duties of a guidance counsellor, it plays a relatively minor role in today’s schedule. Therefore, a new method for promoting our profession should be devised. Subsequently, this is an ongoing item.

11. Participate in MEEDT brochure:
   This is an ongoing item. Brian Stecyk of Rose Country Communications is currently working with Strathcona County on this item.

12. Develop a Rural Surveying Display for Stopping Houses:
   This is an ongoing item. A draft has been prepared by Brian Stecyk and presented to the Committee for discussion at the March 11, 2004 meeting.

13. Raise Awareness of Monument Destruction with other Agencies:
   A brochure was developed, printed and sent to a wide variety of users. Counties, municipalities, Land Titles Offices are some of the users which are currently displaying the brochures to the public. The brochures are also available for Alberta Land Surveyors who wish to distribute them to their clients. A poster was developed with the same picture display. This poster was sent to Council for their comments. They subsequently returned it and requested that it be changed, as they were concerned about a possible negative image of the surveying profession. Council also requested a financial breakdown for the cost of printing and distributing these posters, since there will be a large number produced for a potentially large audience.
In response to Council’s request, the poster was changed by Brian Stecyk, and will be presented to the Public Relations committee for discussion at their March 11, 2004 meeting.

14. Amend/Update ALSA Brochures as necessary:

Members of the Public Relations committee provide comments to Brian Stecyk on the existing and any new brochures on an ongoing basis. The Subdivision brochure was reprinted this year.

15. Investigate Opportunities for the Alberta Centennial in 2005:

At the last meeting, the members of the Committee discussed several ideas to host an event to promote the profession of land surveying to the public. No definite decision has been made. It was generally decided that the ALSA might consider “piggybacking” on another major event to obtain maximum exposure and to keep costs to a minimum.

Mr. Partridge agreed to contact the administration at Heritage Park, and Brian Stecyk agreed to contact Cheryl Burns at the City of Edmonton to see what plans these organizations have for the Centennial year.

16. U of C Beef and Bun Reception:

This event was sponsored by the ALSA, and took place on February 4, 2004. Brian Munday reported that the event was a huge success. He also commented that he feels the Association would have its better success and in promoting the Profession by targeting first year students, since third and fourth year students have already, for the most part, decided on a particular career goal.

17. U of C Career Day:

Three members of the Committee worked the ALSA booth at this event on February 5, 2004. They reported back to the Committee that there was a fair amount of interest in the profession of land surveying.

18. Investigate Working with ASSMT in Developing a Relationship with other Educational Agencies:

Mr. Spencer of ASSMT stated that their Society participates in career fairs at NAIT and SAIT. He suggested that the ALSA might want to have their booth alongside ASSMT at these fairs. Mr. Spencer also stated that he would bring this item up at their next meeting, and then contact Brian Munday regarding the necessary arrangements for the career fair at SAIT in March of 2004.

19. Host BBQ for First Year Engineering Students at the University of Calgary:

Mr. Studer informed the Committee that the first year BBQ went very well. He agreed to organize this event next year, provided he was on the Committee at the time.
Some of the other items which were accomplished by the Public Relations Committee were:

20. **ALS News Articles:**

Three articles were written about the activities of the Public Relations Committee in *ALS News*.

21. **Regional Meetings:**

Two Regional chairmen were chosen from members of the Committee. These volunteers served as chairmen for each of the Regional meetings in Edmonton and Calgary. They also were responsible for arranging for guest speakers.

22. **Polling:**

The major issue discussed was whether or not a poll of the public should be conducted by a public relations firm to help guide the Association over the next few years with regard to our public relations efforts. Three requests were sent out to three different firms, and two proposals were received by the Committee. The Committee decided to use Rose Country Communications, but discussed extensively whether or not a poll of the general public and specific groups was worthwhile. Henceforth, it was decided that since the Association spends a great deal of money on public relations, and since a poll had not been conducted for several years, it was worthwhile. This recommendation was sent to Council for their final approval. Once Brian Stecyk completes the poll, he will report back to the Public Relations Committee with his findings at the March 11, 2004 meeting. The results of the poll should tell the ALSA how successful our public relations efforts have been in the last ten years. Furthermore, it should help in guiding the Association in their efforts over the next few years.

Finally, the Public Relations Committee’s budget was established at $35,000.00.

The dedication of the members of this Committee over the past year has been great. It has been a pleasure to serve the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

**Committee Members**

*Chairman:* Duncan Gillmore  
*Vice Chairman:* Scott Partridge  
*Past Chairman:* James Sloan  
*Council Liaison:* Ross Woolgar  
*ASSMT:* Mike Spencer  

**Committee Members:** Jay Abbey, Blaine Benson, Jule Brassard, Jeff Gibson, Damian Gillis, Colin Keir, Craig McBride, Pat Moloney, Jarl Nome, Lew Rodney, Andrew Roop, Sean Studer, Ross Woolgar

**Real Property Report Ad Hoc**

The RPR Ad Hoc Committee was formed in June of 2003 to take on some of the leftover tasks from the disbanded RPR Committee.
The new Committee’s mandate is as follows:

1. Investigate and prepare a position paper on the Western Torrens initiative from the Law Society of Alberta and make recommendations to Council;

2. Investigate and prepare a position paper on the impact of title insurance in the real estate transaction and make recommendations to Council;

3. Monitor the Real Property Report Index system and make recommendations to Council;

4. Attend meetings of the Real Estate Transaction Committee (RETC) and make recommendations to Council;

5. Work with the RETC, AUMA, AAMD&C and the DOA to finalize a glossary of terms common to all municipalities and make recommendations to Council.

The Committee held its first meeting in September of 2003 and subsequently has had three more face-to-face meetings with another scheduled for March 2004.

The Committee has passed along with a rationale document with recommendations to Council on the RPR Index.

The Committee is working on the tasks assigned by Council and will have the papers finished later this year.

Committee member Syd Loeppky, ALS has been named the chair of the RETC.
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Committee Members: Arlin Amundrud, Charles Chiasson, Bob Haagsma, Syd Loeppky, Bill Mintz, Bill Pang, Lew Rodney, Albert Rachynski, Rae Sutherland, Bob Wallace

Registration
The Registration Committee continues to operate well using a southern group (9 members plus Council Liaison) and a northern group (8 members). Currently there are a total of 86 students and affiliate members. The breakdown was as follows: 41 students for the southern group, 28 students for the northern group and 17 affiliate members. The northern and southern groups meet separately to deal with pupils from their respective half of the province on such issues as the ongoing articles of each student, annual or initial interviews, project reports, and oral exams. The Committee, as a whole, meets at the ALSA office several times a year. These meetings consider the following subjects:

- Review the draft exams on a question-by-question basis; a second meeting reviews the final draft.
- Review the results of the exams. This meeting considers the
overall marks to determine how the pupils fared as a group. A further assessment of the results on a question-by-question basis is done to determine areas of weakness and strength amongst those writing that particular set of exams.

- The first meeting after the exam review welcomes new members, selects a new chair and vice chair, tackles the new terms of reference, and takes a look at the coming year. Each new year brings certain tasks that are perhaps outside the normal routine of interviews, evaluation papers, setting and marking written exams and oral exams.
- There is usually at least one other full committee meeting to deal with non-routine matters.

The past year saw the implementation of a semi-annual sitting of the exams. The exam results were mixed. The results can be reviewed in the appropriate ALS News. It is hoped that with semi-annual examination sittings student will be afforded a greater opportunity to complete their term of articles in a timely fashion. The hope is this exam can become a closed book exam, as the other two are.

This year also saw the first full year of project report submissions. It is felt, by most, that these individual reports will succeed in better introducing the students to the more common aspects of surveying in Alberta and the day-to-day functions of an Alberta Land Surveyor.

As in prior years, the Committee is looking for ways to better perform its function. There have been a number of suggestions discussed about the structure of the Registration Committee. These have been along the lines of a sub-committee to deal strictly with the setting and marking of examinations, as well as consulting with a professional examiner to assist in the setting of exams.

As usual, the Committee is in need of new members to help fill the void left by retiring members. Admittedly, this committee work is demanding. However, it is educational and extremely important and rewarding. With the continued exposure to a great many students, new members and fellow ALSs a member takes away far more than he/she can bring. I strongly recommend all members consider contributing at least one three-year term to the Registration Committee.

Committee Members
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Standards
In 2003-2004, the Standards Committee held seven meetings in Red Deer and three telephone conference call meetings. This year, the Committee was comprised of twenty-four members, including the Director of Surveys, one member from Alberta Registries, one member from ASSMT and one member from ALSA Practice Review.

The Committee members were divided into working groups to deal with particular issues. The working groups then brought their findings back to the Committee for discussion and review.

The Committee worked on the following issues:

1. **Monitor standards and specifications for iron posts and marker posts:**
   - Ongoing action item for Standards Committee. No issues this year.

2. **Liaise with LTO regarding any changes concerning the LTO Procedures Manual:**
   - Two changes brought forward. Standards indicated to Council that it had no objections.

3. **Review standards for dispositions and report findings to Council:**
   - Assigned to subcommittee and recommendation coming forward for the 2004 AGM.

4. **Prepare a supplement to the MSP to be used to house historical material pertinent to today's surveyor and today's re-establishments:**
   - This information has been continually added to the ALSA website as administration has time available.

5. **Implement a corner recordation database:**
   - Recommendation coming forward to retain outside consultant.

6. **Investigate means to improve the survival of urban and rural monuments:**
   - Recommendation forwarded to Council and accepted.

7. **Standard Practice:**
   - Recommendation coming forward to 2004 AGM.

8. **Investigate requirements for monumenting cutoffs for Right-of-Ways:**
   - *ALS News* article developed. Council has forwarded article to PRB for their review.

9. **Investigate the process and obligation to register plans on Metis Settlements with Metis Settlements Land Registry and make recommendations for changes to the Manual of Standard Practice:**
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10. Investigate the process for submission of Section 47 coordinate lists and make recommendations to Council:
   Investigated and no action recommended. Council accepted.

11. Review the concept of restructuring the Manual of Standard Practice into two separate volumes as follows:
   a) practice standards and
   b) compendium of reference material, i.e.: Bulletin 38, LTO Procedures Manual, Commitment to Property Damage Mitigation.

   Various options for restructuring MSP discussed by subgroup and Committee. Recommendation prepared for Council’s approval prior to proceeding with changes to structure.

12. Investigate removing Part C, Section 3.11 (Marker Condition reports) from the Manual of Standard Practice:
   Investigated and recommended retaining as is. Council accepted.

13. Review, and provide feedback on, the proposed wording for the Surveys Act from the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee:
   Feedback provided to Legislation Ad Hoc Committee.

14. Review the Manual of Standard Practice as it pertains to Guide 56:
   Recommendation coming forward for the 2004 AGM.

15. Review the Manual of Standard Practice with respect to delayed posting plans as it pertains to:
   1. should reference controls be referred to as “markers” as opposed to “monuments”? (MSP Part C, Section 5.7 & Part D, Section 2.2) and Council endorsed recommendation.

   2. does the MSP sufficiently address the importance and necessity of establishing a reference control network of markers and its density, stability and maintenance throughout the delay period (MSP Part D, Section 2.2).

   Committee discussed and decision was provided to Council through an excerpt from the minutes.

16. Review results of City of Calgary pilot project and make recommendations (December 2003):
   Report prepared for discussion with City of Calgary in February 2004. Letter going to City requesting meeting to discuss.

17. Review the draft standards on integrated surveys from the Canadian Council on Geomatics and provide comment back to Council:
18. Investigate if it is warranted to include abbreviations for railway plans in the Manual of Standard Practice:
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Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee
The Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association established the Section 9 of the Surveys Act Ad Hoc Committee in October 2002. The Committee was established on the heels of the Statutory Boundary Tribunal Ad Hoc Committee.

As you may recall, the membership recommended to Council at the 2000 AGM that a committee be established that would look at providing an avenue to resolving boundary uncertainties and disputes. In 2001-2002, the Statutory Boundary Tribunal Ad Hoc Committee looked at many different types of boundary uncertainty problems and different ways of resolving them.

In 2002-2003, Council established the Section 9 of the Surveys Act Ad Hoc Committee. This ad hoc committee would also be dealing with boundary uncertainties but would specifically focus on Section 9 of the Surveys Act.

The terms of reference for the Ad Hoc Committee are:

1. To review Section 9 to determine the legislated scope of its powers and articulate what types of boundary uncertainties Section 9 is designed to resolve.
2. Define the term “error in a survey.”
3. To review the “Intent and Application of Section 9 of the Surveys Act” document, as published in the January 1991 issues of ALS News to determine if it covers the entire scope of resolution of boundary uncertainties authorized by Section 9.
4. If it is determined that the “Intent and Application” document does not cover the entire scope of resolution of boundary uncertainties contemplated by Section 9, then draft a new “Intent and Application” document.
5. To investigate and review the current working application of Section 9 to determine if it is consistent with the “Intent and Application” document.
6. If Section 9 is not sufficiently broad to deal with the resolution of boundary uncertainties, to draft amendments to Section 9.
7. Make recommendations back to Council.
At the 2003 AGM the Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee carried out a survey of potential Section 9 survey problems with the membership. We thank those members who participated in both the original survey and the subsequent discussions. Over the past year, we have been fairly active and have held six committee meetings. We have a very dynamic group and over the year at times we have certainly struggled. However, we have been productive as can be seen by the presentation that we bring forward. The suggested process as laid out in the recommendation is by no means fully functional. However, we felt that before we proceed much further we need to review what we have put together to date.

With your support we can proceed further in developing this process over the upcoming year. Possibly even carrying out a few sample cases. We feel that we have almost completed our terms of reference as assigned by Council but there are a couple of loose ends yet to complete. Bob Fulton has agreed to take over the chair of this Committee in the next year and we are always looking for new volunteers. I thank all members past and present of this committee over the past two years for your excellent input.

Committee Members
Chairman: Larry Pals  
Vice Chairman: Bob Fulton  
Council Liaison: Al Nelson  
Committee Members: Mike Fretwell, Ashley Robertson, Peter Sullivan, David Thomson

GELC  
The Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee consists of representatives from the University of Calgary, Department of Geomatics Engineering, Corporation of Land Surveyors of the Province of British Columbia, Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association, Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors and Association of Canada Land Surveyors. The committee has met twice in the 2003-2004 year.

The Committee formulated working groups for the organization of the Survey Camp and Lost Peg Competition as well as the U of C Beef & Bun and Career Day.

Topics of common interest and concern were discussed by the committee and provided a good opportunity to exchange ideas.

• Methods to increase the numbers of land surveyors within the associations represented;
• Attracting students to the Geomatics profession;
• Reviewing feedback from students within Geomatics Engineering;
• Proposed changes to the WCBE.

ALSA representative members: Robert King, Vince Ziegler
Rationale Documents

Recommendation #1

RATIONALE DOCUMENT
for the motion pertaining to changes to the Manual of Standard Practice

What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?

There have been two problems identified:
1. There is a need to improve survey/plan standards for Public Lands Dispositions.
2. In dealing with Public Lands Dispositions, there is duplication between the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association (ALSA) Manual of Standard Practice (MSP) and the approving authority’s website. The recommendation solves both problems by standardizing the survey and plan requirements and by removing the duplicated sections in the MSP.

What is the overall intent of the recommendation?

The intent of the recommendation is to improve the MSP by standardizing survey and plan requirements for Public Land Dispositions and removing duplicated sections found in the MSP and the approving authority’s website. This would remove potential conflicts if there are discrepancies between the two documents.

What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out the committee discussions?)

This recommendation originated with Technical Services. Technical Services has been advising what changes are being made in his department and has requested that the MSP be amended to reflect these changes. To accommodate this request, the Public Lands Dispositions Subcommittee, a subcommittee of the Standards Committee, was created and charged with the following:
Review standards for dispositions and report findings and recommendations to the Standards Committee. The Standards Committee shall make recommendations to Council.

Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?

The Director of Surveys, Technical Services, Public Lands and Forest Division were consulted and fully supported the recommendations.

How is the recommendation in the public interest?

The recommendation is in the public interest as it ensures that the ALSA maintains an effective and current MSP for its membership. It also ensures that members have access to the current requirements of approving authorities.
What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?

There is no financial cost to the Association; however, there may be an incremental cost to some disposition applicants.

RATIONALE DOCUMENT
for the motion pertaining to changes to the Manual of Standard Practice

What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?

Two problems have been identified:

- The Alberta Land Surveyor’s Association’s (ALSA) Manual of Standard Practice (MSP) is not up to date and does not currently account for the recent changes to Guide 56 that came into effect October 1, 2003.

The recommendation solves both problems by referring the membership to Guide 56, on-line at the AEUB’s web site, for technical requirements and guidelines in preparing wells plans that are acceptable to the AEUB.

What is the overall intent of the recommendation?

The intent of the recommendation is to improve the Manual of Standard Practice by removing Part D, subsections 5.6.2 to 5.6.5, which were found to be duplicated in Guide 56.

What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out of the committee discussions?)

It was recommended at the Spring 2003 Steering Committee that the Standards Committee review the Manual of Standard Practice as it pertains to Guide 56.

Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?

No one was consulted.

How is the recommendation in the public interest?

The recommendation is in the public interest as it ensures that the ALSA maintains an effective and current Manual of Standard Practice for its membership. It also ensures that members have access to the current AEUB requirements.

What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?

There are no financial costs. There are no ongoing financial commitments.
RATIONALE DOCUMENT
for the motion pertaining to changes to the Manual of Standard Practice

What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?

Many plans being created on Metis Settlements are not being registered at the Metis Settlements Land Registry (MSLR). This recommendation ensures members are aware of the requirements on Metis settlements.

Currently the client’s interests are not protected if the plans are not registered at the MSLR. The registration of plans at MSLR will address the issue of documenting previously unrecorded survey monuments. Also, the Registry’s records would now be more accurate and complete.

What is the overall intent of the recommendation?

Recommendation provides information in the Manual of Standard Practice as to the reasons for and some of the requirements to register with the Registry.

What is the genesis for the recommendation? (Did it arise from a new business recommendation? Or was it something that came out the committee discussions?)

Council, with motion #2002.12.007, directed the Standards Committee to:

Investigate and revise the Manual of Standard Practice to include the processes and obligation to register plans on Metis Settlements with the Metis Settlements Land Registry.

Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?

Terry Wywal, Geomatics Consultant, Metis Settlements Land Registry.

How is the recommendation in the public interest?

There is no protection to the public’s rights if the surveys are not registered with the registry.

What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?

There are no financial commitments on behalf of the Association.
resolve the situation themselves, the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association may assist with mediation. Second, if mediation has failed or does not apply, there is a referral from the Executive Director to the Boundary Disputes Panel who would convene to determine if the boundary uncertainty is best resolved by Section 9 of the Surveys Act or some other means.

Alberta Land Surveyor may refuse to participate in the mediation process. In order to resolve boundary uncertainties, it is intended that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association establish a mediation process to help two or more active Alberta Land Surveyors resolve a professional difference of opinion as to the position of a corner or boundary of a property.

If mediation fails or does not apply, the matter must be forwarded to the Association’s Boundary Disputes Panel. The Boundary Disputes Panel’s purpose is to determine if a boundary uncertainty can be resolved through other means, or is in fact an alleged error in survey and is best resolved through Section 9 of the Surveys Act. The Boundary Disputes Panel would be a non-statutory committee unless it is decided in the future that it needs to be established under legislation.

The Boundary Disputes Panel may recommend that a Section 9 Board of Investigation be conducted but this Committee is not recommending a change to legislation at this time.

It is also recommended that the Director of Surveys adopt updated intent and application guidelines for Section 9 of the Surveys Act.

The Executive Director is involved in the process so as not to create a conflict of interest for the Registrar or the Director of Practice Review.

What is the problem to be addressed?

How does the recommendation solve the problem?

The problem is that boundary uncertainties or alleged errors in surveys exist in Alberta and that there is no clearly defined process to resolve them. As a result, there are many unresolved boundary uncertainties or alleged errors in surveys lying dormant.

This recommendation establishes a process to help Alberta Land Surveyors resolve boundary uncertainty.

What is the genesis for the recommendation?

At the 2000 AGM, under new business, the membership recommended that Council consider establishing a committee charged with preparing a white paper for presentation to the Government of Alberta with respect to establishing a statutory boundary tribunal to provide an avenue to resolve boundary uncertainties and disputes as an alternative to resorting to the court process.

Following the 2000 AGM, then vice-president Ken Allred was asked to do some research on this issue and prepare a paper. In early 2001, Mr. Allred submitted his paper to the ALSA Council. He concluded that the current Section 9 of the Surveys Act is likely the only process for the resolution of boundary type problems outside the court system. He went on to say that it is clear that the breadth
of this remedy was severely limited in the discussions that led up to the passing of the new Surveys Act. “It is also clear that ‘survey errors’ are only a minor cause of boundary uncertainties and the provisions of Section 9 of the Surveys Act do not extend far enough to resolve the majority of boundary problems.”

In the 2001-2002 Association year, Council established a Statutory Boundary Tribunal committee. The Committee was asked to analyze Mr. Allred’s report, conduct additional research (research court cases, discipline files, speak with Land Titles and the Director of Surveys), and identify options for change including revisions to the Land Titles Act and the Surveys Act.

In December 2001, Mike Michaud, the Director of Surveys, and Tim Grusie, from Land Titles, had a meeting with Council. The Director of Surveys had written a letter to Council on October 19, 2001 that the “need to develop a process for dealing with boundary problems is paramount.” Council passed a motion requesting that the Executive Committee develop a process for dealing with boundary problems.

The Statutory Boundary Tribunal Committee struggled; it had a difficult time focusing on what exactly the issues were and how significant the issues were. In the end, the Statutory Boundary Tribunal Committee passed a motion that the Committee recommend to Council that Section 9 in principle, is suitable for dealing with boundary uncertainties as a result of survey errors. The Executive Committee also struggled with the issue. With all of its regular discussions in advance of a Council meeting, it was impossible to focus on identifying the scope of the issue and then developing a process.

In September 2002, Council disbanded the Statutory Boundary Tribunal and removed the action item from the Executive Committee’s terms of reference. Council established the Section 9 of the Surveys Act Ad Hoc Committee (Council motion 2002.09.010) with the following specific terms of reference:

- To review Section 9 to determine the legislated scope of its powers and articulate what types of boundary uncertainties Section 9 is designed to resolve.
- Define the term “error in a survey.”
- To review the “Intent and Application of Section 9 of the Surveys Act” document, as published in the January 1991 issue of ALS News to determine if it covers the entire scope of resolution of boundary uncertainties authorized by Section 9.
- If it is determined that the “Intent and Application” document does not cover the entire scope of resolution of boundary uncertainties contemplated by Section 9, then draft a new “Intent and Application” document.
- To investigate and review the current working application of Section 9 to determine if it is consistent with the “Intent and Application” document.
- If Section 9 is not sufficiently broad to deal with the resolution of boundary uncertainties, to draft amendments to Section 9.
- Make recommendations back to Council.
Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted?  
What was their reaction?

No one outside of the Association, except as noted below, has yet been consulted. The Ad Hoc Committee will be asking its solicitor for an opinion about the liability involved in the proposed process.

Messrs. Michaud and Grusie spoke to Council about the need for a process in December 2001 and individually spoke with the former Statutory Boundary Tribunal in the 2001-2002 Association year.

A legal opinion was received from the Association solicitors, Shores Belzil Jardine.

If Council approved the proposed process, then further discussion will have to take place with the Director of Surveys, the Land Titles and others.

What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?

There is an ongoing cost to operate (1) a mediation process and (2) a Boundary Disputes Panel.

It is unknown what it might cost. It is expected that there will be a number of Alberta Land Surveyors who bring forward boundary uncertainty cases in the first year or two, but that the volume may subside over time.

Under the mediation process, there will be costs associated with hiring a mediator, arranging meetings and conference calls and administrative costs.

How is the recommendation in the public interest?

At its October 1st and 2nd, 2003 strategic planning session, Council identified “resolving boundary uncertainties” as its top priority and consistent with the mandate to protect the public’s interest.

This recommendation by the Ad Hoc Committee establishes a process to help Alberta Land Surveyors resolve boundary uncertainties. These uncertainties have an adverse effect on land owners now and in the future, and can present significant impediments to the use and enjoyment of land. Moreover, failure to resolve boundary uncertainties may lead to a compounding of the seriousness and expense of resolution in the future. A practical process for resolution of uncertainties will be of direct benefit to land owners and the public. This protects the public’s interest.

The proposed processes in this recommendation should mean that boundary uncertainties will be resolved quicker. It means that the more serious boundary uncertainty cases will have been reviewed by a group of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ peers who may be able to recommend a method of resolving the matter.
Boundary Resolution Process

For the purposes of this document the following definitions shall apply:

An alleged error in survey is defined as a corner or boundary of property of record on a plan registered in a Land Titles Office that has been formally brought into question by an Alberta Land Surveyor.

Boundary uncertainty occurs when the opinions of two or more Alberta Land Surveyors are in conflict as to the position of a corner or boundary of property.

What is the Boundary Resolution Process?

The Boundary Resolution Process may be initiated when:

• there is a boundary uncertainty in a survey to which the Surveys Act applies and which is represented by a plan of record in the Land Titles Office or the Metis Settlements Registry, or
• there is a boundary uncertainty as a result of re-establishing the position of a lost governing monument of a previous survey of record in the Land Titles Office or the Metis Settlements Registry, or
• there is a boundary uncertainty as a result of placing a monument (or computing a coordinate) to govern a boundary shown on a plan of record in the Land Titles Office or the Metis Settlements Registry, or
• there is a boundary uncertainty as a result of an alleged error in a measurement made to show the position of a monument, placed to govern a boundary shown on a plan of record in the Land Titles Office or Metis Settlements Registry, relative to an existing boundary, and
• there is a boundary uncertainty of a magnitude, which is in excess of the accepted limits of accuracy prevailing at the date of survey.

PART I

What is the first step in the Boundary Resolution Process?

The first step in the Boundary Resolution Process is for the involved Alberta Land Surveyors to communicate with one another to try to resolve the situation before the initiation of any formal process.

If there is a continuing difference of opinion, the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association may assist with mediation.

The intent is to mediate a resolution to a boundary uncertainty or an alleged error in survey.

What is Mediation?

Mediation is a process of dispute resolution where a mediator or trained negotiator assists parties to a dispute, who have each agreed to mediate, in negotiating a settlement. The process takes place on a confidential, without prejudice basis and is entirely voluntary. A mediator is usually chosen who has experience with, and an understanding of the area of dispute. Settlements can often be reached within a few hours when mediation is used, saving much
time and money (excerpt from www.aams.ab.ca). The mediator does not render an opinion as to who is right, where the boundary is, or whether there has been professional misconduct.

**When would mediation apply?**
- Are all of the Alberta Land Surveyors involved still active or retired or honorary life members or former members?
- If one of the Alberta Land Surveyors was deceased, mediation would not apply.
- Do all parties agree to mediation? If not, then mediation cannot proceed. The matter would go directly to the Boundary Disputes Panel.

**Who can request mediation?**
- Any landowner or any affected party. Mediation is not intended to resolve disputes between landowners and Alberta Land Surveyors.
- Any Alberta Land Surveyor.
- Any Council of a municipality.
- The Director of Surveys.
- A Registrar to a Land Titles Office.

**Where is the request for mediation sent?**
- The request for mediation is sent to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association office.
- The Executive Director of the ALSA shall take the lead on the file. Because of concerns regarding conflict with the discipline process, the Registrar shall not be responsible for the file. The Executive Director shall not file a complaint on a file brought forward for mediation.

**Who can mediate?**
- The mediator must be impartial and independent with no prior involvement in the dispute. This impartiality must be assessed by all of the parties both in fact and in conduct of the mediator prior to the mediation. If a bias or perception of bias develops at some point during the mediation, either the mediator or one of the parties may terminate the mediation.
- Mediation can be conducted with either one or a number of mediators. A panel of two or more mediators is generally utilized where the dispute is more complex, involving a number of areas of expertise, or where the dispute involves more than two parties. Where more than one mediator is utilized, it is important to ensure that the mediators can work together effectively. (excerpt from www.aams.ab.ca)
- The mediator should be an Alberta Land Surveyor or a member of the Alberta Arbitration and Mediation Society. Regardless, the mediator should have formal mediation training.
What are the Association costs?
• Mediator fees and expenses.
• Mediation training for interested Alberta Land Surveyors.
• Administrative costs.

Who selects the mediator?
• The Executive Director or any other party involved can put forward the name, or names, of possible mediators.
• Parties must unanimously agree to the mediator.

The Outcome
The mediator(s) shall submit a detailed written report to the Executive Director.

What if mediation does work?
For the mediation process to work, it must end in a formal written agreement ratified by the practitioners and an undertaking to resolve all issues for affected parties. There shall be documented confirmation of how the boundary uncertainty or error in survey was resolved submitted to the Executive Director and the parties.

What if mediation does not work or does not apply?
The Executive Director must refer the matter to the Boundary Disputes Panel.

PART II
What is the intent of the Boundary Disputes Panel?
To determine if a boundary uncertainty is best resolved through section 9 of the Surveys Act or some other means.

When would the Boundary Disputes Panel convene?
The Boundary Disputes Panel would convene when mediation has failed, does not apply, or there is a referral from the Executive Director.

Who is on the Boundary Disputes Panel?
Council shall appoint, by motion, members of the Boundary Disputes Panel from which it shall appoint a chairman and/or one or more vice-chairmen from among the members of the Boundary Disputes Panel. The Panel shall have at least six members, one of whom may be a public member and the others shall be Alberta Land Surveyors. Three members shall constitute a quorum of the Panel. The term of appointment for Panel members is five years.

Appointments to be made to ensure a balance of expertise in areas such as urban land development, resource industries, general practice, RPR/construction, control surveying/GPS. Appointments to be made to ensure a reasonable geographic balance.
What are the terms of reference of the Boundary Disputes Panel?

- All parties involved in the boundary uncertainty shall provide all of their research, field notes, and any other documentation to the Panel in advance of the meeting. The Panel may do any investigation that it deems necessary.
- The Boundary Disputes Panel will convene to determine if the boundary uncertainty or alleged error in survey in question is a Section 9 candidate. If so, the Boundary Disputes Panel will make that recommendation to Council. If the boundary uncertainty or alleged error in survey is not evident, the Boundary Disputes Panel shall continue its investigation with all affected parties to assist with the resolution of the boundary uncertainty or alleged error in survey.
- If there is an outstanding complaint against any of the parties relative to the matter in question, the Panel shall not deliberate on the issue.
- The Panel shall report to Council after every sitting inclusive of any recommendations pursuant to Section 9 of the Surveys Act.
- If the Boundary Disputes Panel recommends a section 9 it shall make such recommendation to Council so as to present the case advocating a section 9 to the Director of Surveys on behalf of Council without providing Council with names, facts, or specific information.
- The Boundary Disputes Panel may recommend how the Alberta Land Surveyor may fix the problem but not express an opinion on where the boundary is.
- The Panel shall encourage a resolution that best ensures that a boundary uncertainty or alleged error in survey is resolved.
- The Panel may recommend solution by Section 9 or some other means.
- If a Section 9 Board of Investigation is not recommended, the Panel may express a written non-binding opinion as to a resolution to the boundary uncertainty or alleged error in survey.
- Subsequent to convening of the Boundary Disputes Panel, the Chairman shall prepare a written report of the findings of fact along with any recommendations made by the panel.
- Land Owners, the Council of a Municipality, the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association or a Registrar of a Land Titles Office shall retain their right to request a Section 9 Board of Investigation directly to the Minister.
- The Panel shall not award damages or costs.
- Any sitting of the Panel shall be carried out under proper rules of evidence in order that the evidence gathered can be used if necessary at some later date. All witnesses and those giving testimony must do so under oath and the proceedings must be recorded by a court reporter.
What are the Association costs?
- The Association would be responsible for the expenses of the Panel members, including the public member.
- The Association would be responsible for providing a means of keeping accurate records.
- Administrative costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Section Heading</th>
<th>Current Section #</th>
<th>Current Wording</th>
<th>New Section Heading</th>
<th>New Section #</th>
<th>New Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a non-monumented Part 2 position</td>
<td>39(1)</td>
<td>A monument placed at a corner referred to in and in accordance with section 26(1), (2), (3) and (4) or any section or quarter section corner not monumented under the original Part 2 survey shall fix and govern that position if</td>
<td>39(1)</td>
<td>39(1(a))</td>
<td>all Part 2 monuments used as the basis of the survey are original or restored, and 39(1(b)) the plan of survey is registered in the Land Titles Office or Metis Settlements Land Registry, and 39(1(c)) the surveyor, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39(1(c)(i)) cause notice to be sent by a traceable method to all registered owners of land whom the surveyor has determined may be affected, to the address of the registered owner on record in the Land Titles Office for the Land Titles District and, 39(1(c)(ii)) where no objection to the establishment of the Section 39(1) corner, and if the surveyor has not received notice from the surveyor, the surveyor shall serve the person objecting, by a traceable method, with a notice specifying a period of not less than 30 days from the date of sending the notice, and 39(1(c)(iii)) where the surveyor receives an objection to the establishment of the Section 39(1) corner, and if the surveyor does not accept the objection as valid, the surveyor shall serve the person objecting, by a traceable method, with a notice specifying a period of not less than 30 days from the date of sending the notice, within which the person may take proceedings in the Court of Queen's Bench to establish the validity of his objection and file evidence that the proceedings have been commenced with the surveyor, and, 39(1(c)(iv)) where the surveyor does not receive evidence that proceedings have been commenced in the Court of Queen's Bench to establish the validity of a person's objection within the time limited in the notice served on the person under subsection (1(c)(iii)), the surveyor shall proceed as if no objection was received, and, 39(1(d)) a subsequent plan of survey, prepared by a second Alberta Land Surveyor, registered in a Land Titles Office or Metis Settlements Land Registry confirms the placed monument is, within tolerances acceptable for the date of survey, to be in the position it was intended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second surveyor should complete the survey in accordance with sections 26(1), (2), (3) and (4) as if he/she was doing the first survey. This includes the evaluation of evidence. If the position of the monuments being confirmed are within the survey tolerance of the time the initial monument was placed, the surveyor shall accept the location of the initial monument and show the location as confirmed on his/her plan or

39(1)(d)(i) should the second surveyor determine the position of the Section 39(1) corner(s) being confirmed not to be within survey tolerances acceptable for the date of survey, the second surveyor shall contact the initial surveyor, if practicing, with respect to the discrepancy and it shall be the responsibility of the initial surveyor to review the findings of the second surveyor and, if in agreement, amend the initial plan and survey accordingly or

39(1)(d)(ii) should the initial surveyor disagree with the second surveyor, both surveyors shall present their findings to such designate as appointed by the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association who shall review each surveyor's report and rule on which position is determined to be correct. The ruling shall be final.

39(1)(d)(iii) If the initial surveyor is not practicing, the second surveyor shall proceed as if he is doing the initial survey.

39(2) A monument placed at a corner referred to in and in accordance with sections 26(1), (2), (3) and (4) or any section or quarter section corner not monumented under the original Part 2 survey but marked by a reference to a corner under the original Part 2 survey, shall fix and govern that position if

39(2)(a) it is shown on a plan registered in a Land Titles Office or Metis Settlements Land Registry, and

39(2)(b) (i) confirm the monuments used as the basis for the survey to be in the positions they were intended to be placed, within the tolerances acceptable for the date of the survey when they were placed. The plan is to show the monuments are confirmed should this be the case. If the monuments are not within acceptable tolerances the procedure outlined in Section 39(2)(b)(iii) and (iv) shall be followed, and

39(2)(b)(ii) a subsequent plan of survey, prepared by a second Alberta Land Surveyor, registered in a Land Titles Office or Metis Settlements Land Registry confirms the Section 39(2) placed monument is, within tolerances acceptable for the date of survey, to be in the position it was intended to be placed. The second surveyor should complete the survey in accordance with Section 26(1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Section Heading</th>
<th>Current Section #</th>
<th>Current Wording</th>
<th>New Section Heading</th>
<th>New Section #</th>
<th>New Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2), (3) and (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2), (3) and (4)</td>
<td>(2), (3) and (4)</td>
<td>should the second surveyor determine the position of the Section 39(2) corner(s) as being confirmed not to be within survey tolerances acceptable for the date of survey, the second surveyor shall contact the initial surveyor, if practicing, with respect to the discrepancy and it shall be the responsibility of the initial surveyor to review the findings of the second surveyor and if in agreement shall amend the initial plan and survey accordingly or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)(b)(iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)(b)(iii)</td>
<td>(2)(b)(iii)</td>
<td>should the initial surveyor or disagree with the second surveyor, both surveyors shall present their findings to such designate as appointed by the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association who shall review each surveyor's report and rule on which position is determined to be correct. The ruling shall be final.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)(b)(iv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)(b)(iv)</td>
<td>(2)(b)(iv)</td>
<td>should the initial surveyor or disagree with the second surveyor, both surveyors shall present their findings to such designate as appointed by the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association who shall review each surveyor's report and rule on which position is determined to be correct. The ruling shall be final.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)(v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)(v)</td>
<td>(2)(v)</td>
<td>If the initial surveyor is not practicing, the second surveyor shall proceed as if he is doing the initial survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>All the boundary lines surveyed or established using the monuments placed in accordance with subsections (1) and (2) shall consist of all the land included between the several monuments placed to determine the boundary lines, and no more and no less, notwithstanding any quantity or measure expressed on the plan of survey registered at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry, whether or not the dimensions or areas expressed on the plan are found by re-measurement to be different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Every parcel surveyed using the monuments placed in accordance with subsections (1) and (2) shall consist of all the land included between the several monuments placed to determine the boundary lines, and no more and no less, notwithstanding any quantity or measure expressed on the plan of survey registered at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry, certificate of title, grant or other instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Monuments placed and confirmed in accordance with Sections 39(1) and 39(2) shall govern the position as if they were placed as an original Part 2 monument and shall not be questioned in any court, whether or not the monuments marking the original survey are subsequently found or their positions proved by other evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re-survey of s29 or 32 land in municipality

39(1) The council of a municipality may, on the application of 50% of the registered owners of the parcels of land to be affected, or without an application, pass a resolution that it

40(1) The council of a municipality may, on the application of 50% of the registered owners of the parcels of land to be affected, or without an application, pass a resolution that it
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Section #</th>
<th>Current Wording</th>
<th>New Section #</th>
<th>New Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39(2)</td>
<td>On receipt of a resolution under subsection (1), the Minister may direct the Director or a surveyor appointed by the Director to re-survey the land in question and to place monuments of a style approved by the Minister for the purpose of the survey of the land.</td>
<td>40(2)</td>
<td>Before beginning the re-survey, the Director shall publish notice of it in one issue of The Alberta Gazette and once each week for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper that circulates in the neighbourhood of the land to be re-surveyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(3)</td>
<td>Before re-establishing a monument with respect to which notice has been given, the Director or a surveyor appointed by the Director shall, by registered letter or personal service, request the person who has given the notice under subsection (4) to appear before the Director at a time and place specified to show the position of the monument or to produce the evidence in the person’s possession with regard to it.</td>
<td>40(3)</td>
<td>Any person who claims to know the position of any of the survey monuments defining the land to be re-surveyed, or who claims to be in possession of information whereby the position of monuments can be established, may, before the commencement of the re-survey, notify the Minister by registered mail of the information in that person’s possession regarding the matter referred to in clauses (a) and (b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(4)</td>
<td>Any person may, before the commencement of the re-survey, notify the Minister by registered mail of the information in that person’s possession regarding the matters referred to in clauses (a) and (b).</td>
<td>40(4)</td>
<td>At least 2 weeks after the first publication of the notice under subsection (3), the Minister shall publish notice of it in one issue of The Alberta Gazette and once each week for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper that circulates in the neighbourhood of the land to be re-surveyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(5)</td>
<td>Before re-establishing a monument with respect to which notice has been given, the Director or a surveyor appointed by the Director shall, by registered letter or personal service, request the person who has given the notice under subsection (4) to appear before the Director at a time and place specified to show the position of the monument or to produce the evidence in the person’s possession with regard to it.</td>
<td>40(5)</td>
<td>The Director, or a surveyor appointed by the Director, shall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(6)</td>
<td>Before re-establishing a monument with respect to which notice has been given, the Director or a surveyor appointed by the Director shall, by registered letter or personal service, request the person who has given the notice under subsection (4) to appear before the Director at a time and place specified to show the position of the monument or to produce the evidence in the person’s possession with regard to it.</td>
<td>40(6)</td>
<td>The Director, or a surveyor appointed by the Director, shall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(6)(a)</td>
<td>The Director, or a surveyor appointed by the Director, shall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(6)(b)</td>
<td>The Director, or a surveyor appointed by the Director, shall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(6)(c)</td>
<td>The Director, or a surveyor appointed by the Director, shall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40(1)</td>
<td>On receipt of the plan and other records under section 39(6), the Minister shall publish notice of it in one issue of The Alberta Gazette and once each week for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper that circulates in the neighbourhood of the land to be re-surveyed, and</td>
<td>41(1)</td>
<td>Confirmation of re-survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40(1)(a)</td>
<td>On receipt of the plan and other records under section 39(6), the Minister shall publish notice of it in one issue of The Alberta Gazette and once each week for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper that circulates in the neighbourhood of the land to be re-surveyed, and</td>
<td>41(1)(a)</td>
<td>Confirmation of re-survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40(1)(b)</td>
<td>On receipt of the plan and other records under section 39(6), the Minister shall publish notice of it in one issue of The Alberta Gazette and once each week for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper that circulates in the neighbourhood of the land to be re-surveyed, and</td>
<td>41(1)(b)</td>
<td>Confirmation of re-survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40(1)(c)</td>
<td>On receipt of the plan and other records under section 39(6), the Minister shall publish notice of it in one issue of The Alberta Gazette and once each week for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper that circulates in the neighbourhood of the land to be re-surveyed, and</td>
<td>41(1)(c)</td>
<td>Confirmation of re-survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Section</td>
<td>Current Section #</td>
<td>Current Wording</td>
<td>New Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40(2) After the hearing under subsection 40(1), the Minister may either confirm the re-survey or direct that any amendments or corrections that the Minister considers necessary be made, and shall confirm the re-survey as amended or corrected.</td>
<td>41(3)</td>
<td>On confirmation by the Minister of the re-survey, the Director shall amend the official plan accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40(3) The monuments established by the re-survey mark the boundary lines of the land re-surveyed for all purposes.</td>
<td>41(4)</td>
<td>No review of re-survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41(2) After the hearing under subsection 40(1), the Minister may either confirm the re-survey or direct that any amendments or corrections that the Minister considers necessary be made, and shall confirm the re-survey as amended or corrected.</td>
<td>44(2)</td>
<td>The order of the Minister confirming the re-survey is final and conclusive and shall not be questioned in any court, whether or not the monuments marking the original survey are subsequently found or their positions proved by other evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41(3) On confirmation of the official plan of the re-survey, the Registrar may make corrections to the certificates of title or registers to reflect any changes effected by the re-survey.</td>
<td>44(3)</td>
<td>No review of re-survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41(4) The order of the Minister confirming the re-survey is final and conclusive and shall not be questioned in any court, whether or not the monuments marking the original survey are subsequently found or their positions proved by other evidence.</td>
<td>45(2)</td>
<td>If the position of the monument cannot be satisfactorily ascertained under subsection (1) or if the corner was not previously marked by a monument in the original survey, the surveyor shall re-establish the monument or establish a new one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42(1) The Director shall, forthwith after the confirmation under section 40(2), file one copy of the official plan of the re-survey with the Registrar.</td>
<td>45(3)</td>
<td>If the position of the monument cannot be satisfactorily ascertained under subsection (1) the surveyor shall re-establish the monument or establish the corner's position in relation to those monuments of the original or subsequent survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43(1) The Director shall, forthwith after the confirmation under section 40(2), file one copy of the official plan of the re-survey with the Registrar.</td>
<td>44(3)</td>
<td>If the position of the monument cannot be satisfactorily ascertained under subsection (1) the surveyor shall re-establish the monument or establish the corner's position in relation to those monuments of the original or subsequent survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(1) All expenses for a re-survey shall be paid to the Minister by the municipality on whose resolution the re-survey was made, or, as an invoice from the Minister, which may be issued from time to time during the progress of the re-survey.</td>
<td>44(2)</td>
<td>The municipality on whose resolution the re-survey was made may pay the expenses out of the general funds of the municipality either in whole or in part, as it considers proper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(1) All expenses for a re-survey shall be paid to the Minister by the municipality on whose resolution the re-survey was made, or, as an invoice from the Minister, which may be issued from time to time during the progress of the re-survey.</td>
<td>44(3)</td>
<td>The municipality on whose resolution the re-survey was made may pay the expenses out of the general funds of the municipality either in whole or in part, as it considers proper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(2) The municipality on whose resolution the re-survey was made may pay the expenses out of the general funds of the municipality either in whole or in part, as it considers proper.</td>
<td>45(2)</td>
<td>If the position of the monument cannot be satisfactorily ascertained under subsection (1) the surveyor shall re-establish the monument or establish a new one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(3) If the position of the monument cannot be satisfactorily ascertained under subsection (1) or if the corner was not previously marked by a monument in the original survey, the surveyor shall re-establish the monument or establish a new one.</td>
<td>44(3)</td>
<td>The municipality on whose resolution the re-survey was made may pay the expenses out of the general funds of the municipality either in whole or in part, as it considers proper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(1) Payment for re-survey</td>
<td>44(3)</td>
<td>The municipality on whose resolution the re-survey was made may pay the expenses out of the general funds of the municipality either in whole or in part, as it considers proper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(1) Payment for re-survey</td>
<td>44(3)</td>
<td>The municipality on whose resolution the re-survey was made may pay the expenses out of the general funds of the municipality either in whole or in part, as it considers proper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the corner's position in relation to those monuments of the original or subsequent plan of surveys that can be found, in a manner that carries out the evident intention of the original survey as shown in the original field notes and the official plan of record in the Director's office.

44(3) A surveyor who establishes a corner of a section, quarter-section or legal subdivision that was not previously marked by a monument, or re-establishes the position of a monument in accordance with subsection (1) or (2), shall mark the position with a new monument, and

44(3)(a) shall, within 90 days after completion of the survey, prepare and submit to the Registrar a plan of survey showing the method by which the position was re-established.

44(3)(b) shall, within 90 days after completion of the survey, prepare and submit to the Registrar a plan of survey showing the method by which the position was re-established.

44(3)(c) shall, within 90 days after completion of the survey, prepare and submit to the Registrar a plan of survey showing the method by which the position was re-established.

45(3) A surveyor who re-establishes the position of a monument in accordance with subsection (1) or (2),

45(3)(a) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(b) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(c) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(d) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(e) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(f) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(g) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(h) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(i) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(j) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(k) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(l) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(m) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(n) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(o) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(p) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(q) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(r) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(s) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(t) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(u) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(v) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(w) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(x) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(y) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(z) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(aa) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ab) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ac) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ad) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ae) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(af) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ag) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ah) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ai) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(aj) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ak) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(al) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(am) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(an) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ao) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ap) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(aq) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(ar) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(as) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(at) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall

45(3)(au) shall, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Section Number</th>
<th>Current Wording</th>
<th>New Section Number</th>
<th>New Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45(4)(b)</td>
<td>a subsequent plan of survey, prepared by a second Alberta Land Surveyor, registered in a Land Titles Office or Metis Settlements Land Registry confirms the placed monument is, within tolerances acceptable for the date of survey, to be in the position it was intended to be placed. The second surveyor shall complete the survey as if he/she was doing the first survey. If the position of the monuments being confirmed are within the survey tolerance of the time the initial monument was placed, the second surveyor shall accept the location of the initial monument and show the location as confirmed on his/her plan or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(4)(b)(i)</td>
<td>should the second surveyor determine the position of the Section 45 corner(s) being confirmed not to be within survey tolerances acceptable for the date of survey, the second surveyor shall contact the initial surveyor, if practicing, with respect to the discrepancy and it shall be the responsibility of the initial surveyor to review the findings of the second surveyor and if agreement shall around the initial plan and survey accordingly or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(4)(b)(ii)</td>
<td>should the initial surveyor disagree with the second surveyor, both surveyors shall present their findings to such designate as appointed by the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association who shall review each surveyor's report and rule on which position is determined to be correct. The ruling shall be final.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(4)(b)(iii)</td>
<td>If the initial surveyor is not practicing, the second surveyor shall proceed as if he is doing the initial survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(1)</td>
<td>When a surveyor is required to re-establish the position of a monument placed in accordance with Section 39 that cannot be found, the surveyor shall do so from the best available evidence respecting the position of the monument.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(2)</td>
<td>If the position of the monument cannot be satisfactorily ascertained under subsection (1), the surveyor shall re-establish the monument or establish the position in relation to those monuments of the original or subsequent plan of surveys that can be found, in a manner that carries out the evident intention of the original survey as shown on the plan of survey registered in a Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(3)(a)</td>
<td>A surveyor who re-establishes the position of a monument in accordance with subsection (1) or (2),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(3)(b)</td>
<td>shall mark the position with a new monument, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(3)(c)</td>
<td>shall keep the position and survey records of the re-established position as per Section 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(4)</td>
<td>a surveyor who re-establishes the position of a monument, within 30 days of placing the monument, shall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re-establishment of established non-monumented Part 2 monuments
46(3)(a) cause notice to be sent by a traceable method to all registered owners of land whom the surveyor has determined may be affected, to the address of the registered owner on record in the Land Titles Office for the Land Titles District and,

46(3)(b)(i) where no objection is or evidence against the establishment is received by the surveyor within 30 days of sending the notice, the surveyor shall proceed with registration of the plan. The notices must be part of the package submitted for registration, or

46(3)(b)(ii) where the surveyor receives an objection to the establishment of the Section 39(1) corner, and if the surveyor does not accept the objection as valid, the surveyor shall serve the person objecting, by a traceable method, with a notice specifying a period of not less than 30 days from the date of sending of the notice within which the person may take proceedings in the Court of Queen’s Bench to establish the validity of his objection and file evidence that the proceedings have been commenced with the surveyor, and

46(3)(b)(iii) where the surveyor receives an objection to the establishment of the Section 39(1) corner, and if the surveyor does not accept the objection as valid, the surveyor shall serve the person objecting, by a traceable method, with a notice specifying a period of not less than 30 days from the date of sending of the notice within which the person may take proceedings in the Court of Queen’s Bench to establish the validity of his objection and file evidence that the proceedings have been commenced with the surveyor, and

46(3)(b)(iv) the surveyor does not receive evidence that proceedings have been commenced in the Court of Queen’s Bench to establish the validity of a person’s objection within the time limited in the notice served on the person under subsection (3)(ii), the surveyor shall proceed as if no objection was received, and

46(3)(b)(v) if the initial surveyor is not practicing, the second surveyor shall proceed as if he is doing the initial survey.

46(3)(c) shall, within 90 days after completion of the survey, prepare and submit to the Registrar a plan of survey showing the method by which the position was re-established.

46(4)(a) A monument re-established at a corner referred to in and in accordance with sections 46(1), (2) and (3) shall fix and govern that position if

46(4)(b) if it is shown on a plan registered in a Land Titles Office or Metis Settlements Land Registry and

46(4)(c) a subsequent plan of survey plan, prepared by a second Alberta Land Surveyor, registered in a Land Titles Office or Metis Settlements Land Registry confirms the placed monument is, within tolerances acceptable for the date of survey, to be in the position it was intended to be placed. The second surveyor shall complete the survey as if he were doing the first survey. If the position of the monuments being confirmed are within the survey tolerance of the time the initial monument was placed, the second surveyor shall accept the location of the initial monument and show the location as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Section</th>
<th>Current Section #</th>
<th>Current Wording</th>
<th>New Section</th>
<th>New Section #</th>
<th>New Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45(1) (a)</td>
<td>45(1)(a)</td>
<td>mark the positions of the boundary lines to be established by placing monuments.</td>
<td>48(1)(a)</td>
<td>48(1)(a)</td>
<td>mark the positions of the boundary lines to be established by placing monuments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(1)(a)(i)</td>
<td>45(1)(a)(i)</td>
<td>at every change of direction and the beginning and end of every curve, and</td>
<td>48(1)(a)(i)</td>
<td>48(1)(a)(i)</td>
<td>at every change of direction and the beginning and end of every curve, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(1)(a)(ii)</td>
<td>45(1)(a)(ii)</td>
<td>at every intersection of the boundary lines with every surveyed boundary of the parcels affected by the new survey.</td>
<td>48(1)(a)(ii)</td>
<td>48(1)(a)(ii)</td>
<td>at every intersection of the boundary lines with every surveyed boundary of the parcels affected by the new survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(2)</td>
<td>45(2)</td>
<td>make all measurements necessary to show the positions of the monuments placed and the boundary lines to be established, relative to the existing surveyed boundary lines of the parcels affected.</td>
<td>48(2)</td>
<td>48(2)</td>
<td>make all measurements necessary to show the positions of the monuments placed and the boundary lines to be established, relative to the existing surveyed boundary lines of the parcels affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(3)(a)</td>
<td>45(3)(a)</td>
<td>when surveying a right of way that are not more than 150 feet apart, need mark only one boundary line of the right of way, and the unmarked boundary shall be determined from the marked boundary and the width shown on the plan.</td>
<td>48(3)(a)</td>
<td>48(3)(a)</td>
<td>when surveying a right of way that are not more than 150 feet apart, need mark only one boundary line of the right of way, and the unmarked boundary shall be determined from the marked boundary and the width shown on the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(3)(a)</td>
<td>45(3)(a)</td>
<td>when surveying a right of way that are not more than 45 metres apart, need mark only one boundary line of the right of way, and the unmarked boundary shall be determined from the marked boundary and the widths shown on the plan.</td>
<td>48(3)(a)</td>
<td>48(3)(a)</td>
<td>when surveying a right of way that are not more than 45 metres apart, need mark only one boundary line of the right of way, and the unmarked boundary shall be determined from the marked boundary and the widths shown on the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
45(3)(b) when surveying the boundaries of a strata space, as defined in the Land Titles Act, shall not mark the boundary lines of the horizontal, vertical or inclined planes or curved surfaces, but shall relate the locations of them to at least 2 monuments of known elevation in the geographical positioning system/levels within or adjacent to the boundaries of the parcel for that purpose, or

45(3)(b)(i) to at least 2 monuments of known elevation in the geographical positioning system/levels within or adjacent to the boundaries of the parcel for that purpose, or

45(3)(b)(ii) to 2 survey control markers and shall relate the locations of them to the external boundaries of the parcel within which the space lies, and

45(3)(c) when surveying the boundaries of condominium units other than bare land units as defined in the Condominium Property Act, it shall not mark the boundary lines of the units but shall locate or re-establish the monuments that determine the boundaries of the parcel within which the units lie.

45(4) All the boundary lines surveyed and established in accordance with subsection (1) shall be defined by the monuments placed for that purpose as shown on the plan of the survey registered at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry, whether or not the dimensions or areas expressed on the plan are found by re-measurement to be different.

45(5) Notwithstanding subsection (4), every lot on a linear block boundary in a subdivision survey shown on a plan registered at the Land Titles Office after February 16, 1912, and before June 9, 1988, shall have a frontage measurement proportionate to the total distance between the corners of the block, in the same ratio as the frontage measurement of each lot shown on the registered plan bears to the total distance between the corners of the block shown on the plan.

46(1) When a surveyor is required to re-establish the position of a monument placed pursuant to this Part that cannot be found, the surveyor shall do so from the best available evidence respecting the position of the monument.

46(2) If the position of the monument cannot be satisfactorily re-established under subsection (1), the surveyor shall re-establish it relative to those monuments that can be found, in such a manner that carries out the evident intention of the survey as it is shown on the plan of survey registered at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry.

46(3) A surveyor who re-establishes the position of a monument in accordance with subsection (1) or (2), or establishes a corner that was not previously marked by any monument in a survey made pursuant to this Part, shall mark the position with a new monument and...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Section #</th>
<th>Current Section</th>
<th>Current Wording</th>
<th>New Section #</th>
<th>New Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46(3)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49(1)(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration or filing of non-monumented survey plan</td>
<td>50(1) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, a surveyor may, without placing the monuments required by section 45(1), submit a plan for registration at the Land Titles Office or at the Metis Settlements Land Registry, if sufficient survey control markers exist in the vicinity of the survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to subsection (3), the co-ordinates of the survey control markers and of the monuments, as shown on the plan of survey, determine the boundary lines established by the survey and plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50(3)(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A surveyor who submits a plan pursuant to subsection (1) shall, within one year from its registration or within a longer period of time specified by the Director, place the monuments required by section 45(1) in accordance with the survey control markers and the co-ordinates shown on the plan; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(3)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place with the Registrar proof under oath in the form prescribed by regulations under the Land Titles Act, of having done so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On registration of the form referred to in subsection (3)(b), the Registrar shall endorse a memorandum on the plan, and the monuments placed pursuant to subsection (3) determine the boundary lines as though they had been placed before the registration of the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-survey of s45 land in municipality</td>
<td>51(1) The council of a municipality may, on the application of 50% of the registered owners of the land to be surveyed, or without an application, pass a resolution that it is desirable to re-survey and place monuments at the corners of parcels the boundary lines of which were established pursuant to section 45.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections 39(2) to (6), 40(1), (2) and (4), 41, 42, 43 and 44 apply to a re-survey under this section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Part 4 - Miscellaneous — Sections 49 and 50 would have to be renumbered as 52 and 53 respectively.
Appendix "F"

New Members 2003-2004

A.O. (Arlin) Amundrud
C.J. (Chris) Chiasson
F. (Francois) Dion
G.M. (Geoff) Hobbs
J.H. (Jeff) Johnston

S.R. (Steve) Keddy
J.E. (John) Landry
P.M. (Pat) Moloney
R. (Robert) Radovanovic
A.W. (Andrew) Roop

D. (Doug) Sharp
H.L. (Heather) Stairs
P. (Piotr) Strozyk
T.S. (Tim) Steeves
M.A. (Mark) Sutter
New Members 2003-2004

C.R. (Christy) Thompson

D.C. (Chris) Tucker
Presentation to New Members

The following presentation was made to the new members by President Halliday.

To the new members, it is my pleasure to congratulate you on your accomplishment and to welcome you as Alberta Land Surveyors. It is my duty, as President, to charge you with your obligations as professionals.

As we go about our busy lives, we sometimes forget the things that don’t readily demand our attention. Professionalism is one those human traits that must be subconsciously employed to be truly effective. You have chosen the lifestyle of a professional, It is with you always, and cannot be left on your desk at the end of the day. Your commitment to ethics will be your guide in all that you do.

You have proven your level of knowledge by successfully completing all of the Association’s requirements.

You have proven that you have learned how to learn.

You have now reached a new plateau of education and you must continue to learn, always.

Never neglect the fact that your peers are your best learning resource.

It is said that good decisions come from experience.

Experience is gained from decisions that are not always good.

Remember your experiences and learn from them.

The receipt of your commission has made you a public officer and you are obligated to uphold the public’s rights and interests with respect to property.

Your decisions and determinations of property boundaries must be impartial as every boundary affects multiple owners.

The public has a right to have confidence in you as a professional.

Being right 60% of the time just won’t cut it in their eyes.

Professionalism is the basis of the land surveyor's contract with society. It demands that the interest of the public be placed above those of the surveyor; that standards of competence be adhered to and that expert advice be provided to the public.

Essential to this contract is the public's trust in the surveyor.

Do your utmost to never betray that public trust.

Many of you are here today with your significant others.

Some of you have made this journey alone.

If you are fortunate enough to have a partner with you today, take their hand now, and strive to hang on to it, always.

Their contributions to your successes are significant to say the least and I encourage you to take every opportunity to thank them for helping you get here today.

You, as new members of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association are our future.

You have a duty to be involved in Association affairs to keep it viable and ensure it carries on successfully in the years ahead.

Ladies and gentlemen – please rise, and show your recognition of the hard work these professionals have completed, and help me welcome them into our profession.
25 Year Pin Recipients

L.A. (Lloyd) Cridland

D.J. (Don) MacNeil

P.A. (Peter) Walker
Richard Andrew Bassil received his commission as an Alberta Land Surveyor, #318, on May 18, 1967. He was active for 29 years before retiring from the government. But as his wife, Jill, will attest, Dick Bassil has done anything but retire.

Dick was born in Minnedosa, Manitoba and is a graduate of SAIT. It’s always nice to see a Manitoba kid do well.

Dick articled to Morley Kolomyjec from 1961 to 1967 and articled Harold Von Hollen and Elwyn Koehler.

As many of you know, Dick worked for Alberta Environment as Manager of Control Surveys from May 1974 to June 1990 and was the ninth Director of Surveys from 1990-1996.

Dick has been very active in Association affairs. You know Dick today as the Association’s Registrar and one of the directors of the JH Holloway Scholarship Foundation.

But throughout the course of his career, Dick was:

- ALSA Councillor from 1980-1982
- ALSA President, 1983-1984
- Chair, Education Committee, 1980
- Chair, Legislation Committee, 1981
- Chair, Committee on the Future, 1985
- CCLS Director
- Member, Standards Committee, 1993-1997
- Member, GIS/GPS Symposium Committee, 1996-1998
- Acting Executive Director, 1997
- Represented the ALSA to Government during the digital plan submission process, 1999-2000

Outside of the profession, he has been involved in his church and the Good Sam Society. His hobbies include hunting and fishing.

In 1998, Dick was awarded the President’s Award by Stan Longson for going above and beyond the call of duty. Today, we recognize Dick in a more permanent way by presenting him with honorary life membership in the Association— the 58th Alberta Land Surveyor and the 8th former Director of Surveys to be so recognized.

Mr. Bassil addressed the audience as follows:

It is indeed a great honor for me today to receive this Honorary Life membership. I wasn’t expecting the phone call I received from...
Jim a few months ago informing me of the award and, during his explanation of it, I was quickly trying to remember or recall what the criteria was for this award. The only thing I could come up with at the moment was it had something to do with age.

Many years ago, as a committee member charged with drafting the criteria used in some of these awards, I did not think for a minute that I would be a recipient some day.

It is particularly rewarding when it comes from people you work with, your peers and members of your profession as well as to be included in the list of people that have received this award in the past—people each and everyone have respected for many years. This award does not come without a lot of help from others and opportunities created by this profession.

My career in land surveying started on a May morning in 1959 on a street corner in Calgary near the old Land Titles Office building. It was myself and another engineering student standing on the corner through some pre-arrangements and an individual drove up and asked if we were ready to go to work. It was Morley Kolomyjec, ALS, DLS. We were whisked away to a tent camp northeast of Medicine Hat on the Schuler highway somewhere on the bald prairie. The tents were pitched near the only willow that was within about 100 miles and they looked like balloons in the wind. It took five minutes for us to get rid of some bed rolls and personal belongings. We were then whisked further out to the job where I met Murray Ingalls, who at that time was Morley’s assistant. I mention these two people because that was a point in time where those first experiences and impressions actually made a big change in where I was headed. I thank both of those people for the impression, attention to detail and learning about the principles of evidence and survey evidence in Alberta.

It was from there that I spent the next 37 years in public service. I can truly say that every minute of those 37 years was enjoyable, filled with opportunity through the challenges and rewards that went along with it. Things that each and everyone of us seem to need to grow as individuals. I am thankful that the public service career provided me with plenty opportunity and support. People from the Minister down made sure that we were involved and provided lots of support along the way. Fellow staff members and other management staff members I am very grateful for that support.

As a professional land surveyor, and, in particular, as member of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association since 1967, I want to thank this profession as well for the opportunity to serve this profession along with the public. I appreciate the opportunities that this Association provides its members and continues to provide those of us who have reached retirement age and inactive periods. Personal growth and satisfaction comes with exploiting the opportunities to explore this profession and I urge the new members to participate as there is an exceptional personal reward.

My family has played a big part in receiving this award. Jill and the family have always encouraged me and my career moves and my involvement with Association affairs. As previously mentioned, our profession involves high demands on spouses and families,
particularly those years when we are separated because of field work and the spouses have to take an exceptional role in these cases. I thank Jill for her support and help. Her being here today is exceptional and appreciated as we are in the process of having a seventh grandchild.

In closing, I would like to thank Council for this award and thank all the members including those who are no longer with us for the opportunity to serve what I believe is the best profession going. Thank you.
Presentation of the Professional Recognition Award to J. (John) Deyholos by Wm. R. Hunter, ALS

Mr. Hunter addressed the audience as follows:

Unfortunately, in this instance the presentation of this prestigious award is somewhat saddened by the absence of our recipient. The late John Deyholos, Alberta Land Surveyor, Dominion Land Surveyor and Canada Lands Surveyor.

As you are aware, John left us for a meeting with the great Director of Surveys on the 9th of January 2004. Greatly missed by his wife Deanna, three sons and their wives Michael and Paulette; Jason and Brenda; and Steven and Cheryl. Eleven grandchildren and, I must add, all members of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and sister associations that crossed paths with him over the years.

I am very pleased to announce that John’s wife Deanna Deyholos and their eldest son Michael are present with us today. They have graciously accepted our invitation to attend this awards ceremony and accept this award on John’s behalf.

This Professional Recognition Award is our way of expressing our Association’s appreciation to an outstanding member that dedicated so many hours of his time to Association affairs. We, as an Association, thank you and the rest of your family for sharing John’s time, wisdom, knowledge and patience with us. It was a great memorable experience indeed.

John was a prairie boy reared in Manitoba in 1931 until Alberta called him in the late 1950s. He pursued and then obtained both an Alberta and Dominion Land Surveyor commissions in 1963. John commenced his survey career working for B.C. Forestry and spent a season on the 28th baseline with late Bjorn Rustad.

He was a district surveyor for the Director of Surveys office and spent a lot of time in northwestern Alberta putting a survey control network. Flying these towers in by helicopter and spent many hours relating experiences of men hanging over the edge trying to put these things together. He also worked with Stanley and Associates, Canadian Engineering & Surveys and finally found his own firm called Frontier Surveys Inc. in Calgary.

John’s never-ending thirst for knowledge and his humour made him the most likeable colleague and friend. This diverse background served him and the Association well over the years.

I first remember John when he served our Association as chairman of the Calgary group of surveyors. We used to meet in the Land Titles Office in the evening once a month and tell tales. These were not regimented meetings but rather designed to keep everyone informed. They were more like a study group. There was also senior land surveyors present to tell all the younger ones how
things have been done. Someone had to step up and run these meetings and John filled the bill. He certainly enjoyed the opportunity to share his experiences and wisdom with us in those meetings. I cannot remember a time when John was not serving our Association in some manner.

He served on our Practice Committee, Registration Committee, Land Titles Committee, Discipline Committee, Council’s special Committees and as President of the Association in 1976/1977. At that time, there was little or no budget available for this service. Being a volunteer then also provided you with the opportunity to pay your own way, which John did without any complaints.

One of John’s favorite tasks was the time, effort and serving as Director as the J.H. Holloway Foundation. I believe that John served continuously since its inception in 1975. John did a magnificent job promoting and gathering monies for this fund to the benefit of many survey students over the years. Its continuing success is attributed to the efforts of John Deyholos and others on the Board past and present.

It is never a pleasure to serve on a discipline committee. However, John willingly served on the Committee numerous times. John’s ability to separate the wheat from the chaff at these hearing and come up with his own conclusions based on the facts with any doubt being given to the benefit of the practitioner was always impressive to watch.

In my opinion, John’s years spent serving on the Practice Review Board deserve a special merit award in it self. These were in the early years of the Practice Review Board and very little funding was available for operations. The generally philosophy for the Practice Review Board at that time was primarily that of education rather than discipline. This often resulted in fireside chats with practitioners and some office and field meetings with them for guidance and instructions. It was during these meetings and discussions that John’s desire to educate rather than spend time on discipline was very impressive. His teaching ability based on this vast experience, varied practice and patience served him and members of the Association well.

John would often mention that he would rather spend ten volunteer hours on educating a misinformed practitioner than one hour in the discipline process because the education process was rewarding from both parties, did not create any animosity and in addition contained a long term benefit for the Association and the public. John spent his entire professional career as a land survey student in pursuit of knowledge and truth through the application of right reasoning.

John was a kind man, intelligent, dedicated servant to both our Association and the public at large.

An award of this nature is not given for one heroic event, rather in recognition to the long term dedicated exemplary service displayed by this member. Like accretion the resulting benefit to the Association is often imperceptible. It is tough to recognize the services being perform by an individual while he is continually in the harness and we are as an Association guilty and apologize for not getting around to this task earlier.
John Deyholos can be best described as a surveyor, a gentle and honest man, a man with unquestionable integrity and morals and most deserving to be the recipient of our Professional Recognition Award for this never ending dedication to serving our Association and the public.

On behalf of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, I now present this Professional Recognition Award to John’s family represented today by his wife Deanna and his son Michael. Deanna and Michael, it is our wish that you might proudly display this award for your families as a token of how his efforts and dedication were appreciated by his peers. We also thank both of you for attending this function today and trust you will remember this occasion fondly. Thank you.

Michael Deyholos addressed the audience as follows:

I would like to thank you all for hosting us. Despite Bill’s remarks, I think it is a good thing this was done posthumously because we think that dad might have said if he heard he was getting an award to all of you, "good grief don’t you have better things to do" and might not have even made the trip.

He worked the day before he went into the hospital and his last thoughts of his last week were of his families and about taking care of his clients. He loved his membership and association with his profession. Thank you very much.

Deanna and Michael Deyholos
Presentation of the President's Award
by J.G. Halliday, ALS

Mr. Halliday addressed the audience as follows:

In 1995, Council established the President’s Award, authorizing the President to give recognition for contribution to the Association that goes above and beyond the call of duty.

The Award may be given to ALSA members or non-members alike and is given at the sole discretion of the President.

This year, as President, I have decided to give this Award.

This past November, Ernie Isley completed his sixth and final year as public member on our Council. Ernie didn’t always say a great deal at Council but what he did say was clearly heard and clearly represented the public’s interest.

When he came to Council, we knew he had a great deal of political experience but he also had a keen interest in geography. Ernie taught us that Jasper is not the geographical centre of the province and tried to convince us that Cold Lake would be a great place for an annual meeting.

If there was any negative side to Ernie’s term on Council, I would have to say it was the two times he attempted to spill his water on me. But the positive side of that was that it kept my cat-like reflexes in tune.

But, in all seriousness, on behalf of the seven presidents you served with (Stan Longson, Alex Hittel, Don Jaques, Larry Pals, Ken Allred, David McWilliam and myself), the 34 Council members you served with, and the entire Association, please come forward and accept the 2004 President’s Award. Mr. Ernie Isley.

Mr. Isley addressed the audience as follows:

I feel both honoured and humbled and it is generally hard to humble me. On behalf of Sheila, my wife, and myself thank you for inviting us back to our seventh convention and for the hospitality that you have provided.

I would also like to publicly thank an old friend, Alberta Land Surveyor Ken Drake, who submitted my name as a possible public member a little over seven years ago.

During the six years I served as Public Member on Council, I have met some very interesting people. I have learned a lot about your profession and have developed a high degree of respect for your Association and your professionalism. As I said in ALS News, you look hard to find a profession that has members participating to the level that you people do. I also think I indicated that I have never been to a convention that was so well attended and well participated in.

I have to say that only once in my Association career with you my confidence was shaken and President Jim Halliday already alluded to it.
I was very confident that you as a profession could find the corner of a quarter section, that you could find the central part of an LSD to drill an oil well, and that you could lay out a city subdivision and mark all the lots accurately. Then, low and behold, I heard a bunch of land surveyors arguing that Jasper was the central point of Alberta. For awhile, my confidence was shaken, for a bit. But when you refused to recognize Cold Lake as a central point, I started to realize you were just playing games.

With that, I wish my successor Mr. Lawrence Kluthe, Public Member well, and I am sure he will serve you well as he did on the Practice Review Board. My only advice is do not get into poker games with him. It could be costly.

Good luck and God bless.
Appendix "K"

List of Exhibitors and Sponsors

EXHIBITORS
Alberta Land Titles
Bench Mark Equipment and Supplies
Butler Survey Supplies Ltd.
Cansel Survey Equipment
EECOL Electric and Radiodetection Canada
Ensight Information Services
First Order Measurement Solutions
Gemini Positioning Systems
IHS Energy
Land Measurement Systems Inc.
Leica Geosystems
MicroSurvey Software, Inc.
Mountainview Systems
Oce Canada Inc.
Russel Metals
SECO Manufacturing Co. Inc.
SOKKIA Corporation
Spatial Technologies Inc.
Trimble Navigation

SPONSORS
Platinum—$1000+
All-Can Engineering & Surveys (1976) Ltd.
Caltech Surveys Ltd.
Can-Am Geomatics Corp.
Cansel Survey Equipment
Ensight Information Services Ltd.
Focus Surveys Inc.
Fugro SESL Geomatics Ltd.
IHS Energy
Midwest Surveys Inc.
Russel Metals

Gold—$500-$999
Challenger Geomatics Ltd.
Driving Force
Sharps Audio Visual

Silver—$250-$499
CIBC Private Wealth Management
Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge
Olson Surveys Ltd.
Peerless Printers Ltd.
Pals Surveys & Associates Ltd.
Sharpline Imaging Products
Snell & Oslund Surveys (1979) Ltd.

Bronze—$100-$249
Butler Survey Supplies
Crape Geomatics Corporation
D.W. Data Services
SECO Manufacturing Co. Inc.