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Jasper Park Lodge
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2004-2005 Council
Front row from left to right: L. Kluhe, S.C. Green, A.W. Nelson, J.H. Halliday, L.M. Pals
Back row from left to right: G.D. Cross, D.H. VandenBrink, D.C.J. Bruce, D.N. Marquardt, V.A. Ziegler, L.J. Frederick
# Past Presidents of the Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>W. Pearce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>L.C. Charlesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>L.C. Charlesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>R.W. Cautley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>A.C. Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>J.L. Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>H.H. Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>A.S. Weekes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>G.W. McLeod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>R.H. Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>A.P.C. Belyea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>C.M. Hoar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>J.L. Doupe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>B.J. Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>O. Inkster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>C.M. Hoar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>R.H. Cautley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>E.D. Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>T.W. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>N.H. Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>C.B. Atkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>H.S. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>A. Cormack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>W.E. Zinkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>W. Humphreys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>J.W. Doze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>R.M. Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>G.Z. Pinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>J.H. Holloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>R. McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>G.C. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>G.C. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>R. McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>C.W. Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>W.D. Usher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>D.K.F. Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>C.H. Weir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>W.A. Wolley-Dod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>L.O. Olsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>C.W. Youngs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>E.J. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>G.C. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>A.J. Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>G. Oslund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>W.E. Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>T.E. Rippon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>T.C. Swanby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>D.C. Holmberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>D.B. Gillmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>M.A. MacCrimmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>R.A.F. Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>T. Okamura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>M.L. Sexauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>R.J. Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>J.W. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>J. Deyholos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>E.J. Tessari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>N.R. Mattson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>J.E. Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>B.R. Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>W.R. Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>R.A. Bassil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>R.J. Fulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>A.D. Hosford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>R.E.D. McCuaig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>L.W. Breton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>G.E. Olsson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>I.C. Maltais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>S.M. Loeppky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>G.L. Haggerty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>R.F. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>H.E. Impey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>L.H. Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>J.H. Holmlund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>W.R. Dabbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>S.J. Longson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>D.R. Jaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>L.M. Pals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>G.K. Allred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>D.R. McWilliam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>J.G. Halliday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>A.W. Nelson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attendance at the 96th Annual Meeting

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS

Amundrud, A.O.  
Andersen, L.A.  
Anderson, C.F.  
Bates, B.P.  
Bearisto, B.A.  
Beatty, K.B.  
Benson, B.L.  
Boggs, G.A.  
Boutilier, J.K.  
Brassard, J.F.  
Brea, P.J.  
Brooks, J.S.  
Brown, T.A.  
Bruce, D.C.J.  
Cheng, F.S.  
Chiasson, C.J.  
Chiasson, C.L.  
Chiddy, T.J.  
Cloake, D.A.  
Cote, R.J.  
Cross, G.D.  
Croucher, M.K.  
Cummings, H.L.  
Densmore, P.A.  
Devlin, R.L.  
Dharamshi, A.M.  
Dion, F.  
Douglas, I.  
Drake, B.M.  
DuFour, S.C.  
Edmundson, D.L.  
Egger, R.D.  
Emmerson, I.R.  
Ewen, S.B.  
Finner, L.C.  
Fleece, B.G.  
Frederick, L.J.  
Fretwell, M.  
Fulton, R.J.  
Gibson, J.  
Gill, A.  
Gillmore, D.C.  
Goosens, H.J.  
Gosling, D.E.  
Grant, D.M.  
Green, S.C.  
Hagen, D.J.  
Haggerty, J.  
Hall, R.O.  
Halliday, J.G.  
Hanrahan, C.M.  
Hanson, D.R.  
Harding, T.  
Hasham, A.M.  
Haub, D.M.  
Higgins, D.B.  
Hingley, W.F.R.  
Howard, S.  
Huber, B.L.  
Hudema, T.W.  
Hume, A.J.  
Hunter, W.R.  
Hut, V.G.  
Hutchinson, S.A.  
Ingalls, M.R.  
Ironstone, J.P.  
Irving, B.  
James, L.  
Jamieson, D.A.  
Johnston, J.H.  
Jones, B.W.  
Jones, D.R.  
Keddy, S.R.  
Keir, C.D.  
King, R.G.  
Kinloch, M.E.  
Kocher, M.S.  
Lachance, D.A.  
Landry, J.E.  
Lenius, C.L.  
Lin, S.P.  
Loepky, S.M.  
Longson, S.J.  
Lovse, W.J.  
Lunty, D.J.  
MacDonald, M.A.  
MacLeod, J.W.  
Main, A.R.  
Marquart, D.N.  
Marshall, P.L.A.  
Martin, T.G.  
Matthysen, J.J.  
Mayne, R.E.  
McArthur, D.J.  
McBride, C.A.  
McGaffin, R.J.  
McKenna, B.J.  
McWilliam, D.R.  
Meashaw, F.J.  
Medlicott, T.C.  
Metcalfe, R.O.  
Miles, A.F.  
Moloney, P.  
Morden, L.P.  
Morrison, R.  
Murray, B.A.  
Nelson, A.W.  
Neufeld, D.B.  
 Nome, J.A.  
Oh, E.  
Olson, L.O.  
Pals, L.M.  
Partridge, S.S.  
Paziuk, J.R.  
Petersen, C.R.  
Pinkerton, R.A.  
Pollard, R.B.  
Pominville, R.J.  
Prefontaine, F.H.  
Prevost, M.D.  
Rachynski, A.R.  
Radovanovic, R.  
Rasmuson, J.E.  
Regan, D.R.  
Robinson, M.D.  
Rogers, F.S.  
Roop, A.W.  
Ross, R.C.  
Rutherford, D.J.  
Salmon, E.R.  
Schirrmacher, G.A.  
SexSmith, M.L.  
Sharp, D.  
Sharpe, J.C.  
Smith, G.E.  
Smith, P.E.  
Stephens, J.D.  
Stoliker, P.C.  
Strachan, D.W.  
Strochinski, F.M.  
Stromsmoe, G.K.  
Strozyk, P.  
Sullivan, P.J.  
Sutter, M.A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swabey, K.T.</td>
<td>Van Berkel, S.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney, J.E.</td>
<td>VandenBrink, D.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarapaski, A.J.</td>
<td>Voss, V.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therault, A.J.</td>
<td>Walker, P.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle, J.O.</td>
<td>Wallace, R.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, C.R.</td>
<td>Wallace, J.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson, D.R.</td>
<td>Weimer, K.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomkinson, D.N.</td>
<td>Wesolowsky, W.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripp, C.J.</td>
<td>Westersund, P.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tronnes, D.L.</td>
<td>Westlake, I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker, D.C.</td>
<td>Westlund, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Berkel, J.W.</td>
<td>Wetter, B.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, R.F.</td>
<td>Clark, E.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassil, R.A.</td>
<td>Gillmore, D.B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christenson, J.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RETIRED MEMBERS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin, J.</td>
<td>Nixon, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fehr, J.A.</td>
<td>Pelletier, P.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keong, J.</td>
<td>Phillips, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koncan, M.J.</td>
<td>Pyc, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemrava, K.</td>
<td>Siu, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen, H.</td>
<td>Thompson, A.J.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choy, A.K.Y.</td>
<td>Heck, W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebb, G.B.</td>
<td>Ingraham, T.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacPhee, J.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTICLED PUPILS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Members ..................................... 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Life Members ............................ 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Members .................................... 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled Pupils .................................... 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Members ................................ 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total .................................................. 210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2005-2006 Council
Front row from left to right: G.D. Cross, L.M. Pals, S.C. Green, D.H. VandenBrink, A.W. Nelson
Back row from left to right: T.A. Brown, D.C.J. Bruce, V.G. Hut, L. Kluthe, D.N. Marquardt, M.H. Young
Invited Speakers

1. J. K. Lee, University of Toronto
   - Title: "Recent Advances in Nanotechnology for Biomedical Applications"

2. Dr. A. H. Smith, University of California, San Diego
   - Title: "Role of MicroRNA in Cancer Development"

3. Prof. E. G. Brown, University of Western Ontario
   - Title: "The Evolution of Human Language"

4. Dr. L. M. Johnson, University of British Columbia
   - Title: "Innovations in Renewable Energy Technology"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Council Liaison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATUTORY COMMITTEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Committee</td>
<td>A.W. Nelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Board</td>
<td>D.A. Wiberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Committee</td>
<td>C.R. Petersen</td>
<td>G.D. Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDING/AD HOC COMMITTEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel</td>
<td>D.R. McWilliam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
<td>D.J. McArthur</td>
<td>D.H. VandenBrink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of the Association Ad Hoc</td>
<td>A.O. Amundrud</td>
<td>V.G. Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical &amp; Biographical Committee</td>
<td>A.R. Main</td>
<td>D.C. Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation Ad Hoc</td>
<td>T.W. Hudema</td>
<td>D.N. Marquardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
<td>A.W. Nelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Committee</td>
<td>N.R. Woolgar</td>
<td>M.H. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Committee</td>
<td>S.S. Partridge</td>
<td>T.A. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Committee</td>
<td>K.T. Swabey</td>
<td>D.N. Marquardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>S.C. Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER COMMITTEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALSA/DOS/LTO/Metis Settlements Liaison</td>
<td>S.C. Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention &amp; Social Group</td>
<td>B.E. Munday</td>
<td>S.C. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Gas Ad Hoc Committee</td>
<td>D.A. Jamieson</td>
<td>V.G. Hut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSMT</td>
<td>Liaison: G.D. Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPP Geomatics</td>
<td>Liaison: S.C. Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Council of Land Surveyors (CCLS)</td>
<td>Director: L.M. Pals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Council of Land Surveyors Professional Liability Insurance Committee</td>
<td>Member: M.E. Kinloch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral Mapping Specifications Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Member: C.A. McBride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee (GELC)</td>
<td>Members: R.G. King, V.G. Hut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Transaction Committee</td>
<td>Members: R.L. Haagsma, S.M. Loeppky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canadian Board of Examiners (WCBE)</td>
<td>Members: V.G. Hut, L.M. Pals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXTERNAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES**
President A.W. Nelson officially called the 96th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association to order at 9:04 a.m.

The assembly rose for the Canadian national anthem.

Mr. Nelson announced that the meeting will follow Robert’s Rules of Order with Public Member Lawrence Kluthe presiding as parliamentarian. He continued by announcing the voting privileges of different categories of membership.

Mr. Nelson introduced the 2004-2005 member of Council to the assembly as well as public members, Lawrence Kluthe (Council), and Russ Barnes (Practice Review Board). He added that Mr. Barnes sent his regrets that he could not attend this year’s Annual General Meeting.

President Nelson presented a brief history of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association attendance at the Lodge as follows:

This year marks our second of three consecutive years to Jasper Park Lodge. The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association first came to Jasper for an annual meeting in 1972 and this is our 17th annual general meeting overall to be held here.

The membership enjoys coming to these beautiful surroundings as witnessed by the tremendous turnout this year.

Just outside is Lac Beauvert. The name for this lake was suggested by Hugh Matheson, DLS, in 1914. The lake was originally called Horseshoe Lake because of its shape but, to avoid duplication, the name was changed to describe the “beautiful green” colouring ranging through every tone.

Hugh Matheson was born May 2, 1989 near Kincardine, Bruce County, Ontario, of Highland Scottish ancestry. He obtained his early education locally in public and high schools. From 1904 to 1907, he attended Queen’s University as a student of mining engineering, working during the summer months on surveys on the prairie north of Swift Current, Saskatchewan. In 1907, he graduated from Queen’s with a Bachelor of Science and spent the following two years in the Yukon and southern British Columbia.
In 1910, he qualified as a Dominion Land Surveyor. From 1911 to 1914, he was occupied with miscellaneous surveys with the Department of the Interior, of which perhaps the most important was a topical survey of Jasper Park including laying out the original townsite of Jasper.

Alberta Land Surveyors have enjoyed coming back every since.

President Nelson then introduced Ms. Amanda Robinson who joined the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge just this past month from her most recent position as hotel manager at the Fairmont Banff Springs, the site of the Association’s centennial AGM. He added that Ms. Robinson brings with her twenty-five years of management experience and more than fifteen years with Fairmont to the position.

Ms. Robinson addressed the assembly as follows:

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. It is my distinct pleasure to welcome you all to the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge. As Al mentioned, I have actually been in the office fourteen days, so I am definitely new to Jasper—but during the fifteen years with the company, Jasper has always been one of my most favourite out of all of our properties. I feel very privileged to have the position of general manager here.

The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association is a very important group to our hotel. You mark the launch for our conference season and, as many of you can imagine, Jasper can be a little tough in the winter for our staff to get hours. It is very exciting for them to see so many attendees as, for them, it means full-time work. They are thrilled and, of course, we are thrilled to have a full house.

Obviously, we will be sad not to have your group in 2007, 2008 and 2009 but, we are very grateful that you are staying with Fairmont hotels and certainly the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge looks forward to welcoming you back in 2006 and 2010. I hope you have a fabulous conference and please just ask any one of us if there is anything at all we can do for you during your stay.

President Nelson presented Ms. Robinson with the Association’s newly published book on the history of land surveying in Alberta.

Mr. Adrian Pritchard, Manager and Lyn Johnson, Liaison Officer with Professions and Occupations, Alberta Human Resources and Employment were introduced to the assembly. The assembly learned that Mr. Pritchard was representing The Honourable Mike Cardinal.

Mr. Pritchard addressed the assembly as follows:

It is definitely my pleasure to bring greetings and best wishes from the Government of Alberta and particularly from the Honourable Mike Cardinal, the Minister of Human Resources and Employment. In his new portfolio, Minister Cardinal is responsible for the
governing legislation of twenty-four self-regulating professional associations. Among that legislation is included the Land Surveyors Act which, as you know, is the governing legislation for your profession.

On a personal note, I was very pleased to be invited to attend this year’s annual general meeting. This is now the fourth ALSA AGM that I have had the opportunity to attend as the Manager of Professions and Occupations and, as has been noted, with me today is Lyn Johnson, who is a vital part of our Professional and Occupations office. She is certainly familiar to members of your Council, and certainly to your administration with the work that we do with you with any respective amendments to your legislation. As before, I wish to thank you for inviting both myself and Lyn and giving us both a chance to learn more about the Association’s ongoing work and its business activities first-hand.

Alberta has had a long history of strong collaboration between government and the province’s various professions. With this province’s land surveyors, that history goes back, virtually, to the turn of the century when the ALSA was incorporated as one of the province’s earliest fully-fledged self-regulating, professional associations. In this regard, I note that you are marking your membership’s accomplishments in a new book, *Laying Down the Lines: A History of Land Surveying in Alberta*, is of particular interest to myself, as at one time, I used to study history. Anything to do with history, in whichever capacity, is always of great interest to myself. I will be most interested to read this book which will undoubtedly be an important addition to the growing list of titles that are coming out this year to mark not only your work in the province, but also Alberta’s history during the past century.

Over the past few decades, Professions and Occupations’ relationship with the ALSA has been an excellent example of how the Alberta Government and a professional association can work together to benefit the people of this province. Not only have you built a progressive, cooperative and strong working relationship with the Alberta Government but, you have also continued to build equally strong relationships with other professional associations, the academic community and, above all, within the overall land surveying profession both within Alberta and across Canada.

For its part, the Government of Alberta will continue to work closely with your Association and assist you in strengthening your relations with your industry partners. We strongly believe that these relationships are absolutely vital if we are continue to collaborate closely on issues that affect the well being of all Albertans.

The services you provide are absolutely essential to Albertans. They were essential in serving what would become Alberta as a province at the beginning of the last century and have remained so throughout the ensuing one hundred years. I strongly encourage you to keep up your excellent work with the people of Alberta. For our part, we will continue to work with you to ensure that professionalism is demonstrated both by your membership and that it also remains strong and vital in years to come.
Once again, thank you, and continued success at this year’s AGM.

Mr. Nelson presented Mr. Pritchard with a copy of *Laying Down the Lines*.

Mr. Nelson asked the assembly to participate in a moment of silence for the following members who passed away during 2004-2005:

- K.J. (Kasimir) Sawicki (ALS 398) June 6, 2004
- P.K. (Pete) Muirhead (ALS 252) October 9, 2004
- C.N. (Norm) Hanson (ALS 212) October 27, 2004
- J.W.P. (John) Matthews (ALS 279) March 1, 2005

Mr. Nelson also asked that the assembly recognize Farley McKenzie who passed away on January 6, 2005. He added that Mr. McKenzie worked in the survey supply business and probably attended every annual meeting of the Association for the last twenty years.

Mr. Bob Baker, Historical & Biographical Committee Chairman, was called upon to help launch *Laying Down the Lines: A History of Land Surveying in Alberta*.

Mr. Baker addressed the assembly as follows:

There is that old saying, that before any organization can plan where they are going, they have to know where they have been. Over the past several years, the Association, with the assistance of the members of the Historical & Biographical Committee and our consultant author, Judy Larmour, has managed to document a large portion of our past and present. The very roots of the Association were dug into and recorded to address the headings of the various chapters that make up the publication.

Early in the Committee discussions, it was agreed the book of the history of surveying in Alberta would be a coffee table version—it would contain a lighter version of surveying history in the province, not recorded in minutes of meetings or formal publications, but of tales of events, anecdotes and characters with a generous smattering of photographs, all serving to shape surveying in the province.

Some historic events and tales did not make it into the final draft as space was limited and it was not economical to increase the number of pages. One tale that was alluded to in some of the earlier promotional literature provided helpful advice on what to do when a rattlesnake got loose in a truck. This and other tales did not make it into the records. For instance, the tale of the 1973 Association Executive Committee who decided to hold a retreat to discuss future strategies in the Hamlet of Cadomin, south of Edson. While on a midnight walkabout, complete with bagpipes, through the hamlet in the wee hours of the morning, the only commercial outlet burst into flames. The Executive quickly surmised, at that time, that it must have been the heated discussion that caused the fire.
The task of having a publication worthy of the Association’s name ready for the 2005 AGM would have never been completed without the dedication of the members of the Committee, past and present, our Executive Director, Brian Munday, and, of course, our author, Judy Larmour. To these individuals, I offer my heartfelt thanks for their support and dedication, over the years, for a job well done.

At this point, I am going to turn the podium over to author, Judy Larmour, who will provide the assembly with more detailed accounts and some of the highlights that are contained in the book, *Laying Down the Lines: A History of Surveying in Alberta*.

Judy Larmour addressed the assembly as follows:

Before I do a couple of excerpt readings from the book, which is traditional for book launches, I would like to say a few words.

Yesterday, the Association bestowed on me an extraordinary honour for which I am grateful, deeply appreciative and one which I will cherish. A book such as this, however, is always the result of hard work on the part of a great many people. The author is part of a team. I would like also, to pay tribute to the Historical & Biographical Committee, along with what Bob has said, under his very able chairmanship for a number of years. Having completed almost fifty oral history interviews, the Committee then exercised considerable patience while providing input, support and guidance as the manuscript took shape.

It can be difficult for a researcher/writer to work with a committee in writing a book but, in this case, I can honestly say that it was unfailingly a pleasure and truly a cooperative effort. There were about twenty-six people who sat on the Committee over the number of years. Thank you to everybody.

Thank you for trusting me and giving me the freedom to work my way into the subject matter. That is a rare gift.

The Historical & Biographical Committee read draft chapter after draft chapter carefully and always constructively. A number of people, both Committee members and others too many to mention by name this morning, contributed to the research for specific issues and explained technical details.

When the final panic checks had to be done, there was always someone to help. I’d like to especially thank Dick Bassil, Doug Barnett and Gordon Olsson and also Allan Main who, at the last minute, provided assistance with the nuances of putting an index together.

Brian Munday certainly did go above and beyond the call of duty. He carefully shepherded the book along and read and re-read a number of drafts up to the last. He caught small errors and inconsistencies and, although we don’t always agree on where to place commas, I am indebted for his meticulous attention to the manuscript.

Thanks also to everyone at the Association office, especially Sharon and Lyall. Thank you also to the series of presidents and Councils of the Association for their enthusiastic support of this
project which celebrates the story of your profession in Alberta’s centennial year.

Ms. Larmour read a short excerpt from the book about surveying for tourism for Jasper Park.

President Nelson advised that Ms. Larmour will be autographing books during the coffee breaks until noon on Saturday. He went on to say that the Association has also launched an historical website in conjunction with the book at www.landsurveyinghistory.ab.ca.

Mr. Nelson proceeded to auction of a copy of *Laying Down the Lines: A History of Land Surveying in Alberta* which was signed by the author, Judy Larmour, and Premier Ralph Klein, the proceeds of which will go to the J.H. Holloway Scholarship Foundation.

Mr. Terry Hudema was successful in obtaining the book for a bid of $1,000.

President Nelson then asked honorary life members Bob Baker, Dick Bassil, Ken Berg, Jim Clark, Dunc Gillmore, Marlin Sexauer, Ross Tate and Charlie Weir to stand and be recognized.

Retired member John Christenson and associate members Anthony Choy, Greg Hebb, Wade Heck, Terry Ingraham, Janet MacPhee and Steven Tronnes were also introduced.

Newly commissioned members were introduced as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#719</td>
<td>David Gosling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#720</td>
<td>Martin Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#721</td>
<td>Lee Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#722</td>
<td>Andrew Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#723</td>
<td>Mike Fretwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#724</td>
<td>Reid Egger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#725</td>
<td>Ed Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#726</td>
<td>Sirt Lin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#727</td>
<td>Harvey Goosens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#728</td>
<td>Roy Pominville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#729</td>
<td>Leanne James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#730</td>
<td>Terry Chiddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#731</td>
<td>Jarl Nome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#732</td>
<td>Colin Keir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#733</td>
<td>Don Hanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#734</td>
<td>Jeremy Zettel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#735</td>
<td>Robert G. King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#736</td>
<td>Connie Hanrahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#737</td>
<td>Patrick Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#738</td>
<td>Robert Pinkerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#739</td>
<td>Courtney Tripp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#740</td>
<td>Mark MacDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#741</td>
<td>Steven Van Berkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#742</td>
<td>Art Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#743</td>
<td>Dwayne Edmundson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#744</td>
<td>Mark Knott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#745</td>
<td>Lee Morden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#746</td>
<td>Mark Woychuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#747</td>
<td>Scott DuFour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Nelson asked that principals or representatives come forward to introduce articled students.

- Jerry Rasmunson of Maltais Geomatics Inc. introduced Matthew Vanderwey who is articled to Bruce Gudim.
- John Stephens of Focus Surveys Inc. introduced his articled students Huong Nguyen and Cory Tucker. He also introduced Adam Thompson who is articled to George Munro.
Scott Westlund of Stantec Geomatics Ltd. introduced his articled student, Jonathan Austin.
Jules Brassard of Challenger Geomatics Ltd. introduced Mark Koncan who is articled to Rod Buchko.
Jim Sharpe of Midwest Surveys Inc. introduced his articled student Mike Prokopetz.
Brent Irving of All-Can Engineering & Surveys (1976) Ltd. introduced John Wong and Troy Motz who are articled to James Sloan.
Greg Stromsmoe of Focus Surveys Inc. introduced his articled students Jeff Fehr and Jonathan Phillips.
James Hume of Crape Geomatics Corporation introduced Peter Pelletier who is articled to Joe Longo. The other two students, Paul Hatch and Patrick Wetherup were working in the field.
John Haggerty of Can-Am Geomatics Corp. introduced Rich Nixon who is articled to Roger Ross.
Roy Pominville of Focus Surveys Inc. introduced three articled pupils: Jacek Pyc, articled to Ron Hall, Javier Siu and Jiunhan Keong who are articled to Damian Gillis.
Mark Prevost of The Cadastral Group Inc. introduced his articled pupil Michael MacEachern and Kevin Nemrava, on behalf of his principal, David ten Broek.

President Nelson introduced visiting guests as follows:

Max Batten, President
Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors

Derek French, President
Association of Prince Edward Island Land Surveyors

John Ross, President
Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors

Henry Schubert, President
Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors

Ted Katz, President
L’ordre des arpenteurs-geometres du Quebec

Paul Church, President
Association of Ontario Land Surveyors

Vern Hink, President
Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors

Jim Clarke, President
Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association

Jeff Beddoes, President
Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors

Hal Janes, President
Association of Canada Lands surveyors

Tim Fox, President
Idaho Society of Professional Land Surveyors

Brent Johnston, Vice President
Land Surveyors Association of Washington
The following representatives from related associations were asked to stand and be recognized:

**Bert Hol, Vice President**
Canadian Council of Land Surveyors

**Rick Beaumont**
Canadian Institute of Geomatics

**Ken Revoy, President**
Alberta Society of Surveying and Mapping Technologies

Mr. Nelson also recognized Greg Hebb, representing SAIT; Allan Theriault, Connie Hanrahan and Terry Ingraham representing NAIT and Elizabeth Cannon from the Department of Geomatics Engineering at the University of Calgary.

Director of Surveys Mike Michaud and Association solicitor David Jardine were also introduced to the assembly.

Mr. Nelson acknowledged Tim Grusie from the Land Titles Office and Brian Stecyk of Rose Country Communications Ltd. who were not able to attend.

Director of Surveys, Mike Michaud addressed the assembly as follows:

On behalf of Linda and myself, I would like to thank the membership for your hospitality as guests to the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association annual general meeting.

I have five items that I would like to highlight as activities that the Director of Surveys Office has been involved in over the year. One of them is the free data you can get your hands on and that is the field notes on SPIN. Staff have been active on control surveys and have had limited discussion with the cities of Edmonton and Calgary on their high precision network maintenance. Expansion of networks within eight other municipalities and cities is also being discussed.

Another area that the Geodetic Control Unit is busy on is a service where one can pick up a radio receiver for approximately $1,000 and get real time corrections down to a metre or less.

The final area that the unit has been involved with is commenting on and reviewing of the Calgary EDM Baseline. We are currently in discussions with the Association to see what might hold for the future of that baseline.

In the land surveys area, we have been involved with ten official surveys typically within townships or settlements. There are a number of activities going on within Metis settlements. We are conducting an investigation in the County of Leduc and are looking at three formal survey investigations under Section 9. We have been involved in approximately thirty-five other informal investigations/advisory services which involves speaking to members on issues with official surveys, section corners, township corners, and so on.
Early Bird Prize

The assembly learned that Huong Nguyen was the early bird prize winner of a complimentary evening stay for two at the Fairmont Jasper Park Lodge.

Introduction of ALSA Staff

President Nelson introduced Association office staff 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
- Cindy Chomlak, Administrative Assistant
- Matt Parrish, Geomatics Technologist

The assembly was advised that NAIT graduate Jeremy Dawson will replace Matt Parrish as the Association’s technologist on staff as Matt plans to head to the University of New Brunswick.

Introduction of the Convention & Social Committee

Mr. Nelson also thanked and introduced members of the Convention & Social Committee as follows:
- Wade Heck, Chair
- Jason Thistle, Vice Chair
- Mark Kocher, Past Chair
- Grant Beach, Exhibitor Liaison

Adoption of the Minutes of the 95th Annual General Meeting

It was MOVED by Mr. Loeppky, seconded by Mr. Pratt, that the Report of Proceedings of the 95th Annual General Meeting be adopted.

Motion Carried

President’s Address

President Nelson then addressed the membership as follows:

Today, I would like to speak briefly about resources and how we use them.

This province we live in hinges, to a great extent, upon the exploration, development, extraction and marketing of natural resources. This has provided Alberta and our profession with significant economic activity. The resulting sale of iron posts and marker posts has enabled our Association and its members to pursue very proactive programs that contribute to fulfilling our legislative mandate and to protect the public through a number of initiatives that would include things like:
• A leading peer review model that we know as Systematic Practice Review.
• Involvement of active and committed public members on both the Council of Management and the statutory Practice Review Board. For that, we are indeed blessed. I believe the public is well represented by that as well.
• Significant organized support through staff and through the hiring of specialized consultants who keep some of our committees operating at a very high level.
• Interaction with the public includes many informative brochures, publications, press releases and regular meetings with the political community. Again, as Adrian Pritchard said, a close liaison with government that we find very valuable.
• Better information, better service and maintaining the open dialogue in the public interest is our job.

On the horizon are a couple of new issues. One is the recommendations from the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee respecting the status of governing monuments. This issue will have a direct impact on land owners and land surveyors.

A second issue is an approved pilot project by the ALSA under the direction of the Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee dealing with a pilot project to streamline the process of boundary resolution. It is a pilot project because we are not sure what the results are going to be but I believe it is a very proactive stab at that very thing and that is the protection and service to the public.

The Future of the Association Ad Hoc Committee is looking at the future of our profession and how we continue to provide the essential services to the public and to the industry today and into the future. Demographic studies point to the potential for declining membership in the next few years. The offering of new services, spawned in part by new technology and the rapidly advancing information age, is an old topic under this banner that used to be known as “expanded profession.” There is no doubt in my mind that we will be examining those issues in the near future in a very serious way. What should fall under our legislation and how may it better serve the public?

There are global issues. We have high revenues. They haven’t always been enjoyed as they currently are. In our own businesses and in the resources of the ALSA there is an ebb and flow. It is an important consideration when you hear our members react to things that happened in the last couple of years—your fees have been raised while there is a surplus in revenue. This is a product of a number of things but mainly it is because of a fairly rigid policy on how we budget and the forbidding by Council and the membership to do a deficit budget. Increasing demands of the committees and the members at large provide a challenge for that.

Establishment of priorities to achieve our own objectives for the membership but, more importantly, to continue to improve on our good record of public service and protection is an essential component of that fiscal responsibility. Council, in the upcoming year, will be challenged to render a couple of difficult decisions. Choosing between priorities as to who will and how to address certain issues requires investment of resources (both human and
monetary). We all know that all the work done by our committees hasn’t always been perfect; there are times where it has overlapped or not met with the success we had hoped for. We have made investment in outside organizations or global community activities hoping to achieve the benefit of a wider range of knowledge from different areas. Not all of those things have been successful. Our challenge is to back up and look at this picture again and try to put our resources in a manner that makes the most sense. I think we will continue to pursue the right opportunities. I am not sure we will be perfect as I am hoping but I think we will get close.

The 2005-2006 Council will be charged with balancing those supposed strengths of a national or even global perspective against the need to look inward at ourselves and what is unique to Alberta. Resulting decisions may disappoint some of you in this room as to who may want to spend resources in another environment—other than what Council may decide at the time. Others may want to leave a legacy for future Councils. There will be some conflict and that is the price of professionalism—we are challenged to do the right thing.

Last year, I challenged members and committees to reduce three things: terms of reference, overlap in assignments and budget and I got sent packing—we are busy and we want to do this. Retrospective analysis of the satisfaction of those terms of references does not, however, show that we collectively accomplish what we think we can. We continue to bite off more than we can chew—and that isn’t a criticism of the committees, it’s the reality that we are forwarding-thinking people and we just take on too much. What I would like to challenge the upcoming Council with is to chew on things we know we can deliver, do them right and get them in the right priority. Last year we spent $150,000 that was not in the budget at the request of committees. That included consultants. Staff are fully engaged and it is obvious that we cannot simply continue to hire more people to meet the demand.

I will challenge this Council to re-engage the issue to ensure prioritized terms of reference, elimination of overlap, effective use of resources and continuing fiscal observance. Those will be top issues in the upcoming year.

On a personal level, I need to thank that contingent of staff that I just introduced a few minutes ago for their support and enthusiasm. I would like you to join me as well in thanking Council and the individual members. They came ready to every meeting; they came prepared and there was indeed true respect shown for everybody’s valuable time in the past year. I believe that correct decisions were rendered and there was opportunity to debate issues and I credit these individuals for coming ready to do that. They deserve our acknowledgement and respect and I would like you to join me now in giving them a hand.

It was MOVED by Mr. Pals, seconded by Mr. Beaumont, that the 2003-2004 financial statements be adopted for the year ending April 30, 2004. (Appendix A)

Motion Carried
Mr. Nelson drew the assembly’s attention to the 2005-2006 budget.

Mr. Stephens asked Mr. Pals to expand on what President Nelson alluded to respecting revenues and iron posts and marker posts. He went on to say that according to the 2003-2004 financial statements, the Association’s financial position is at approximately $1.6 million. Mr. Stephens noted that there will also be a surplus for the 2004-2005 fiscal year. He expressed concern that, in reviewing the budget for 2005-2006, the Association is under-budgeting and is picking up the shortfall.

Mr. Pals responded that Council has a hard and fast policy that restricts it to providing a budget number of the average of last four years of iron post and marker post sales. He added that there will come a point in time where that policy may go the other way if post sales go down and Council needs to keep that in perspective.

President Nelson advised that Council passed a motion to not engaging in deficit budgeting and to use the four year average for post sale budgeting.

Mr. Nelson drew the assembly’s attention to the committee reports, the Executive Director’s report and the Registrar’s report. He introduced the 2004-2005 committee chairs and council liaisons as follows:

**Convention & Social**  
Wade Heck (Council Liaison: Al Nelson)

**Discipline**  
Jim Halliday

**Editorial Board**  
David McArthur (Council Liaison: Dirk VandenBrink)

**Future of the Association Ad Hoc**  
Arlin Amundrud (Council Liaison: Stephen Green)

**Historical & Biographical**  
Robert Baker (Council Liaison: Les Frederick)

**Legislation Ad Hoc**  
Terry Hudema (Council Liaison: Les Frederick)

**Nominating**  
Jim Halliday

**Practice Review Board**  
Chad Finner

**Professional Development**  
Ross Woolgar (Council Liaison: Dirk VandenBrink)

**Public Relations**  
Scott Partridge (Council Liaison: Vince Ziegler)

**Registration**  
Tim Harding (Council Liaison: Grant Cross)

**RPR Ad Hoc**  
David Hagen (Council Liaison: Clayton Bruce)

**Standards**  
Francis Prefontaine (Council Liaison: David Marquardt)
Mr. Loeppky noted that the RPR Ad Hoc Committee has spent two years putting together two reports for Council. He expressed concern that this group needs to get moving to protect the interests of the public. He indicated that he chairs a committee that founded itself on the former RPR Committee, namely the Real Estate Transaction Committee (RETC). Mr. Loeppky advised that this committee is composed of fifty-two members representing real estate, lawyers, bankers, municipalities and so forth. The RETC met one month ago and Mr. Loeppky indicated that he was charged, as chairman, to look at where we are going and what we are doing with that committee and also possibly meet with three separate provincial ministers. In order to be able to do that, Mr. Loeppky stated that it was suggested by one of the representatives of the government that we should look to all our committee members and ensure they are happy with the work of the RETC. He added that he will be asking the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association to give us a summary of how they feel about the RETC and the RPR Ad Hoc Committee. Mr. Loeppky further expressed concern that there is a lot of work that needs to be done with real property reports and he would like to see that committee, with Council’s guidance, get on with the job.

Mr. Nelson called upon Public Relations Committee Chairman Scott Partridge and Council Liaison Vince Ziegler to present the bylaw amendment. He added that everyone except honorary members may vote.

It was MOVED by Mr. Partridge, seconded by Mr. Ziegler, that Student Member be added to the list in Section 51 and that a new section be added as Section 51(7) as follows:

(7) Student Member

(a) Council may upon application, confer membership in the Association as a Student Member to any individual who is enrolled as a full time student and who currently complies with one or more of the following criteria:

(i) enrolled in a geomatics program or a related academic program;
(ii) enrolled in a high school with the intentions of entering a geomatics program or related academic program;
(iii) has an interest in the field of geomatics and is enrolled in a related program.

(b) A Student Member is not required to pay an annual fee.
(c) A Student Member may attend any annual general meeting, special meeting or regional meeting of the Association and is entitled to discuss any motion or resolution before the meeting, but may not vote and may not propose any motion or resolution to the meeting.

(d) A Student Member may sit as a member on any non-statutory committee of the Association.

(e) A Student Member may use the designation “Student Member/Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association” (Student Member/ALSA).

(f) Membership may be cancelled by Council ...

...and that a new Section 52(5) be added to read as follows: Student memberships are valid for one year and applications become due on October 31. Students must reapply annually.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Ziegler, seconded by Mr. Woolgar, that the wording in item (a)(iii) be replaced by has an interest in geomatics.

Amendment Carried

Mr. Ziegler advised that the purpose of the amendment was to put the recommendation in line with what was discussed at the Committee level. The Committee felt that the first category would have the greatest number of applicants. The second category would have the second greatest number and probably be the most valuable of the three. The third category was added to catch any students that may have been left out of the first two categories. During the discussion at the Committee level, it was realized that there were some students that worked with firms that were pursuing different careers but showed a interest in the land surveying profession.

Mr. Partridge added that the Committee ran a pilot program to ascertain how many students were interested in taking advantage of the membership category. 104 students signed up.

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED

That Student Member be added to the list in Section 51 and that a new section be added as Section 51(7) as follows:

(7) Student Member

(a) Council may upon application, confer membership in the Association as a Student Member to any individual who is enrolled as a full time student and who currently complies with one or more of the following criteria:

(i) enrolled in a geomatics program or a related academic program;
(ii) enrolled in a high school with the intentions of entering a geomatics program or related academic program;
(iii) has an interest in geomatics.

(b) A Student Member is not required to pay an annual fee.

(c) A Student Member may attend any annual general meeting, special meeting or regional meeting of the Association and is entitled to discuss any motion or resolution before the meeting,
but may not vote and may not propose any motion or resolution to the meeting.

(d) A student Member may sit as a member on any non-statutory committee of the Association.

(e) A Student Member may use the designation “Student Member/Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association” (Student Member/ALSA)

(f) Membership may be cancelled by Council

...and that a new Section 52(5) be added to read as follows:

Student memberships are valid for one year and applications become due on October 31. Students must reapply annually.

Main Motion as Amended Carried

Mr. Pratt spoke in favour of the amended motion and pointed out that during the trial membership drive, the high schools were not being reached. He added that he felt that there was some work to be done in selling memberships to the high school students.

Mr. Partridge commented that one of the pleasures that he experienced was while he was attending a high school career fair where students would engage in conversation about opportunities in the land surveying profession. There was keen interest from a select set and he took that opportunity to make those students aware of the student membership. Mr. Partridge asked individual members of the Association to take on the responsibility of informing students of the new category.

Mr. Partridge drew the assembly’s attention to the Science Alberta Foundation “Made to Measure” crate available for viewing at the annual general meeting. He added that the material that was put together turned out admirably well.

Mr. Nelson advised that the next few motions involved the Manual of Standard Practice and only active, honorary life and retired members may vote. He called upon Francis Prefontaine to present the motion.

Standards Committee Chairman Francis Prefontaine acknowledged and thanked the Committee members for the hard work during the past year. He also acknowledged the assistance given to the Committee by office staff Brian Munday and Dawn Phelan.

It was MOVED by Mr. Moloney, seconded by Mr. Prefontaine, that the following change be made to the Manual of Standard Practice at the end of the first paragraph of Part D, Section 1.4: When a circular curve boundary is non-tangential to an adjoining line segment boundary, radial bearings or a chord bearing and distance must also be shown.

Motion Carried
It was MOVED by Mr. Prefontaine, seconded by Mr. George, that the following be added to Part D, Section 2.2 of the Manual of Standard Practice as Section 2.2.4: Grid (NAD83) co-ordinates must be shown on the plan or on a separate document registered along with the plan.

**Motion Carried**

It was MOVED by Mr. Jamieson, seconded by Mr. Prefontaine, that the compendium (Bulletin 38, Control Survey Standards and Specifications, History of Re-Establishing from Road Plans and The Commitment to Property Damage Mitigation) be taken out of the Manual of Standard Practice and be placed on the ALSA website.

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Prefontaine indicated that Mr. Jamieson stated that the motion reflects the idea of “things to do” and “things to know.” “Things to do” will remain in the Manual and the “things to know” will be placed in a compendium which will be easily accessible on the ALSA website.

Mr. Hagen spoke against the motion by indicating that a copy of the Manual should be complete. He felt that having a hard copy in hand was better than having to search on the website.

Mr. Pratt asked whether in future, if there is material that is not deemed as “things to know” that end upon being in the Manual, does that have to come before the membership for approval?

President Nelson responded that Council has approved separating information into a compendium. He went on to say that because the membership approves the Manual itself, Council felt that the issue to remove it from the Manual was not a decision that Council should make.

Mr. George spoke in favour of the motion. He alluded to Mr. Hagen’s comments and indicated that it would be ideal to have everything in the Manual but if all the information on all the different things that the profession does was included, it would be unmanageable. What the Committee is proposing is to keep the manual lean and material could be printed off from the website that deals with different facets of the profession. Mr. George further stated that it is incumbent on the land surveyor to print out all the information that staff requires.

Dr. Elizabeth Cannon, the Head of the Department of Geomatics Engineering at the University of Calgary was asked to present a report on the Department and its activities.

Dr. Cannon thanked the membership and the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for their strong support of the program at the University of Calgary and addressed the assembly as follows:

**Recommendation #3:**
Manual of Standard Practice (Grid Coordinates)
(See Appendix E for Rationale Document)

**Recommendation #4:**
Manual of Standard Practice (Compendium)
(See Appendix E for Rationale Document)
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April 22, 2005
AFTERNOON SESSION

U of C Presentation by Dr. Elizabeth Cannon, Head, Department of Geomatics Engineering
The past year was the 25th anniversary of the Department. It was a very special milestone for us and a number of you came out to celebrate. Over and above the 25th anniversary, we also had some exciting things happen in the Department. One of them is that we had some new faculty members join the program. In fact, we had three in the last year: Kyle O’Keefe, who is one of our own Ph.D. students and one of our undergraduate students as well, joined last July; Bo Huang joined in the GIS area. He came from Singapore; and Alex Braun came to us from Ohio State University to work in the geodesy area. He has a background both in geodesy and geophysics. Those are three bright, young faculty members that are really adding a lot of depth to our program.

We have continued to have a number of awards given to our professors and to our students which, again, in the academic environment, speaks to the quality of work that we are doing as academics and the quality of students that we are attracting to our program. They are competing in many international and national competitions and getting recognized for their work. A number of our faculty members are involved both at the provincial, national and international level, both in associations and learned societies. Again, that is very important from our program perspective to make sure that we are aware of current trends and others are aware of our program.

Research is still very strong and is one of the cornerstones of the university program. We feel very strongly about research and the benefits, not only to our graduate students but also to the undergraduate students and the students you hire in the future. We have been able to attract significant research funding. We consider faculty members individual entrepreneurs. The University doesn’t give us money to hire graduate students. We have to go out and convince industry and government that the research that we are doing is worthwhile and have them invest in our research programs.

Looking to the future, we are going to continue to add to our faculty complement. We are attracting Dr. Danielle Marceau to our program on July 1st. She is coming as a full professor from the University of Montreal. She started and runs a geo-computing lab and is a rigorous geographer. She is going to add a lot of depth to our GIS program and be able to look at GIS, not only in terms of development of new techniques but really to be able to integrate to various other units across campus and outside to look at interesting and new GIS applications. We are thrilled to have her. We filled that slot, not from an open slot in our Department, but it was the University backing the program and recognizing the quality of work we are doing and the talent that Danielle can bring, not only to our Department, but to the University in general. They have given us an additional position to be able to bring her here. That is a strong vote of confidence from the senior administration at the University.

The 25th anniversary of the Department was a very exciting time for us. Some of you were very responsible for the starting of our program. If you look at where we have come in the last twenty-five years, it is really astounding, not only in our reputation but in our
size and the leaders that have been produced from the program, many of whom are in this room, that have really gone on to shape the geomatics industry in Alberta and beyond. It was a time for us to reflect and to celebrate. A number of companies in this room sponsored our banquet and our scholarship program and also, many of our alumni came to the banquet. We also had a number of other activities associated with the 25th anniversary which included an open house and a lost peg competition.

In terms of research and teaching and some of the faculty members involved, one of the things we are very proud of in our program is that we do cover a very wide breadth of the geomatics engineering field; everything from geodesy, gravity field, GIS and land studies, digital imaging, positioning and navigation as well as engineering metrology. We are very broad and we have faculty members working in each one of these areas. From your perspective, we have two faculty members focusing on cadastral and land tenure systems—Mele Rakai and Mike Barry.

We currently have eighteen faculty members with another one joining us in July. There has been a significant growth over the late nineties. This is significant because this occurred at a time when it was very tough to get new academic positions. In a university environment, you do that through two routes. One, is you need to demonstrate student numbers. If you don’t have undergraduate students in your program, the university will not invest new faculty members to teach students who may not be there. The other thing is quality. You need to be able to demonstrate that, not only are you a quality program within the university, but that your program (Geomatics Engineering in our case) really stands up to all the other programs worldwide. We have been able to demonstrate that and the provincial government gave us funding through the access program to increase our number of faculty members. What that has done is build up our complement of faculty and allowed us to attract some very good, young faculty members to be able to expand our capabilities.

We are increasing in enrolment. We are, more or less, at a steady state now at the undergraduate level. Our quota is about fifty-five students per year. The program is such that first year engineering is common and end of the first year, students decide what area of engineering they want to study. Out of that cohort, we draw in fifty-five students who start in our program in the middle of second year. Students indicate what department they want as their first choice, second choice, third choice and so on. We believe the vast majority of the fifty-five students we bring in to geomatics, have selected geomatics as a first or second choice. These are students who are very highly motivated to study geomatics. There is always going to be a little bit of attrition out of that fifty-five. We have about one hundred eighty students in our undergraduate program right now and we have about eighty-two full-time graduate students in our program. In 2005, the expected number of graduates is approximately thirty-eight.

The internship program is an opportunity for students after third year, to spend twelve to sixteen months in industry to get experience and to come back and finish their geomatics program.
Typically, that has been growing and about half of our students have been participating in the internship program. What we have seen this year is that internship has been decreasing. We have twelve students out of third year placed in internship and five currently looking for internship placements. That is a significant reduction. We can look at that either positively or negatively. From the anecdotal evidence that I have from the students, one of the things that is driving a lower interest in the internship program is the very high demand from the land surveying sector. Many of the students who are interested in land surveying as a career are saying, why should I go off and spend twelve to sixteen months in an internship program when I can just get right through my degree in four years, start earning money and then start articling right away and having all that time count towards my commission. It is a double-edged sword as to whether students are interested in the internship program or not.

Between $47,000 to $48,000 has been raised specifically to give scholarships or bursaries to our students. There was a major increase in funding due to the 25th Anniversary Scholarships. There were three scholarships of $3,000 each that were set up as a long-term legacy of the 25th anniversary. Many individuals and companies contributed. This is something that we always want to see increase and I appeal to you as companies to think about establishing a scholarship either on a short or longer term basis. Students really appreciate it. You can set the scholarship up for academic merit, for financial need or a combination of both. Again, it goes a long way, not only to promote your company, but to offset the increase in costs for student education.

Our career day, which is held annually in February, is something that we are very proud of. Our students organize the event where companies can come and showcase their capabilities, do some interviewing of students for either summer jobs, internship jobs or for permanent placements. There are approximately thirty-five companies that were involved this year and we are really appreciative of that support. In terms of careers, obviously our graduating students are in good shape as many of them have jobs. Third year students are getting either internship jobs or summer jobs. I did speak to the representative from our second year program and a number of those students are not getting summer jobs or have not been offered summer jobs yet. So, if you are still looking for students to hire for summer term placement, please contact the Department, let us know what you are looking for and we would be happy to pass that on to the students. These are students who are just in the geomatics program but they have taken the surveying course, GIS and estimation least squares as well.

I wanted to give you some information that was collected by the University just to get a sense of where our students are in their skill-sets and their thinking of the future. There was a survey conducted a few years ago. The data was only reported last June. The survey was done of students who were in our program, most of them undergraduate, whereby they asked them whether or not they felt that they had achieved or gained skills in a number of areas. All of those students surveyed from our program felt that they got the
skills needed to be able to obtain a job when they graduate. That gives us some satisfaction that we have, to a large extent, developed a curriculum to meet the needs of industry. Engineers ranked high on their ability to be effective speakers and writers. As well, 50% of the students felt they had graduated with strong leadership skills, computing skills and the ability to work independently. This survey was done by the University but, we have collected, and will continue to collect, similar feedback data from all our students. We have just done that from our students graduating this spring and will have that analyzed within a month or so. It is very important for us to understand, not only the academic program where they are technically trained, but to find out if they are developing the softer skills that you, as industry, will require of the future graduates and your future employees. Similarly, they were asked questions on various factors when choosing a job. The thing that they valued the most was the ability to advance in their workplace. That is a message to you as employers that when you go to hire geomatics engineering graduates, one of the things they will look at carefully is how that opportunity will allow them to advance in their careers, how they will be able to work in teams and so on. Company reputation was voted as being very strong by the students in making choices about future careers.

It is very important from a university perspective that we keep our research current, leading edge and well-recognized. We have eighty-two graduate students. We attract graduate students from all over the world and that speaks to the recognition of the program on an international basis. Our students come from many different backgrounds. They are not just geomatics students coming into a geomatics graduate program. We have electrical engineering students, mechanical engineering students, physicists and so on. It brings a real breadth and a real diversity to our graduate program. That has allowed us to move into interesting research areas that we could not have contemplated five or ten years ago. Our students also have been very successful at being recognized through a number of awards and scholarships, both at the University and nationally.

The percentage of the graduates students coming from outside of Canada (VISA students) exceeds 50%. One of the difficulties in an environment where the career opportunities are so strong, is to convince Canadian students that a graduate degree would be worthwhile. There is a richness that is brought through VISA students but we would like to see more Canadian students contemplate graduate studies.

Out of eight-two students, sixty-three are in the positioning, location and navigation area where we have six faculty members working. In a way it is over-subscribed relative to some other areas. GIS and land tenure have approximately eighteen students. What I would like to see, as a department head, is a re-balancing. I would like to see the total number of graduate students expand and I’d like to see more graduate students move into some of these other key areas. We expect that to happen in the future as some of our new faculty members that joined us start ramping up their research programs.
Research funding continues to be strong. We attract over $3.5 million per year in research funding to support our graduate students by infrastructure and so on. It comes from a number of sources: the provincial government, the federal government, as well as foreign governments and industry. Industry is a very strong supporter of our research programs and is one of the reasons why, on a per faculty number basis—the amount of money divided by the number of professors we have—we would have the highest funding per faculty member in the faculty of engineering and one of the highest of any department in Canada.

One of the things we also do is review our curriculum. We want to ensure that we are delivering a program that meets the needs of future employers. This is something that is done on a regular basis. We, as individual faculty members, get information from our own circles that we move in. We have a Geomatics Engineering Advisory Committee as well as the Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee which is specifically targeted with liaising with the land surveying sector. We put all that together and asked ourselves whether we are teaching the right thing and whether we are teaching it in the right order. We did a review last summer and we are changing the curriculum for the fall of 2005. We have looked at what is required core knowledge and what are things that can be elective that students can opt or not opt to take. We wanted to look at new trends to ensure that, in our technical electives which students take in fourth year, they have a choice of courses that are meeting current and emerging trends. We also wanted to capture the fact that we have an added capacity from some of the new professors. One of the changes concerns the GPS or satellite positioning which used to be an elective in fourth year. We are now moving that to a required course in third year. That will be of benefit to you because it will mean that students that you are hiring either out of third year for a summer job or into internship will have a solid course on GPS. They will also have good skills in data collection and data analysis. We are deleting the physical geodesy course and moving much of that material into other courses. We have dropped a few things but made things more efficient so as not to lose it totally. We are introducing new technical electives; one in wireless location, one in the GIS area and one in advanced photogrammetry and ranging techniques to capture things like lidar. We are very excited about this new program and I think our students will benefit as well.

Project management, which used to be taught by a civil engineering professor will now be in our fourth year design course and will be taught in a module on project management specifically related to the geomatics sector. Some of you may be familiar with the fact that there has been a curriculum pulled together, funded by the federal government, on geomatics project management that we will get access to. Diane Coleman, who has done workshops in this area, will be teaching our students project management based on that curriculum.

In summary, we are very proud of the success we have had over the last twenty-five years. Thanks to many people in this room who, not only initiated the program to start with, but helped in its
success. We have great, strong student demand. There is a very
definite correlation between the number of students who come into
our program and the career opportunities that are available for
them when they finish. Research continues to be excellent and top
notch. We are hoping to increase faculty numbers through broad
engineering initiatives. There are a number of things that are
happening at the faculty level which we believe could end up with
us having even more professors in the Department.

In closing, we have had great success over the last twenty-five
years but we are really excited about what is going to happen in the
next twenty-five years.

Mr. Ross asked whether the Department tracks which sectors of the
geomatics industry that the undergraduates get employment and, if
so, what was the percentage was in the cadastral area.

Ms. Cannon replied that an exit survey is done with the students
that is specific to the program where all kinds of questions about
the quality of the program and where their future interests lie. That
data is not analyzed until all the marks are in. She guessed that this
year, at least 50%—it could be as high as 60% or more—of the
students would be interested in a land surveying career. Ms.
Cannon commented that the individual members and companies
and the Association have done an excellent job of promoting the
sector. She added that there is involvement throughout the school
year in supporting events organized by the students which is really
appreciated. Ms. Cannon indicated that in the growth and expan-
sion of the land surveying sector, there are many opportunities. Not
all students want to get a land surveying commission and some may
want to work in the GIS area. She added that the students can still
do that within the umbrella of a land surveying company because
the sector is doing end-to-end type work and integrating all the
gomatics tools. Ms. Cannon agreed to communicate the survey
results to the membership, perhaps through an article in ALS News.

Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, Allan Theriault, was
asked to provide the assembly with an update.

It is my great pleasure to be able to be here to represent NAIT, and
I thank you for inviting me to address the assembly.

I would like to take the opportunity to extend congratulations
to the twenty-nine new members. On behalf of NAIT and our
Geomatics Engineering Technology Program, I would like to
thank the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and the member-
ship for their continued strong support. The Association and its
membership provide a combined total of approximately $5,000 in
scholarship for our students and the majority of that is awarded to
second year students. It is much appreciated by them and helps
them get through their second year.

Last year, the program’s graduating class was 100% employed
in the geomatics industry. I don’t have complete statistics on the
placements, but I can say confidently, that Association member
firms employed all but a few. Every year, members come to NAIT
to make presentations to the students. The students gain so very much from these experiences. Thank you very much and please continue to come. All you need to do is call me.

One particular person I want to single out today is Lyall Pratt. Lyall comes to NAIT every year and speaks to our students. I know I have thanked you many times before but I wanted to do that in front of everyone here today. Your contribution helps us prepare our students to be a strong part of the cadastral team. Many of our students are inspired and motivated by such visits to pursue further education and many aspire to become Alberta Land Surveyors. Many of you here can vouch for that.

I’d like to report that we have just recently made an application to the Western Canadian Board of Examiners for more formal exemptions. Our graduates can obtain three exemptions from the syllabus and our recent application seeks exemptions for five more. This application is supported by the strength of our curriculum and the hard, dedicated work by our academic staff, Connie Hanrahan, Terry Ingraham and Dwayne Westacott, all of whom are members of this Association. When we receive more exemptions, I feel that more people will be encouraged to enter into our program.

In an effort to encourage students further, we have entered into discussions with the University of New Brunswick which is interested in forming an agreement with us with respect to transfer credits. Many of our former students have gone to study at UNB and I will be travelling to Fredericton next month to work on this.

This past year, we had sixty-seven applicants for thirty seats. I have had many calls this year from prospective students resulting in a present number of forty-eight applications which is more than we usually have at this time of year. This year there are twenty-four students in the graduating class and twenty-five students in our first year class. Our students have tremendous opportunities for employment, wages are going up and times are good. Last year, we had eighty-seven posted opportunities; this year, we have ninety-six to date and there are four more months left to go in the same comparison period.

In closing, on behalf of NAIT and the Geomatics Engineering Technology Program and, most importantly, our valued students, please allow me to once again thank the Association. We strongly value our relationship with you.

Mr. Haggerty asked Mr. Theriault whether there is any work being done to increase the number of students in the program.

Mr. Theriault replied that one of his goals this year is to get out to more high schools to promote the program. Connie Hanrahan is going to Grande Prairie to attend the Women in Technology session with a view to target more students. He further commented that in the NAIT web calendar, the word “surveying” has been added to the program, i.e. Geomatics (Surveying) Technology. The reason for this is that NAIT’s career placement has stated that when students are trying to decide what program to enroll in at NAIT, they find it difficult to find surveying.
Mr. Nelson then called on Mr. Greg Hebb who delivered the following address:

I am pleased to be here this afternoon representing SAIT. Student numbers are excellent. We are sending out twenty-eight students this year, eighteen of whom are from the surveying option. At SAIT we still have the surveying and the mapping options.

We will be taking forty students in the fall. We would like to increase those numbers, but it is just not possible at the present time. The number of applicants on the waiting list is sixty-five.

What we have noticed over the past three years is the number of first-year students getting jobs in industry which makes a big difference in their second year. The students return with four months of knowledge of what goes on in the survey industry which complements what we are trying to teach them in the third and fourth semester. We really appreciate the support for industry in this regard. Last year, we sent out twenty-eight students for a work week practicum in October. They were all over Alberta and into British Columbia.

The SAIT Advisory Committee met last week and it is great to get the input from industry. SAIT is also applying for a few more exemptions from the WCBE and is hoping this will make the program better for the students.

One thing that I would like to mention is that we are running a survey assistant program this summer from June 6th to 30th. It is intended to be a fast-tracked, one month program for people who want to work in the geomatics industry. It is intended for those who want to gain interest in the geomatics industry by starting out as an assistant. It is a full, one month program with two weeks intense classroom study, one week of safety training and one week of an on-the-job practicum for the students. We are hoping to fill up the quota of twelve students for this summer and are anxious to see how industry responds.

Thank you very much for your time and support.

President Nelson added that NAIT and SAIT are producing candidates that are the life-blood of this Association and the commitment to the profession is appreciated.

President Nelson stated that the Canadian Council of Land Surveyors is an organization to which all members contribute. He added that there are a number of initiatives that CCLS has been working on which includes the national board of examiners which has turned into a national forum on the harmonization of entry standards, distance education and the CCLS professional liability insurance program.

Mr. Nelson called upon Bert Hol, Vice-President of CCLS, Larry Pals, CCLS Director and Munroe Kinloch, who is on the CCLS Professional Liability Insurance to give a brief report on CCLS on their involvement with CCLS.

Mr. Pals addressed the assembly as follows:
The annual CCLS meeting was held in Quebec City in early June 2004. The next meeting of CCLS will be held in September in Winnipeg in conjunction with the meeting of the Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors.

CCLS has developed three business skills seminars which are on its website. I would invite anybody to go to that section on the CCLS website and you can draw down the information and even put the seminar on yourself. I believe the whole course outline is there.

At the AGM in June, CCLS approved a strategic plan. Mr. Hol will present more details on that plan and some changes in the way we will do business.

In regards to NAFTA, all CCLS activities are currently on hold until the United States survey societies decide on the body who best represents them. At the table right now are Canada and Mexico. We have decided that it is best to put any operation on NAFTA on hold at this point in time.

Some activities that CCLS has worked on in the past month include a redesign of the CCLS website. In March of 2004, the national forum on entrance was carried out in Winnipeg. As a result of that forum, there were six recommendations that were ratified and supported by the associations. Those six recommendations are that a national exemption study be carried out, that we not look behind the degree, there was a harmonization of certificates of completion, that a major review of curricula be carried out, that a streamlining of the equivalency process be carried forward and that something be dealt with as far as articling and making the processes more viable to various individuals. The final report of the national forum is on the CCLS website.

The Professional Liability Insurance Committee, which Monroe Kinloch is going to speak to very shortly, has also been very busy.

Mr. Kinloch provided the following report to the assembly.

CCLS has a committee called the Professional Liability Insurance Committee (PLIC). There are five members and our job is continue with the program that is in place, keep it up-to-date and try to keep things under control as far as mandatory insurance which we have in place through our bylaws in Alberta.

The PLIC manages the Errors and Omissions Insurance Program (E&O). It is a customized program specifically for surveyors and engineers. Insurance and its premiums are a necessity. In the robust economy of Alberta, it is not a matter of whether you are going to get involved in a claim, it is just a matter of when.

Although we have a mandatory insurance bylaw in Alberta, there are other insurers beside the one that the PLIC has in place. The job of the PLIC is to make sure that we get the best bang for the buck. Just be sure that you are comparing apples to oranges when you are dealing with insurers.

Presently, all of the renewal forms, if you are a member of the program, should be in your corporate offices now. We would ask you to give consideration for the program as we have managed to negotiate a two-year program that keeps your premiums the same
for two years. I’d ask for your support as members for the program that we are proposing to you through the Encon Corporation. With the two years, we also have a stabilization fund which helps us take care of the spikes that do occur in the insurance business.

The program itself is confidential. The Committee is sworn to confidentiality and if you have a concern, I would encourage you either to approach me or one of the Committee members and we would be glad to talk about your concerns. We do believe that the insurer we have has the best in-house claims resolution process that we are aware of.

CCLS Vice-President Bert Hol spoke to the assembly as follows:

First of all, I would like to bring greetings from President Jim Dobbin to the Council and members. On behalf of CCLS, my wife Marnie and myself, I’d like to thank President Al for the invitation to attend this AGM and thank the members for the generous hospitality we have enjoyed here.

I will speak first on the Board of Examiners Coordinating Committee. That Committee is the part of CCLS which looks after accrediting education programs in Canada for the geomatics profession. Right now, we are just in the closing parts of accrediting the University of Calgary program. We had an evaluation team go to the U of C during the last school year and the Committee has come back with a report that has been presented to the Board of Examiners Coordinating Committee. I believe that report is just being finalized and should be presented to the Directors of CCLS in the next couple of weeks. Hopefully, the five-year accreditation will be granted to the University of Calgary at that point in time.

We have also been asked to evaluate the University of New Brunswick program. It will be expiring sometime this summer. We have started mobilizing a team and coordinating our efforts with the faculty at UNB so that we can get a team in there in the fall. We will go through the same process where we evaluate the program that they have running against the curriculum that is important to the profession and I hope that we will be able to grant them a further five-year accreditation as well.

The next school that also expressed interest is Laval in Quebec. Laval was accredited many years ago and I believe their accreditation expired sometime in the mid-nineties. One of the reasons that it has become important to them again is that they have rejoined CCLS and, with the Labour Mobility Agreement, it is important that all of the programs that produce surveyors in Canada have the same groundwork behind them.

We will be talking to Ryerson in Ontario and any other schools in Ontario which are also producing the majority of the land surveyors there.

The new BCIT Geomatics Degree program has also expressed interest in accreditation. BCIT has a two-year diploma program, similar to SAIT and NAIT. They have added a degree granting component in geomatics and they are just getting that off the ground. Last year, they asked for an accreditation of that program but, in our initial dialogue with them, we found that they weren’t
quite ready. Now they have all of their programs ready and we have a small sub-set of our Committee helping them put together a package of information that would be comparable to what U of C or UNB have been providing to us for evaluation purposes in the past. I hope that in the next year, we will be able to accredit their program.

With reference to the Board of Examiners Coordinating Committee, last weekend was the first meeting of a team that got together to do a review of the curriculum. We hope that they will be able to get together later in the year to develop a final report.

Due to the limited resources that CCLS has, both monetarily and in staff, we found that we were getting overburdened with some of the tasks that we were trying to undertake and were not able to complete as many as we would like to. Also, we are not a regulatory body like the member associations, so we do not have the power to provide direction to any of the associations. What we want to do is act as a resource and facilitate communications between the various associations. We take initiatives that are identified from a number of sources; either an individual association brings them to our attention or the president’s forum will bring them to our attention. If we feel, through polling associations, that there is a national enough scope for an issue, then what we do, through our strategic planning, is undertake a project and assign a champion to it. Then we try to facilitate getting resources from the various associations so that we can come up with some kind of model that the associations can use. An example might be the expanded profession. There are a couple of associations that do have an expanded profession now and there are a number that are looking at the issue. A model for the way CCLS would handle that type of issue would be to get all of the associations, which have or want to have an expanded profession in the near future, together; help organize all of the information that the associations have that have done it already, and; try to put together, through their learning, a model that other associations, who may want to enter into an expanded profession can apply.

Thank you again for inviting me to attend this meeting. I look forward to the rest of your deliberations.

The assembly applauded Messrs. Pals, Kinloch and Hol for their presentations.

Mr. Nelson asked Legislation Committee Chairman, Terry Hudema, to come forward and present recommendations 5(a) and 5(b).

Mr. Stephens asked permission to bring forward a motion regarding voting on recommendations 5(a) and 5(b).

*It was MOVEd by Mr. Stephens, seconded by Mr. Main that voting on recommendations 5(a) and 5(b) be done by ballot as opposed to a show of hands.*

*Motion Carried*
Mr. Stoliker asked for clarification on whether the motion refers to just the main motion or does it include any amendments that may come forward.

Mr. Stephens responded that it refers to the main motion. He commented that this is the first time, that he can remember, that the membership has looked at doing something as significant as opening an act. He felt it was more important to ensure that all members present vote and participate.

President Nelson advised that the voting on recommendation 5(a) and 5(b) will be done by ballot.

Mr. Hudema advised that recommendations 5(a) and 5(b) were the result of the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee’s deliberations over the last three years. He thanked the Committee for their hard work and dedication.

It was MOVED by Mr. Hudema, seconded by Mr. Frederick, that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association recommend to the Government of Alberta that the Surveys Act be amended by adding Section 39.1 to give governing status to Part 3 monuments placed at non-monumented Part 2 positions.

Mr. Hudema advised that the motion deals with monuments that are under Section 26.1, 2 and 3 that are posted under Part 3 or non-monumented Part 2 positions that, on a township plan, have not been placed at a normal east quarter or north quarter pin.

The assembly learned that the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee was set up in 2002 after a motion that Council assign a committee to review a method which allows monumentation placed under Sections 44.3 and 26.1, 2 and 3 of the Surveys Act to have official status. Mr. Hudema advised that he brought the motion forward after reading an article by John Wallace which was published in the March 2002 issue of \textit{ALS News}. This article was the result of discussion that occurred after Council had asked the Practice Review Board to look at the intersection of quarter lines. The discussions from the Practice Review Board brought forth another motion in August of 2002 which asked that consideration be given to change the legislation to allow monuments placed under Section 26 to have governing status.

Mr. Hudema went on to say that over the last three years, the Committee spent time looking at different options. During the first year the Committee looked at options that were basically confirmation of the placement of a monument and a ten-year period of it being in place before it could be given governing status. This option was reviewed by the Standards Committee, the Association solicitor and the Practice Review Board. There were issues that arose that indicated that the option would not work.
The assembly learned that, in 2003-2004, the Committee reviewed the Manitoba legislation with respect to conflicts in re-establishing a monument. In 2004-2005, the Committee reviewed all the previous discussions, the letters received from the Director of Surveys office and from members and decided that there was nothing wrong with what was taking place at the present time as far as the placement of monuments. Mr. Hudema informed the assembly that the Committee created the wording that it feels will allow the monuments, placed in a method that is currently used, to obtain governing status, and that is Section 39.1.

Mr. Hudema advised that the recommendation deals strictly with monuments placed under Part 3 in non-monumented Part 2 positions (i.e. the north quarter, centre section, LSD boundaries). Monuments placed after enactment would gain governing status after those monuments were shown on a plan of survey and it was registered. He indicated that there are a number of these monuments that would have been placed prior to enactment. The Committee put these types of monuments under Section 39.1(2). The monuments that were placed at these positions prior to enactment would have to be verified that they were located within a region that was within tolerance for the date they were placed. Mr. Hudema added that once that was shown on a plan of survey that was subsequently registered, those monuments would have governing status.

Mr. Hudema reiterated that the recommendation does not propose anything different than what is taking place at the present time with respect to placing the monuments. The only difference is that the monuments will have governing status after the plan is registered.

Mr. Hunter commended the work done by the Committee and stated that he has found, throughout the years, that one of the most important role of committees is to educate the members of the committee. From the information available, he surmised, that the intent is to give the public the right to rely on a survey post. Mr. Hunter added that he was not convinced that the recommendation would accomplish the intent and felt that it is trampling on the rights of individuals. He also felt that the recommendation was protecting the rights of surveyors more than the public.

Mr. Hunter stated that the posts that are planted, govern. Governing status is gained by the public and surveyors accepting the position of the monuments. He felt that common sense and professional judgment should be applied. Mr. Hunter added that it is not a sin to have a kink in a blind line or a quarter line just because the Act states that it governs by straight lines. Common sense should prevail in the spirit of the Act and legislation as it is right now.

Mr. George commented that he was not convinced that the monuments can be accepted now with the current legislation in place. He believed that the change to the legislation is providing the allowance to accept the position of the monument. Mr. George added...
that his understanding of the legislation is that the north quarter of the blind line is governed by two original monuments at either end. He further stated that survey evidence is being destroyed and the proposed changes to legislation would give more weight to protecting and enhancing survey evidence. Mr. George also felt that the public would be better served by giving the monuments governing status.

Mr. Hagen expressed concern about Section 39.1(5) which states that a monuments shall not be questioned in any court. He commented that land surveyors can offer an opinion but the final arbiter is still the court. Mr. Hagen suggested that Section 39.1(5) be removed.

Mr. Loeppky stated that he was in favour of the motion and was also in favour of adopting a resolution that there is a certification of the land surveyor that is signing the plan that they were on site and reviewed the evidence found and placed. He received clarification from Mr. Hudema that with the proposed change, the monuments would stand no matter what. Mr. Loeppky asked what would happen if there was a blunder and there ends up being two monuments.

Mr. Hudema responded that the procedure is no different than what takes place at the present time. If there is a blunder, the option is open for the surveyors involved to solve the blunder. The option is also still open to go to court to obtain a judge’s order. Under the proposed legislation, if a monument is planted in error and the plan becomes registered, the surveyor is required to obtain a judge’s order to get the plan corrected.

With reference to Section 39.1(5), Mr. Hudema advised that there are many situations where landowners dispute the position of a monument because of evidence such as a long standing fence line. The section is to prevent a landowner from taking a case to court in these types of cases.

Mr. Gillmore (Sr.) spoke in favour of the motion. He commented that, as far as blunders are concerned, the Act is clear as it states that monuments placed at non-monumented Part 2 positions should govern. If the monument is placed in error it is not really placed at the non-monumented Part 2 position.

Mr. Michaud asked for clarification on the statement that if a blunder is made, the issue can go through the courts for a judge’s order.

Mr. Hudema responded by saying that was what was discussed at the Committee level.

Mr. Michaud disagreed with the statement and commented that currently the legislation refers to Part 2 monuments governing. If the north quarter on a blind line is established for the first time in...
error, Mr. Michaud suggested that the legislation clearly indicates it does not govern and then, the question is whether that would have created or moved a boundary. He added that the issue may end up in a court of law but it would not have anything to do with a boundary being moved. It may have resulted in a landowner suffering damages from accepting a monument placed in error. Mr. Michaud suggested that the issue might go to court for a civil action, but no boundaries have been moved and, therefore, there would be no need to go to court.

Mr. Howard commented that there is a big difference at the time of the placement of a post. When a township was subdivided, the posts were placed before there was a boundary. Boundaries are created after the monumentation. In the north quarter on a blind line, there was no monument in, say, 1905. We are working with boundaries that were created a long time ago. Mr. Howard went on to say that a surveyor can only express an opinion. The wording in Section 39.1(5) states that opinion cannot be overturned by a court of law. He felt that the proposed legislation gives the surveyor too much power. Mr. Howard also expressed the view that the problem is not big enough to warrant changing the Surveys Act. He further stated that he would be hesitant in opening up the Surveys Act as government may then want to review everything in the Act. Mr. Howard’s solution was to work through the Manual of Standard Practice and decide, as a group, what good practices should be.

Mr. Hagen stated that removing Section 39.1(5) would not change the intent of what the Committee is proposing but would allow for the courts to be involved if necessary.

**AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Hagen, seconded by Mr. Gillmore (Sr.) that Section 39.1(5) be removed.**

**Amendment Withdrawn**

Ms. Morden advised that the intent of the Committee was to place the monuments in non-monumented Part 2 positions so that they would govern in the same way that a monument originally placed in a Part 2 survey would govern. The intent of saying that they should not be questioned in any court was that the monument in its location in the ground will establish the position of that boundary. She further advised that if there is any dispute between the adjacent landowners as to whether they have ownership of more or less land than would be indicated by that position of the pin, they would have the right to go to the courts or through other means to make a claim for an adjustment of the value of their land but, the monument itself would govern the position. During the original surveys, the monuments were placed in the field to the best ability of the surveyors to establish those positions. Other surveyors may have a different opinion about where those monuments should have been but, the monument itself governs. Ms. Morden added that if a monument is placed in a Part 2 position at the present time, the monument itself should govern regardless of whether another surveyor has another opinion of where that monument should be placed.
Mr. Gillmore (Jr.) indicated that he had a problem with the statement “and shall not be question in any court.” He felt that the public should have the right to question anything a professional does and, as well, the public should be able to appeal the decision of an Alberta Land Surveyor.

Mr. Main asked whether it was the intent that the wording go forward to the government for a legislative amendment.

Mr. Hudema responded that if the motion is passed at this annual general meeting, the wording as put before the assembly would go to the government for legislative drafting.

Mr. Main stated that he did not have a problem with the wording going before the government as undoubtedly, it will be massaged before it becomes law. He felt that body would look at such a proposal and question whether it can be challenged in court or not.

Mr. McBride spoke against in the amendment as he felt it goes against the intent of Section 39.1 which is to give governing status to the monuments.

Mr. George pointed out that Section 39.1(5) is contained in current legislation, that being Section 41 of the Surveys Act under the resurveys section.

Mr. Frederick suggested that the assembly was getting too bogged down in wordsmithing. He stated that the recommendation is asking whether the membership wants the monuments to govern or not. Mr. Frederick added that if the proposal will go through legislative drafting, the final product will probably look different but the intent will remain the same.

Mr. Hudema expressed concern about taking out 39.1(5) entirely because the first part is very important. He asked the mover of the motion to consider only removing the words “and shall not be questioned in any court.”

After discussion, it was agreed that the amendment be withdrawn and a new amendment be brought forth.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Stoliker, seconded by Mr. Loeppky, that the words “and shall not be questioned in any court.” be struck from Section 39.1(5).

Amendment Carried

It was clarified that the revised wording to Section 39.1(5) is as follows: “A monument referred to in subsections (1) of (2) shall govern the position as if it was placed as an original Part 2 monument.”

Discussion then took place on the main motion as amended.
Ms. Morden commented that there was some discussion about putting procedures that allow land surveyors to accept monuments in previously non-monumented positions into the Manual of Standard Practice as it appears that is already occurring. She went on to say that the current statute explicitly prohibits this action. Every time a north quarter on a blind line or the center of a section or the corner of an LSD is established, it requires that this be done from the original Part 2 monuments that were placed. If due diligence is to be done, it needs to be done that way every time regardless of how many surveys have already retraced that position. Ms. Morden encouraged the members to bring the statute in line with what is acceptable practice.

Mr. Moloney suggested that the current Act is not inadequate when consideration is given to the two sources of law within the legal system (legislative law and case law). If a land surveyor marks a position and thorough due diligence is done, legal principle would suggest that it would not be unreasonable for society to accept the position until it is proven wrong.

Mr. Tripp did not feel that the current Act was insufficient and indicated that there is room for interpretation in the wording of the Act that gives the land surveyor the right to judge evidence. He did not feel that it was necessary to change legislation.

Mr. Hut asked for clarification on Section 39.1(3). He recalled that, at the regional meeting in Calgary, there was discussion that indicated that the words “whether or not the dimensions or areas expressed on the plan are found by re-measurement to be different” should be omitted.

Mr. Hudema indicated that he could accept that amendment but was not sure what the reasons were.

Mr. Hut stated that he felt that the statement may be redundant. He felt that the statement was implicit in the whole purpose of recommendation 5(a).

Mr. Hudema stated that the statement is contained in the current Act and that the statement was there for clarification.

Mr. Wiberg stated that he was against the motion. He further stated that he has had internal debates on the issue of Part 3 monuments being placed in a Part 2 position. Mr. Wiberg felt it was up to the land surveyor to decide whether the post governs or not. He added that he did not believe that there was a big problem from the public’s perspective.

Mr. Woolgar advised that for the last 80 to 100 years, surveyors have been placing monuments at the north quarter and at the centre of sections using the simple instructions that are in the Act today. Surveyors have accepted these monuments as governing for this period of time and so has the land owner. He added that the
monuments were placed in good faith, using the tolerances and the standard of equipment used in the day. He felt that the profession has lost the art of understanding how monuments were placed. Mr. Woolgar went on to say that he was against the motion as he felt it was redundant.

Mr. Main stated that the decision made today will be important to the public for a long time to come. He suggested that motion be tabled until the next day so that members can have the opportunity to continue discussion among themselves.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Main, seconded by Barry Fleece, that recommendation 5(a) be tabled to the next day.*

Motion Carried

The meeting was adjourned until Saturday, April 23rd.

President Nelson brought the annual general meeting back to order at 9:07 a.m. and called upon the Registrar, R.A. Bassil, to conduct the elections.

Council was asked to retire from the head table during the elections.

Mr. Bassil announced that Messrs. Andersen, Goosens, Pinkerton and Van Berkel would be acting as scrutineers for the election process.

The assembly learned that the biographies 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*. A slate of candidates was also included in the recommendations package.

Mr. Bassil continued by announcing that the Nominating Committee put forward the name of S.C. (Stephen) Green for the position of president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for the year 2005-2006.

Mr. Bassil called for further nominations from the floor.

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

Motion Carried

Congratulations were extended to Mr. Green on his election as president.

The assembly learned that R.H. (Rick) Beaumont and D.H. (Dirk) VandenBrink were nominated for the position of vice president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2005-2006.

Mr. Bassil called for further nominations from the floor.
It was MOVED by Mr. Prefontaine, seconded by Mr. Fulton, that nominations cease.

Motion Carried

Messrs. Beaumont and VandenBrink were invited to address the assembly.

Mr. Bassil advised that there were four nominations for the three positions of councillor for two-year terms. He added that Mr. Lachance removed his name from the ballot for personal reasons. T.A. (Tony) Brown, V.G. (Victor) Hut and M.H. (Murray) Young were announced as candidates for the position of councillor for 2005-2006.

Mr. Bassil called for further nominations from the floor.

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

Motion Carried

Messrs. Brown, Hut and Young were congratulated on their election as councillors of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for a two-year term.

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

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

President Nelson resumed his position at the podium and congratulated all of the candidates for their decision to put their names forward.

It was MOVED by Mr. Main, seconded by Mr. Loeppky that recommendation 5(a) be removed from the table.

Motion Carried

Discussion resumed on the motion as amended.

Mr. Stoliker asked Mr. Hudema to clarify if 5(b) is not passed, and 5(a) is, will a surveyor be able to split the blind line if posts at the north-east corners are re-established or do the posts have to be original monuments.

Mr. Hudema responded that if 5(a) is passed, the monument that would be placed at the north quarter would govern whether 5(b) is approved or not.

Mr. McBride indicated that with using high precision technology in the present day it is easy to split a blind line. Splitting the blind line with a Gunter’s chain fifty to one hundred years ago was not the same. He continued that there was amazing accuracy for the times.
and for those pins to be considered inaccurate does not make any sense. Mr. McBride encouraged the assembly to vote for the motion.

Mr. Metcalfe felt that motion eroded the land surveyor’s right to use professional judgment.

Mr. Rasmuson spoke in favor of the motion in that the underlying theme throughout the Surveys Act is that all corners will be monumented; the monuments for those corners will define those corners and reference other monuments within the survey. He went on to point out that Section 26 is an anomaly in that the Legislature has seen fit to include in the Act, survey instructions as to how to establish the monument to define those corners. He further pointed out that no person that made any verbal comments regarding the motion has denied that a monument placed by a surveyor should govern. Mr. Rasmuson alluded to points made in some letters and an article in the recommendation package that suggested that if land surveyors could not establish those posts, to the satisfaction of those writers, that they should be granted legal status under the Surveys Act and govern those positions. He felt that Alberta Land Surveyors have been legislated to establish monuments at those positions and are very qualified to be able to place monuments that should govern. Mr. Rasmuson continued by stating that the passing of this motion will make the Surveys Act consistent in that all established monuments by Alberta Land Surveyors will govern the corners that they purport to govern. He also raised the point that when a corner that is posted that is witness monumented presently, that corner, once posted by a surveyor in this legislation, would be governing evidence of that corner because it would be the first time that the post would be established to monument that position. Mr. Rasmuson asked the membership to support the motion.

Mr. Loeppky indicated that land surveyors are planting monuments that the public are accepting and, as such, the motion should be passed. He asked Public Member Lawrence Kluthe to comment on the discussions.

Mr. Kluthe stated that it was his position that land surveyors are the only people authorized to identify locations and the public has a right to expect that when a monument is placed in the ground. He did not feel that the incident of error should be a factor as the public does not have an option but to accept the positions. Mr. Kluthe went on to say that in many rural areas the positions are used to determine boundaries. As real estate becomes more expensive, the public is more aware of their boundaries.

Mr. J.D. Wallace alluded to a comment that the profession should be careful about opening up the Act. He disagreed and stated that rather than hesitate, if this is the right thing to do, the profession is obligated to open up the Act and fix it.
Mr. Woolgar read an excerpt from *Principles of Evidence* by the late J.H. Holloway as follows:

*From what I have said, it will be evident that the land surveyor’s work has as its object the establishment of the facts as to the positions of boundaries on the ground. The primary and therefore the most relevant evidence of those facts is provided by the positions of the survey monuments which are placed on the ground to define boundaries. Field notes and plans are simply records of the primary evidence; they are made for the purpose of enabling land owners or other interested parties to locate the primary evidence and are themselves of value as secondary evidence only when the primary evidence has disappeared. On the basis of that reasoning, it has become a well established legal principle that the position of a boundary is governed by the survey monuments on the ground, and that other evidence such as the measurements shown on plans or the statement of witnesses should only be used for determining the position of a boundary if the monuments which were placed to define it can be found. That principle is enunciated in Section 62 of The Dominion Land Surveys Act which says that “all boundary lines of townships, sections or other authorized subdivisions and of towns or villages and all boundary lines of blocks, gores or commons, all section lines and all limits of lots or parcels of land surveyed or re-surveyed, as defined by monuments placed at the corners (thereof) shall ... be the true boundaries ... whether the same are or are not found to contain the exact area of dimensions mentioned or expressed in any plan or any letters patent, grant or other instrument.” And Section 63 says, “Every township, section, etc., shall consist of the whole width included between the several corners thereof and no more or less, notwithstanding any quantity or measure expressed in the official plan, letters, patent, grant or other instrument.” You will find the same principle stated in Sections 27 & 28 of the Alberta Surveys Act and in every other statute dealing with legal surveys in those provinces where official survey and land registration systems are in operation.

That principle applies even though the position of a monument is found to be in error. Once a monument is placed and the survey has been confirmed, the monument governs the position of the boundary which it was intended to define, even though it may have been put in the wrong place. When such an error is found to have occurred, it can only be corrected with the consent of the parties interested in the lands whose boundaries it defines and the procedure by which the correction has to be made is rigidly and elaborately specified by statute. Until such time as the error may be corrected, the position of the monument on the ground will govern the position of the boundary, and if a surveyor finds a monument wrongly placed, he must nevertheless be guided by it.

Mr. Hunter felt that motion encompasses what the common practice is today. He also felt that the interpretation put on the monument governing by the membership has been, and continues to be, the right to rely on another surveyor’s work. Mr. Hunter went on to say that unless there is an error found, it is incumbent on the
land surveyor to follow in the paths of previous surveyors and accept the work they have done. He stated that his objection to the motion is that the attitude expressed presently exists in applying the fundamental spirit of the Act to daily practice.

Mr. Thomson recognized the hard work of the Committee which may result in a means of straightening out problems that may come up daily. However, he spoke against the motion, expressing the view that the boundary was created at the time of the original township survey under Part 2. Subsequent surveys re-established the positions even at non-monumented corners. He added that in that re-establishment, the public has a right to rely on the land surveyor’s opinion, as a professional, as to where that corner is but if it is still a re-establishment and still the opinion of the surveyor where that corner rests. Mr. Thomson stated that, in his view, if it is allowed to govern, it has the effect of the opinion governing and the boundary will be changed even if there is an error. He did not feel that land surveyor’s have the right to change existing boundaries; they have a right to establish new ones, but not change existing ones.

Mr. Hagen spoke in favor of the motion and felt that it will result in a codification of what the practice is and should be.

Mr. Michaud commended the members on the healthy debate. From the Director of Surveys’ perspective, he indicated that the boundaries have all been established by the original surveys. The thought is that if the Surveys Act is changed as proposed, the opportunity will be open for a land surveyor to move a boundary. He asked the membership to consider whether that is what they really want to do. Mr. Michaud stated that one hundred years, or more, of history has suggested that land surveyors cannot and do not move boundaries. There are legislative process such as re-surveys, Section 9s or court orders that allow methods for boundaries to be moved. He added that it has been mentioned that errors will result in monuments governing and asked the assembly to consider carefully whether it is desirable for errors to govern boundaries. Mr. Michaud asked the assembly to consider what the need is to change legislation. Land surveyors agree that their primary mandate is to serve the public. He added that he is not aware of any large outcry from the public about problems with original surveys.

Mr. Michaud pointed to the differences of opinion on the question. He asked whether there were other ways to solve the issues and concerns other than changing legislation. He suggested that an option open to the land surveying profession is to review the Manual of Standard Practice. Mr. Michaud pointed out, that in his view, there are two areas that the profession seems to be struggling with; that being the amount of effort in verifying monuments and how tolerances are applied when looking at monuments that have been placed.
In closing, Mr. Hudema, on behalf of the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee, thanked all the members of the assembly who have given their opinions. He agreed that the current act gives precise direction as to how to determine the non-monumented part 2 positions. However, based on the discussions that have occurred here, he felt it was obvious that there is inconsistency in the membership as to how the positions that are monumented are to be dealt with. The Committee unanimously agreed that this inconsistency exists. Mr. Hudema went on to say that, as professional land surveyors, we are responsible for the establishment and placement of monuments and establishment of boundaries. The public assumes, and should expect, that this is done in a consistent manner and it is the opinion of the Committee that this is not occurring. He added that the comments that have been made make it obvious there are different viewpoints on the issue. This is the basis of the Committee bringing forth the recommendation and wording; to try to establish a consistent method so that the public can rely on monuments placed and all the land surveyors are working on the same basis. Mr. Hudema stated that the profession owes this to the public.

The scrutineers, Messrs. Fretwell, Nome and Fretwell, were called upon to distribute and collect the ballots for the vote on Recommendation #5a. They left the room with Executive Director Brian Munday to count the ballots.

President Nelson asked Registrar Dick Bassil was called upon to deliver the election results.

Mr. Bassil informed the assembly that the vice president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for the year 2005-2006 is Dirk VandenBrink. The assembly applauded.

It was MOVED by Mr. Andersen, seconded by Mr. S.J. Van Berkel, that the ballots be destroyed. Motion Carried

Al Nelson commented that Council deals with some tough issues over the course of the year and assured the assembly that it always has the best interests of the Association and the public at heart. He added that some of them have served their term on Council and will be leaving that body.

Mr. Nelson called on Past President Jim Halliday and retiring Council members, Les Frederick, Dirk VandenBrink and Vince Ziegler to accept a small token of appreciation on behalf of the membership. Retiring Council member plaques were presented to Messrs. Frederick, VandenBrink and Ziegler. The assembly applauded Mr. Halliday for serving the last five years on Council.

Mr. Nelson asked remaining members of Council to come forward and he presented them with a small token of appreciation on behalf of the Association.
of the membership to Messrs. Green, Bruce, Cross, Marquardt, Pals and Kluthe.

The meeting was adjourned in favour of a short open forum.

Main Motion As Amended:
It was MOVED by Mr. Hudema, seconded by Mr. Frederick, that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association recommend to the Government of Alberta that the Surveys Act be amended by adding Section 39.1 to give governing status to Part 3 monuments placed at non-monumented Part 2 positions.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Stoliker, seconded by Mr. Loeppky, that “…and shall not be questioned by any court…” be removed from the proposed section 39.1(5) of the Surveys Act
Amendment Carried

Main Motion as Amended Carried
(113 to 53—68% in favour)

It was MOVED by Mr. Hudema, seconded by Mr. Frederick, that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association recommend to the Government of Alberta that Section 44 of the Surveys Act be amended to give governing status to re-established Part 2 monuments and re-established Part 3 monuments placed at non-monumented Part 2 positions.

In speaking to the motion, Mr. Hudema indicated that the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee felt that there are many original Part 2 monuments that have been destroyed in the southern part of the province. The greater percentage of monuments currently existing at the positions described in the recommendation, are re-established. The public and many surveyors are accepting these monuments as governing but, again, under current legislation, there is a discrepancy to whether they have the right to govern. He added the recommendation is being brought forward to ensure consistency.

Mr. Hagen agreed with Section 44(5) in that if there is evidence of an original monument being found after the position has been re-established, then the position of the original monument shall govern. He asked what the difference is with what is in the Act presently.

Mr. Hudema responded that the number of cases of evidence being found after a re-establishment has taken place is limited. The recommendation is to cover those situations where that original Part 2 evidence is found and allow the practitioner to go back to the original monumentation and give it the governing status it deserves. He added that what the present legislation does not do is give governing status to those other monuments that have been re-established.

Recommendation #5(b)
Re-establishment of Part 2 Monuments
Mr. Hagen asked what happens to monuments that were not placed under Part 2.

Mr. Hudema clarified that this change to legislation only covers re-established Part 2 monuments and re-established, non-monumented Part 2 positions monumented under Part 3.

Mr. Wiberg stated that he understands that this motion only affects the township survey system. He asked whether the re-establishment of a block corner in a city has governing status. Mr. Wiberg suggested if the legislation is changed in the first instance, it should be changed in the other.

Mr. Hudema responded that the Committee was asked to deal with the monuments that were placed under Section 44 which deals with Part 2 monuments and non-monumented positions.

Mr. Wiberg spoke against the motion, as he felt that, if the township fabric is being discussed, then so should Part 3 surveys.

Mr. Wiberg asked Mr. Hudema for a comment on how many re-establishments could be perceived as happening. He suggested that if he does not agree with a re-establishment, he could re-establish that monument in another position. Mr. Wiberg suggested that there is a possibility that there could be more than one monument.

Mr. Hudema clarified that the way the recommendation reads is that once the first plan that re-establishes a monument is registered, that is the monument that has governing status. If a disagreement erupts as to the position of the monument, then the second surveyor would contact the first surveyor who re-established the monument to see if there could be a resolution. If a resolution is reached, then a judge’s order could be obtained to revise the plan. Mr. Hudema continued by clarifying that the monument placed by the first surveyor is the only monument that would govern until such time as that monument was destroyed and re-established.

**AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Haggerty, seconded by Mr. Ross, that Section 44(5) be removed from the proposed Surveys Act amendment altogether.**

Amendment Defeated

Mr. Haggerty felt that the amendment does not give the public certainty by leaving Section 44(5) in. The public wants to see a post in the ground and know that is the monument that they can use for boundaries.

Mr. Stoliker felt that if Section 44(5)(b) is removed, the ability to challenge someone else’s professional judgment is taken away.

Mr. George spoke against the amendment and stated that sometimes the conditions are not right to be able to do a proper
excavation, especially in the winter months. He did not feel that traces of original evidence should be ignored.

Mr. Ross felt that the standard of survey would be raised with the passing of the amendment as perhaps re-establishments will not be done under poor conditions but the job will be left until conditions are right to be able to do a proper search. He also felt that if the original monument is out, but the owners have accepted it for a long time, the original monument should be used.

Mr. Loeppky expressed concern about removing Section 44(5) as he felt it reminds practitioners that they need to check for evidence.

Mr. McWilliam also spoke against the amendment for the reason that it is directly connected to the perception of moving boundaries. If older evidence is found of a long-standing boundary, it needs to be accepted. He went on to say that surveyors are not infallible. Sometimes evidence is missed and it leads to a pin being re-established when, in fact, the original monument still exists. Mr. McWilliam stated that it is incumbent upon the professional to do the job correctly in the first instance, but if an error is made, it is also incumbent upon the professional to correct it.

Mr. Drake commented that he always explains to the public that surveyors do not create boundaries; legislation creates boundaries. Surveyors interpret monumentation and boundaries. He added that he would like to see Section 44(5) left in so that everybody knows that someone who has a different opinion has the opportunity to be heard.

**AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Schirrmacher, seconded by Mr. McBride, that the proposed wording relating to Section 44(4)(c) be amended to read as follows: “a monument place din accordance with Section 44(1), (2), (3) or (4) shall govern the position as if it was placed as a Part 2 monument.**

Amendment Carried

**AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. McWilliam, seconded by Mr. Loeppky, that “…or (4) be replaced with or (4)(a) and 4(b)…”**

Amendment to the Amendment Carried

Dave McWilliam stated that (a) and (b) need to be added to 44(4) as it refers to its own section.

Mr. Hunter felt that the motion has the effect of moving boundaries. All owners are affected by re-establishments. He went on to say that the Surveys Act gives owners the right to participate in the re-establishment of a lost corner. A corner cannot be re-established without the consent of the owner. Mr. Hunter felt that some of these issues should be left to the professional judgement of the members.
Mr. Steven Van Berkel commented that if the original monument is gone, then the boundary is indeterminate and, therefore, the boundary is not being moved but being established. He felt it was a better service to the public to say that we are able to establish a boundary. If the profession determines that there is a problem, even without a public outcry, it is enough to make a change.

Mr. Roop felt that the membership is fortunate, as a self-governing body, to have the ability to bring forward these changes. He added that the proposed legislation changes do not change the ability of surveyors to deal with blunders. Part of the reason that 44(5)(b) is proposed is to keep everything on a consistent basis. Mr. Roop felt that the degradation of the original Part 2 fabric is a serious problem in the province. He went on to say that the legislation will result in minimal movement of boundaries and potentially less conflicts in boundaries. Mr. Roop indicated that he heard the comment that if the monuments are given governing status that they will be blindly accepted. He commented that, as a professional, any evidence being used in the course of a survey needs to be evaluated.

Mr. Hudema summed up by stating that the recommendation gives the legislation consistency to what is currently taking place and to allow the public to know that those monuments govern.

President Nelson called for the scrutineers to distribute and collect the ballots. They left the room with Executive Director Brian Munday to count the ballots.

MAIN AMENDMENT

It was MOVED by Mr. Schirrmacher, seconded by Mr. McBride, that the proposed wording relating to Section 44(c) be amended to read as follows, “a monument placed in accordance with Section 44(1), (2), (3) or (4)(a) and (b) shall govern the position as if it was placed as a Part 2 monument.”

Main Amendment Carried

Main Motion as Amended Carried

(104-42 – 71% in favour)

Mr. Nelson informed the assembly that in January 2005, Council approved a recommendation from the Section 9 of the Surveys Act Ad Hoc Committee to create a boundary resolution process as a pilot project.

Mr. Dave Thomson, the Vice Chair of the Committee addressed the assembly as follows:

The Section 9 of the Surveys Act Ad Hoc Committee was given the task to review Section 9, determine what type of boundary uncertainties it was intended to resolve. It was given the task to define the term “error in survey.” It was given the task to review the Intent and Application of Section 9 of the Surveys Act Document.
published in *ALS News* in 1991. It was also asked to investigate the current workings of Section 9 to see if it was applicable to solving the issues that surveyors face and resolving boundary uncertainties.

One of the results of the Committee’s work was to develop a boundary resolution process. The process was developed to assist surveyors in addressing boundary uncertainties and alleged errors which arise in the course of their day to day activities. The process consists of two phases; a mediation phase and a boundary panel phase. Both phases result in a recommendation as to how best resolve the issue and not make judgments on where a boundary is but to provide a facilitation to bring surveyors together and recommend a method to go forward and resolve the boundary uncertainty.

The definition of a boundary uncertainty is that it exists when two or more surveyors have a difference of opinion as to the position of a corner or boundary. If the surveyors are unable to resolve the issue on their own, then they may apply to the Executive Director to convene a mediation process between the affected parties; generally two or more land surveyors and a mediator. The Committee deliberately channelled the requests through the Executive Director to keep it separate from the discipline process and to assist Council in maintaining its objectivity.

Ideally, mediation would result in two or more parties getting together, agreeing on a way to resolve the issue, document the resolution and move forward to getting the boundary uncertainty resolved. If mediation does not apply (one participant may be deceased) or if mediation fails because a resolution cannot be found, then a boundary panel can be convened. A panel may consist of three experienced surveyors and a member of the public which would hear the facts of the case. The panel would make a recommendation on how to resolve the boundary uncertainty. It would not make a judgment on where the boundary is, that liability still rests with the surveyors involved. A Section 9 may be one of the recommendations. They make other recommendations as well such as looking for more evidence, bringing other parties to evaluate the evidence or seek a judge’s order to resolve the issue.

The Committee began investigating why Section 9 was used very rarely in its history. In recommending this process, it is hoped that any recommendations for a Section 9 investigation are well vetted so that the Director of Surveys would give it due consideration.

The process has been approved by Council to proceed as a pilot project. It is the hope of the Committee that those of you who are experiencing problems that you can’t resolve on your own in terms of boundary uncertainties, would seek out the process.

President Nelson encouraged the assembly to ask Mr. Thomson questions on the process.

Mr. Hagen asked what happens if the other party to a boundary uncertainty is deceased.
Mr. Thomson responded that the case would be referred to the Boundary Panel.

Mr. Pratt asked whether there are any cases at the present time and whether the success or the failure of the pilot project would be documented and available to the membership.

Mr. Thomson responded that he was not aware of any cases as yet and that by this presentation, cases are being solicited. He added that consideration would need to be given to the merit of publishing the results of the pilot project.

Mr. Schirrmacher asked whether the Committee gave consideration to a situation that involved retired members.

Mr. Thomson replied that the Committee anticipated that if a retired member is not willing to participate in the mediation process, a boundary panel would be convened to recommend a process to untangle the situation.

Mr. Loeppky asked how extra costs are handled if the two individuals involved do not agree to mediation and the panel finds a solution that directs or finds something that involves extra cost.

Mr. Thomson replied that the role of the panel is to mediate, facilitate between surveyors and to give advice, not to make a judgment. The costs to the Association are limited to the costs of convening the panel. The cost of resolving the problem clearly rests with the land surveyors involved.

Mr. Nelson commented that when Council approved the process, it felt it was a pro-active responsibility to encourage the resolution of boundaries as opposed to automatically looking at a Section 9 investigation or a discipline proceeding. He added that if the process is going to work, volunteers for the boundary panel are needed. Mr. Nelson felt that the process will be very educational and rewarding.

Mr. Thomson summed up by indicating that the issue started about as a motion from an AGM in 2000. He added that the Committee struggled over the years to find purpose and definition and thanked the members of the Committee for their hard work, particularly, Chair Ashley Robertson who was not in attendance.

The meeting was adjourned in favor of a brief open forum session before lunch.

President Nelson called the meeting back to order by recognizing the following committee chairs with a small gift of appreciation for each of them:
- Convention & Social—Wade Heck
- Editorial Board—David McArthur
- Future of the Association—Arlin Amundrud
Historical & Biographical—Bob Baker  
Legislation Ad Hoc—Terry Hudema  
Practice Review Board—Chad Finner  
Professional Development—Ross Woolgar  
Public Relations—Scott Partridge  
Registration—Tim Harding  
RPR Committee—David Hagen  
Standards—Francis Prefontaine  
Public Land Dispositions Subcommittee—Kevin Swabey  
Section 9 Ad Hoc—Ashley Robertson

The following individuals were winners of the draw for committee volunteers conducted by President Nelson: Lee Morden, John Van Berkel, Mark Knott, Tim Grusie and Bryan Bates.

Mr. Nelson then called newly elected President Stephen Green to the podium to take the oath of office as follows:

I, Stephen Green, 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 the 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.

President Green asked the retiring Council members to step down and asked the new Council members to take their place on the stage to take the following oath of office:

I (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.

President Green then presented Past President Nelson with a plaque and pin signifying that he served as president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.
Mr. Nelson presented Mr. Green with the gavel who then addressed the assembly as follows:

Mr. Green then addressed the assembly as follows:

I am both pleased and honoured that you have chosen me to serve as your president for the 2005-2006 term. I have benefited personally and professionally from my twenty-one year membership in our Association and, therefore, thank you for providing me with the opportunity to give something back. I am also honoured to be serving with our now immediate past president, Al Nelson, who has been a very capable role model contributing so much to our Association over the years. I hope I can live up to his legacy.

Building relationships through networking and then one-on-one communication is the cornerstone of acquiring, retraining and developing clients in most of our businesses. Regular contact with clients and potential clients helps us build our reputation and recall. I think we need to transfer some of this thinking to our work within the Association as we continue to move toward a preferred future for us and for our Association. I believe a crucial role for our Association, during the next year, is to build and sustain relationships with other technical and professional groups that deal with geomatics within our industry, government and educational institutions. Dialoguing with these groups:

1) will ensure that we have input into the development of regulatory processes that impact our industry, thereby controlling our own destiny;
2) that we demonstrate the value of our involvement in these processes ensuring that we continue to be invited to the table; and
3) that we heighten awareness about the contribution we make to business, to government and to the community.

Our challenge is to identify the groups and the issues that are driving changes to our industry and establish a proactive, continuing presence within these groups. If we do not have a voice at the table, we risk being negatively impacted by the changes implemented not familiar with our concerns. Building these critical relationships will be a priority for me over this next year. I am looking forward to the next year and to the opportunity to work with a terrific Council and to the many opportunities to interact with all of you, my colleagues.

Please share with me, you concerns and ideas as we move forward together. Thank you for your confidence and support.

President Green announced that the assembly would engage in an unrecorded open forum session.

President Green advised the assembly that new business recommendations must be in writing and signed by the mover and seconder. New business resolutions are not binding on Council but Council is obliged to consider the matter, if 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
It was MOVED by Mr. Stephens, seconded by Mr. Wiberg, that Council consider replacing the following policy: “the annual budget for iron post and marker post revenues shall be established by averaging the previous four years’ actual revenues for iron post and marker post sales” (2002.05.003) with a forecasting approach to budgeting iron post and marker post revenues.

Motion Carried

Mr. Stephens advised that he brought the motion forward to give Council more latitude in having a more realistic budgeting process. He felt that Council was being hamstrung by having to use a rigid formula to determine marker post and iron post revenues. Mr. Stephens added that in looking at the formula Council may not feel it is necessary to increase fees.

Mr. Pals advised that during the budgeting process for the current year, all of Council agreed to use the policy of a four-year average although it was felt that revenues would most likely be higher. He felt that the direction of the motion is something that Council needs to consider, especially in the event of the Association selling less posts.

President Green invited a representative from among the visiting delegates to address the assembly.

Mr. Paul Church, President of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors thanked the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for making the visiting delegates part of the annual general meeting. He added that the delegates appreciate the opportunity to be involved in the business discussions and to take part in the social events. Mr. Church complimented the Association on a well organized event. He wished President Green all the best as he takes over the reins as President. Mr. Church expressed appreciation on behalf of all the visiting delegates.

President Green declared the 96th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association closed at 3:00 p.m.
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**Financial Statement**

for the year ending April 30, 2004

Statement of Financial Position as at April 30, 2004
as prepared by Peterson Walker, Chartered Accountants
and approved by Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and short-term investments (note 3)</td>
<td>$1,737,757</td>
<td>$1,399,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>302,453</td>
<td>180,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses (note 4)</td>
<td>26,818</td>
<td>24,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,067,028</td>
<td>1,605,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment (note 5)</strong></td>
<td>85,049</td>
<td>68,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,152,077</td>
<td>$1,673,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS** | |
| **Current Liabilities** | |
| Accounts payable and accrued liabilities | $ 302,265 | $ 60,485 |
| Goods and Services Tax payable | 22,072 | 16,592 |
| Deferred contributions (note 6) | 246,275 | 231,295 |
| | 570,612 | 308,372 |
| **Due to RPR Index Revolving Fund (note 7)** | 650 | 740 |
| **Net Assets** | |
| Invested in equipment | 85,049 | 68,669 |
| Internally restricted | 1,495,766 | 1,295,967 |
| | 1,580,815 | 1,364,636 |
| | $2,152,077 | $1,673,748 |

**Lease Commitment (note 8)**

Appendix "A"
### Statement of Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>2004 Actual</th>
<th>2004 Budget</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>2003 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees and levies</td>
<td>$216,460</td>
<td>$210,940</td>
<td>$5,520</td>
<td>$193,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and other</td>
<td>46,456</td>
<td>75,412</td>
<td>(28,956)</td>
<td>11,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument division contribution</td>
<td>883,331</td>
<td>630,319</td>
<td>253,012</td>
<td>660,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on disposal of equipment</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>1,151,264</td>
<td>916,671</td>
<td>234,593</td>
<td>865,902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council and committees (schedule 1)</td>
<td>165,987</td>
<td>175,300</td>
<td>(9,313)</td>
<td>142,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic practice review (schedule)</td>
<td>319,647</td>
<td>307,157</td>
<td>12,490</td>
<td>290,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses (schedule 3)</td>
<td>422,065</td>
<td>424,420</td>
<td>(2,355)</td>
<td>394,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on write-down of equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of investments</td>
<td>4,289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,289</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>911,988</td>
<td>906,877</td>
<td>5,111</td>
<td>851,586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Internally Restricted Funds       |             |             |                 |             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue (expenses)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary recoveries</td>
<td>8,627</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary expenses</td>
<td>(10,262)</td>
<td>(20,449)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>(5,912)</td>
<td>(16,799)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>(15,550)</td>
<td>(34,343)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3,473)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue Over (under) Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$216,179</td>
<td></td>
<td>($57,948)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balance at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Revenue Over (under) Expenses</th>
<th>Net Additions To Capital Assets</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance At End Of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$268,454</td>
<td>(45,558)</td>
<td>$(222,896)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invested in Capital Assets</strong></td>
<td>68,669</td>
<td>(29,178)</td>
<td>45,558</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68,669</td>
<td>239,276</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(222,896)</td>
<td>85,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internally Restricted</strong></td>
<td>(note 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>875,967</td>
<td>(5,912)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205,711</td>
<td>1,075,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(1,635)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(15,550)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,550</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Centennial Fund</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</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>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>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>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,295,967</td>
<td>(23,097)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222,896</td>
<td>1,495,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,364,636</td>
<td>$216,179</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,580,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statement of Cash Flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flow provided by (used in)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue over (under) expenses</td>
<td>$ 216,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges not affecting cash:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>34,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on write-down of equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on disposal of equipment</td>
<td>(5,017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net changes in non-cash working capital items <em>(note 10)</em></td>
<td>138,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash provided by operating activities</td>
<td>383,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investing activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds on disposal of equipment</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of equipment</td>
<td>(59,558)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in RPR Revolving Index Fund</td>
<td>(90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash provided (used in) investing activities:</strong></td>
<td>(45,648)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash flow</strong></td>
<td><strong>337,759</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and short-term investments at beginning of year</td>
<td>1,399,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash and Short-Term Investments at End of Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,737,757</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes to Financial Statements for the year ended April 30, 2004

**1. Purpose of the Organization**

The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association is a non-profit, self-governing professional association legislated under the Land Surveyors Act. The Association regulates the 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**

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

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

**Equipment:** Equipment is recorded at cost. Amortization is provided over the estimated useful lives of the assets using the declining balance method at the following rates:
Office equipment .......... 20% Automotive equipment 30%
Furniture and fixtures ..... 20% Computer equipment .. 30%
Survey equipment .......... 20%

A full year’s 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.

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.

3. Cash and Short-Term Investments
Cash and short-term investments include $1,505,370 (2003—$1,295,967) 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>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent deposit</td>
<td>$18,692</td>
<td>$5,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>3,274</td>
<td>7,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>4,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s travel costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff dues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,818</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,859</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Equipment
The investment in RPR Index Revolving Fund represents the Association's net equity in the fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Accumulated Amortization</td>
<td>Book Value</td>
<td>Book Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>$64,435</td>
<td>$40,815</td>
<td>$23,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>14,603</td>
<td>7,375</td>
<td>7,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>30,304</td>
<td>20,522</td>
<td>9,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer software</td>
<td>7,128</td>
<td>4,413</td>
<td>2,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,470</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,125</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,345</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Deferred Contributions
The Association assesses its members an annual membership fee at the beginning of its fiscal year. Membership fees and levies received in advance for the subsequent fiscal year are recognized as deferred contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at beginning of year</td>
<td>$231,295</td>
<td>$263,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions received during the year</td>
<td>$246,275</td>
<td>$231,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts recognized as revenue</td>
<td>(231,295)</td>
<td>(263,165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at End of Year</td>
<td>$246,275</td>
<td>$231,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. 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.

8. Lease Commitments
The Association leases office space under an agreement which expires June 30, 2005. The Association also pays a proportionate share of operating costs.

During the year, the Association entered into a new lease agreement for office space which commences July 1, 2004 and expires June 30, 2014. The Association will also pay a proportionate share of operating costs.

Future minimum lease payments due within the next five years under these operating leases will be approximately as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 / 2005</td>
<td>$25,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 / 2006</td>
<td>$38,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 / 2007</td>
<td>$40,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 / 2008</td>
<td>$40,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 / 2009</td>
<td>$40,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$186,476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>$(122,231)</td>
<td>$(30,204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>$(1,959)</td>
<td>$(6,697)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accrued liabilities</td>
<td>241,780</td>
<td>(12,978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td>(31,870)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$138,050</td>
<td>$(81,121)</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
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.

13. Comparative Figures
Certain of the 2003 comparative figures have been reclassified to conform with the current year’s presentation.
### Schedule 1

#### Council and Committees for the year ended April 30, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 Actual</th>
<th>2004 Budget</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>2003 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration and Examination</td>
<td>$35,090</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$6,090</td>
<td>$22,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>33,872</td>
<td>27,450</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>20,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>30,712</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>(4,288)</td>
<td>32,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Travel</td>
<td>16,388</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>(8,612)</td>
<td>20,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Meetings</td>
<td>8,909</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,909</td>
<td>5,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Board</td>
<td>8,353</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>(4,147)</td>
<td>8,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>5,133</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(867)</td>
<td>3,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(1,627)</td>
<td>4,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>4,368</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPR</td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and Biographical</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>(1,199)</td>
<td>5,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards: Dispositions</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(2,836)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(1,491)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(609)</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomatics Engineering Liaison</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(139)</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention and Social</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(676)</td>
<td>1,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCLLS Committee</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(830)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Finances</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$165,987</strong></td>
<td><strong>$175,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>(9,313)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$142,362</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule 2

#### Systematic Practice Review for the year ended April 30, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 Actual</th>
<th>2004 Budget</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>2003 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>$260,368</td>
<td>$262,851</td>
<td>(2,483)</td>
<td>$249,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>17,866</td>
<td>8,206</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>8,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>15,054</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>6,054</td>
<td>9,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and Plans</td>
<td>7,232</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>(768)</td>
<td>6,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Transportation</td>
<td>7,136</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>(864)</td>
<td>7,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Maintenance</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and Dues</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>(2,593)</td>
<td>5,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(1,100)</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Supplies</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rentals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$319,647</strong></td>
<td><strong>$307,157</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,490</strong></td>
<td><strong>$290,986</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Administration Expenses

for the year ended April 30, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 Actual</th>
<th>2004 Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>2003 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Benefits and Contract Staff</td>
<td>$206,259</td>
<td>$206,126</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td>$189,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Operations</td>
<td>74,752</td>
<td>61,484</td>
<td>13,268</td>
<td>60,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies and Photocopying</td>
<td>18,249</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>3,749</td>
<td>13,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>16,329</td>
<td>14,813</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>14,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank and Investment Management Charges</td>
<td>15,176</td>
<td>14,387</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>16,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Courier</td>
<td>14,939</td>
<td>18,960</td>
<td>(4,021)</td>
<td>14,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Donations</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Stationery</td>
<td>10,046</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>(954)</td>
<td>11,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>7,880</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>(1,120)</td>
<td>12,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6,175</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>(525)</td>
<td>5,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>5,873</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>3,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Maintenance</td>
<td>5,163</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>(5,337)</td>
<td>7,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, Internet and Database</td>
<td>5,001</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCB Levy</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>4,096</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>3,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and Subscriptions</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training and Library</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>(1,306)</td>
<td>1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Debts</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical File Management</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>(2,489)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(205)</td>
<td>1,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence and Travel</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>(1,223)</td>
<td>2,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate and Stamps</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(1,355)</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>(2,369)</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>(10,869)</td>
<td>10,569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$422,065  $424,420  $ (2,355)  $394,666
Executive Director's Report

The most notable change to the office in the last twelve months has been the office itself. The move from the CN Tower to the Phipps-McKinnon Building was successful and relatively painless. We were out of commission for two days during our slow period in July but were quickly back up and running on Monday. I was pleased to see a number of members come to our open house in December to see the new offices. We have more space now but it is quickly becoming filled up. I think everyone agrees that the office looks cleaner and smarter now and an appropriate space for a professional organization.

The other significant change to the office in the last year has been the hiring of an additional staff person. Cindy Chomlak answers your calls when you call the office, she registers you for seminars and regional meetings and processes your post orders. A number of members thought that, with the hiring of Cindy, that Michelle was no longer with us. Michelle, in fact, has now taken over doing the Association’s books and organizing the annual general meeting. This move was important for a couple of different reasons. First, with the number of posts now being ordered and the number of members signing up for events, or signing up for articles, we needed a bookkeeper who was in more than one day a week. Michelle will be able to answer your accounting queries during regular business hours from Monday to Friday. Second, Michelle has taken over the organization of the annual meeting. Michelle has never organized a meeting of this magnitude before but her previous experience in working in catering at Northlands will be beneficial. I made this move in anticipation of the day that will eventually come when Sharon Stecyk retires. This year, Sharon reduced her work week from five days a week to four days a week. Sharon has found that this change has worked well for her and it has allowed us at the Association office greater flexibility to respond to the demands of the membership.

I am fortunate in my position as Executive Director to be surrounded by so many long-serving staff that continue to show tremendous dedication to serving the profession.

On the technology front, we have done some things with the new Association boardroom that allow us to do some things which, hopefully, will improve committee communication and understanding. However, the Association website is probably the most visible sign of the Association taking advantage of technology. Now members can search for any word or words on the Association website, even words contained within pdf files. It is my goal to put more issues of ALS News and other related publications on the website so that you have a complete set of resources at your disposal. We will also continue to put up more historical documents on our website for your research.

We have finally put a robust hit counter on the website. The information that we are getting from this resource would seem to indicate that the general public is coming to our website looking for...
more information on easements and rights of way than any other subject. It will be interesting to see if this trend continues.

As we move forward, we will be adding the ability to accept payment online for events and post orders using e-commerce tools. This should prove to be quite valuable once it is up and running. We also hope to take advantage of video-conferencing opportunities in the near future.

The Association continues to play a low-key but active role in the political realm. We hope to meet with a number of key ministers before the AGM; our name is on the list to hold another MLA reception; and we will once again attend the Premier’s Dinner in Edmonton. There is no doubt that a number of committees are working on issues which may require change to government legislation or input on government policy. It will be important that we have established a good working relationship with government both at the political and the administrative level.

One cannot look forward without taking the opportunity to look back. I have spent a great deal of time this year looking back. Of course, I am referring to Laying Down the Lines: A History of Land Surveying in Alberta which will be launched at this year’s Annual General Meeting. A new website on the history of the ALSA will be launched at the same time as a companion piece to the book. It has been fascinating for me to read the stories that author Judy Larmour has uncovered. It has also been interesting to read some of the stories which did not make it into the book but a few of them did get on to the website. I am proud to have been a part of the book. As I mentioned in my ALS News article, it has been a long time coming.

So the writing of the book is done and the history of land surveying in Alberta has been recorded for all to read. But this really just closes just one chapter in our history and we embark on another. I look forward to being a part of this new chapter.
# Registrar's Report

## Average Length of Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Actively Practicing</th>
<th>Average Active Membership (yrs.)</th>
<th>Male/Female Ratio Year Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Male/Female Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Received</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1999</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1994</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1989</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled Pupils</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate Members</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*January 1-31, 2005

## New Member Information

### New Alberta Land Surveyors and Articling Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>No. of New ALSs</th>
<th>Average Age of New ALSs</th>
<th># Birthdates Available</th>
<th>Average Length of Articles (mos.)</th>
<th>No. of New Pupils</th>
<th>Average Age of Pupil</th>
<th># Birthdates Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56.2**</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 31, 2005: 3 39.5 1 38.3 2 2 2

*averages calculated using the number of available birthdates, i.e. 2004 - average calculated on 17 new ALSs, not 27.

**3 of these new ALSs came from being affiliate members - therefore have no articling time.

**1 of the new ALSs articled for 47 months and then became an affiliate members (47 months included in average).

## Principal Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>No. of Articled Pupils</th>
<th>No. of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 31, 2005: 2 2

If a pupil transferred to another principal in the year’s period, both of the principals are counted in that year.
### Departing Member Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Active Members That Left</th>
<th>Deceased</th>
<th>Former</th>
<th>Honorary Life</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Suspended</th>
<th>Average Age of all That Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*average based on 4 of 5 retired ages; 1 retired birthday not available
**average does not include on that went to former status as birthday not available.

Note: one of the retiring members in the statistics for 2004 was only 30 years old. This is why the average age is so much lower than the rest.

### Educational Information for Active Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University College</th>
<th>Year of Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Industry Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>No. of Operating Head Offices</th>
<th>No. of Operating Branch Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONVENTION AND SOCIAL

Through four meetings this year, the Committee has dealt with the terms of reference as provided by Council.

In particular, the Committee has:

1. Organized the 96th Annual General Meeting, which will be held at the Jasper Park Lodge in Jasper, AB, from April 21st to 23rd. This year’s theme night will be a Casino Night. We are expecting a great turnout from the membership for the AGM.

2. Liaised with the Professional Development Committee regarding seminars for the 2005 AGM. This year, the seminar will be a two-part series on leadership, presented by Ms. Debora Rothermel. The first part is entitled Developing Your Leadership, and works on building personal leadership skills. The second part deals with using leadership skills to build successful teams. Both sessions should be very informative and expect that all attendees will find the information presented interesting and valuable. These are to be held on Thursday, April 21 at the Jasper Park Lodge.

3. Organized and held another successful golf tournament at the Lacombe Golf and Country Club, which was held on August 20th, 2004. Turnout was excellent, as was expected. We continued with the prize distribution method that was introduced last year and found it worked well.

4. Begun to initiate plans for the 100th AGM, which will be held at the Banff Springs Hotel in April 2009. Future Annual General Meetings scheduled: Jasper Park Lodge; April 20th to 22nd, 2006 - Chateau Lake Louise; April 19th to 21st, 2007 & April 17th to 19th, 2008. No serious discussions were held regarding the 101st AGM.

5. Had preliminary discussions regarding making the AGM self-sufficient. No recommendations came from these discussions. It is felt more investigation would be required, and with the cost of hosting the AGM increasing every year, it is not sure it is viable. Council did approve a contingency fund for the AGM to help offset any overages in budget.

6. Had discussions on changing the annual golf tournament to a charity tournament. It was decided not to change the current format as it was felt the tournament was intended to be more of a social gathering. This recommendation was approved by Council.
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## Discipline

At the time of this writing:

- Four formal complaints have been received by the Association. None of these formal complaints originated from the general public.
- One complaint went to a hearing and the decision was published in the September 2004 issue of *ALS News*. A second discipline decision that originated in the previous year was rendered in January 2004 and subsequently published in the June 2004 issue of *ALS News*.
- One complaint is still being mediated by the Registrar as provided for by the Act.
- Two complaints are currently being investigated by the chairman of the Discipline Committee.

In March 2004, Council passed a motion to amend the Committee terms of reference to ensure ongoing relevant education for committee members. To that end, an administrative law seminar was presented by Association solicitor David Jardine on June 24, 2004. The seminar was well attended and I think it is worth repeating that the seminar is available to all members of our profession.

I would like to thank the members that serve on the Discipline Committee for their ongoing dedication. Several of these members will see their terms expire in 2006. I encourage all members to seriously consider this committee as one that you may dedicate some of your time to.

---

### 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. This task is carried out by a group of knowledgeable individuals who are experts in each of their areas of practice. The Board held four meetings during the year, including one face-to-face meeting with the author group. The author group has been very busy researching and writing the book.

The author group is led by Dr. Alec McEwen as editor, Marie Robidoux LLB, CLS, Ken Allred, ALS, CLS, Monroe Kinloch, ALS, Dunc B. Gillmore ALS, CLS, and Gord Olsson ALS, CLS. During the year, we had Dr. Robert Radovanovic, ALS and Khaleel Khan departed the author group. We were successful in recruiting Messrs. Kinloch, Gillmore and Olsson to be lead authors. The authors have called on several ALSA practitioners to assist in the writing of their respective 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 submitted to the Board by May 21, 2005 with a final manuscript by September 30, 2005. The Board will have an opportunity to review the draft and be able to provide comments on the manuscript during June, July and August. Publication of the book would follow thereafter. Further input will be sought from Council on the format of the publication of the book.

---

### Committee Members

**Chairman:**
- Jim Halliday

**Vice Chairman:**
- Ken Allred
- Dave McWilliam
- Larry Pals

**Members:**
- Bruce Bearisto
- Bruce Gudim
- Terry Hudema
- Bill Hunter
- Daniel Lachance
- Con Lenius
- Doug MacAulay
- Tim Martin
- Dave Thomson
- John Wallace
- Wayne Wesolowsky

---

**Committee Members**

**Chairman:**
- David McArthur

**Vice Chairmen:**
- Fred Cheng

**Council Liaison:**
- Dick VandenBrink

**Committee Members:**
- Greg Hebb (SAIT)
- Terry Ingraham (NAIT)
- Dr. Mike Barry (U of C)
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.

The Executive Committee has committed itself to being prepared for the meetings. This has meant that we have been able to finish our meetings sooner and, therefore, we have been able to hold several by conference call. This has saved everyone a great deal of time.

The Executive Committee will continue to evaluate its investment adviser and decide if any changes need to be made.

This year, the Executive Committee reorganized how the statements are presented in order to present a clearer financial picture of the Association. Revenues and expenses are now shown separately instead of as one net figure.

The Executive Committee also deals with any staffing issues brought forward by the Executive Director. It is good to know that there are few staff issues as we have a dedicated group of people working for the Association on behalf of the public and the members.

FUTURE OF THE ASSOCIATION AD HOC
Background: The Committee held its first meeting on June 14, 2004. Our Committee realized that we are not the first to tackle this issue and that it will take a well-coordinated effort from this Committee to produce meaningful results. As a Committee, we decided to try to keep a narrow focus. We would leave the creative thinking to a later date once we had a better understanding of the current situation and of the future needs of the Association.

With this in mind, we broke into three separate sub-groups to collect information. One group looked at the potential use of an outside specialist who had expertise in this area and who may prove more effective than our Committee alone. The second group was to take a look at the current and past membership numbers and try to predict the future numbers of the Association. This group also was to attempt to forecast the future economic demands on the profession. Then the group was to compare the two predictions and try to foresee any future problems in membership numbers. The third group was to research other professions and associations and see if they would be able to find any related work that the ALSA could glean.

Action Taken: The first group looking at an outside consultant with more expertise in the matter came back with two proposals. Our Committee reviewed these two proposals and sent back a revised terms of reference to the more promising of the two proposals. The firm got back to us with the revised proposal and the Committee then approved this proposal for review by Council. Through the revised proposal, this is what the consultant will be looking at:
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Do membership demographics indicate a broad retirement is coming in the profession?
What is the current and future market? (i.e. demand for the profession)
Will membership have the ability to serve ALSA’s market?
What challenges exist to marketing the profession and attracting new entrants?
What bottlenecks exist to entry into the profession that ALSA can help to address?
At the current level of education and training standards, will the trends and the availability of technical staff affect ALSA’s membership?
What concerns do members have about the profession’s long-term viability?
What strategies and roles can ALSA pursue to meet the long-term interests of the profession?

The second group looked at future numbers and economic forecasts compiled a report and concluded there is a potential lack of Association members in the intermediate time period, five to fifteen years, but that the longer term forecast seemed to indicate a more stable situation.

The third group has been researching other professions and jurisdictions and has found a few articles of interest, but has not found a study of what we are looking for.

Future Work: Council has recently approved the proposal for outside consulting. Our Committee’s primary task will be to support and coordinate with the consultant to maximize the benefits and effectiveness of the consultant’s work. We will have an initial meeting with key members of the Committee and consultant to begin. This will ensure that the consultant clearly understands what their mandate is and will allow them to communicate to us what support they will need from us. Throughout the process, we will continue to provide support and information. Once the consultant has prepared a tentative report, we will review it with them and give input to finalize the report.

Once the findings of the consultant have been finalized, we will look at the recommendations as a committee and discuss how to best implement them. Then, as a committee, we will bring this plan to the membership/Council for their approval/input. If approved, we will help orchestrate the implementation of the plan, if it is required.

GEOMATICS ENGINEERING LIAISON COMMITTEE
The Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee (GELC) consists of representatives from the University of Calgary, Department of Geomatics Engineering, Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors, Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association, Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors and Association of Canada Land Surveyors. The Committee met twice in the 2004-2005.

The Committee formulated working groups for the organization of the survey camp, lost peg competition and professional
lectures and discussed involvement in the U of C Beef & Bun and Career Day.

This Committee provides a good opportunity to exchange ideas on topics of common interest and concern. Some topics discussed were:

- Presentation of survey camp and professional lectures;
- Using the concept of a “Made to Measure” crate developed by Science Alberta and ALSA, in other provinces;
- Geomathematics – a method of introducing surveying and mapping concepts to high school students;
- The exchange of information between the public relations and public awareness committees of the association members;
- Status of membership for the respective association members and forecasts for the future;
- Internship Program – the responsibilities and expectations for the employer and the student;
- The periodic CCLS accreditation of the U of C, Department of Geomatics Engineering;
- Discussions on course material and content.

HISTORICAL & BIOGRAPHICAL

The Committee met seven times during the course of the year. The majority of the meetings were conducted by conference call.

It was reported at the first meeting that the grandson of R. H. Cautley, a former president of the ALSA, had a number of his grandfather’s effects on hand and they could be made available to the ALSA.

Members expressed their comments on the draft of Chapter 10 which had been circulated earlier. Ms. Larmour reported that Chapters 7, 8 and 9 were being reworked for the next meeting as a result of the comments received.

Brindle & Glass was presented with a proposal to undertake the publishing of 1,500 copies of “The History of Surveying in Alberta.” Brindle & Glass presented a letter of understanding for the Committee’s consideration.

The Committee was informed at the second meeting that a photographic record of all the presidents of the ALSA had been completed.

Members, in considering a draft publishing agreement with Brindle & Glass, were informed that a number of the concerns had already been resolved. A recommendation was then made that an agreement with Brindle & Glass be formalized for publishing the book.

Members offered a number of suggestions regarding an appropriate photo for a dust cover and a title for use in marketing the book. The photograph is of an instrumentman working with a transit on John Pierce’s survey party subdividing townships north of the 25th Baseline, 1915. *Laying Down the Lines: A History of Land Surveying in Alberta* was selected as the title for the book as it identified with the subject. A draft of the dust cover and advance order forms were prepared and made available at the Annual General Meeting in April 2004.
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Members were given the opportunity to express their views on the content of Chapter 11 at the June meeting. Chapter 11 dealt with the oil exploration era and the various technological advances that had taken place. The report presented on the members preordering the book indicated that the numbers were very encouraging. It was explained that the preorder form was for the hardcover version of the publication and available from the ALSA only. Soft cover copies of the book would be marketed by the publisher at commercial outlets.

A draft of the ALSA historical website prepared by Mr. Munday as a companion to the book was well received by the members. Members of the Historical & Biographical and the Public Relations Committees made a joint visit to Heritage Park in Calgary to investigate activities to upgrade the display in McVittie’s Cabin. A similar approach was made upgrade the display at Fort Edmonton but the Fort was not overly receptive to the suggestion.

The final manuscript along with photocopies and photo captions was reported to be in Brindle & Glass’ hands by mid-August according to schedule.

The report on the advance ordering of books prompted a recommendation by the committee to update the number the ALSA would purchase from 1,500 to 2,000.

At the September meeting, the members were given the opportunity for a final look at Chapters 1 to 10 and the drafts of final chapters 11, 12 and 13.

Members were kept informed of the progress leading up to the publication date early in 2005. Editing and proof reading the material had been arranged and was on schedule.

Page proofs of the final chapters 11, 12 and 13 were made available at final meeting of the committee before forwarding for publishing at the end of February 2005.

The main thrust of the Committee the past year was ensure the history of surveying in Alberta book would be available for the AGM in April 2005; hence, some terms of reference were tabled for the 2005/2006 Committee.

In conclusion, the Executive Director, Ms Larmour and the Committee members (past and present) should be commended for their devoted and unselfish dedication over the past several years to make the history of surveying in Alberta book a reality.
LEGISLATION AD HOC COMMITTEE
In 2004-2005, the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee held six meet-
ings at the Red Deer Lodge and one conference call meeting. Mr.
John Van Berkel was appointed vice-chairman.

At its first meeting in June 2004, the Committee reviewed the
discussions and straw vote which occurred at the 2004 AGM and
came to a consensus as to the direction for the Committee for 2004/
2005. The Committee agreed that the notification process and
confirmation process would be dispensed with. It was also agreed
the direction to try and achieve was any Part 3 monument placed
in a non-monumented Part 2 defined position would govern once
the plan showing the monument was registered. There was also
discussion as to whether re-establishments should be included in
the Committee’s deliberation and the consensus was it should. It
was decided ultimately the recommendation should be that re-
established monuments would obtain governing status once a plan
showing them was registered.

The Committee spent the next five meetings discussing and
preparing the draft wording and the rationale documents. The
meetings were very productive and it was the Committee’s opinion
that recommendation’s could be made to Council in February 2005
and hopefully to the 2005 AGM. The Committee is forwarding two
recommendations, one for Part 3 monuments placed at non-
monumented Part 2 defined positions and once dealing with re-
establishments of these positions as well as Part 2 positions. Both
recommendations are supported by rationale documents prepared
by the committee.

Discussions have occurred with the Director of Surveys office
in December 2004 and early 2005. Copies of the letters form part
of the rationale documents.

The direction of the Committee for 2005/2006 is dependant on
the decisions which will be made on the two recommendations. As
a result, no direction was suggested by the Committee at this time.

NOMINATING
At the beginning of my year as past president, I knew that one of
my greatest challenges awaited me in my role as chairman of the
Nominating Committee. By the time that our Registrar Dick Bassil
informed me in early November of the January 11 deadline for a
submission of a slate, I had already made some of my phone calls
in search of candidates. In hindsight, I don’t think it is ever too
early to start the recruitment process. The months of November
and December fly by with incredible speed and I was quickly into
January, approaching the deadline with lots left to do.

I believe the members of this Association deserve to have a
choice in the selection process, so I did not simply want to fill a
slate. The goal is to have an election as opposed to an acclamation.
I am pleased to report that by January 11, I had enough volunteers
to allow for an election.
The following members have agreed to let their names stand for the indicated positions.

**For President:** Stephen Green  
**For Vice President:** Richard Beaumont, Dirk VandenBrink  
**For Council:** Daniel Lachance, Murray Young, Tony Brown, Victor Hut

The membership will vote for one vice-president and three members of Council. My thanks to these members for their commitment. I encourage all members to give serious consideration to becoming involved at this level in Association affairs at some time during your career. This is a great and strong Association but it needs your participation to stay that way. However, the greatest benefit is to the individual in the education you gain and the people you meet. You will take away much more than you give.

### OIL & GAS AD HOC COMMITTEE

In 2004-2005, the Oil & Gas Ad Hoc Committee was charged with two tasks from Council:

1. **Special Areas:** At the 2004 AGM, a motion from new business read: “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.”

   The Committee held two meetings to identify issues and prepare a request, through the Association office, for a meeting with the Special Areas Board.

   The ALSA was represented at a December 20, 2004 meeting with Special Areas Board in Hanna by Barry Fleece, Jim Berry and Allan Main. Issues of concern were discussed, and Special Areas Board is moving towards solutions. It is the intent that a liaison remain open as we monitor the changes.

2. **EUB:** In September 2004, Council requested that the ALSA have representation on the EUB Committee that was developing standards and the technical process for submitting digital pipeline plans to EUB as part of the pipeline application.

   The Committee met with the EUB group on October 19, 2004, as part of a large group dealing with this issue. We had several subsequent meetings in smaller groups, resulting in our members providing the EUB group with samples of several types of construction and legal survey pipeline plans in various digital formats.

   The final process is ongoing, but it would appear EUB would be moving towards requiring a pdf format copy of a construction plan, and a geo-referenced digital file containing the right-of-way boundary and a continuous line representing the proposed pipe location, most likely in dxf format.

### Committee Members

**Chairman:** Al Jamieson  
**EUB Liaison:** Dianne Haley  
**Members:** Jim Berry, Chris Chiasson, Jacques Dupuis, Barry Fleece, Harvey Goosens, Stephen Green, Ron Hall, Wayne Hucik, Craig Hughes, Victor Hut, Jim Macleod, Allan Main, Robert Morrison, Jeff Skelton, John Wallace
PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD
The Board welcomed three new members at the beginning of the present term, following the departure of two from the previous term. Mr. D. Russell Barnes continues as our public member and six Board members have been held over from last year. At this time, we estimate that three of the present Board will be leaving at the end of this term.

The Practice Review Board (PRB) has met five times thus far in the present term, commencing with our initial meeting on June 9, 2004. We have one more meeting scheduled for this term on March 16, 2005.

Systematic Practice Review (SPR): The Board has thus far considered 26 new Phase 2 reviews, with only a few Phase 2 follow-up reviews remaining to be brought before us. We will be considering the first of the new reviews in Phase 3 at our upcoming March 16 meeting. We have had four practitioners voluntarily attend a PRB meeting this year, at the time that their review was being considered.

The Board conducted a formal hearing with one practitioner, in the course of our regular meeting on November 10, 2004. We lodged one complaint to the Registrar on November 16. The PRB Chairman and the Director of Systematic Practice Review attended as witnesses before the Discipline Committee on May 12, 2004, with regards to a complaint that the Board lodged with the Registrar last term.

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

Guardpost Articles: PRB Vice Chairman, Dwight Wiberg prepared an article for the June 2004 issue of ALS News while Paul Westersund prepared one for the September issue, as well as Doug Neufeld for the December issue. Blaine Benson will have his article published in the upcoming March 2005 issue of ALS News, and our public member, Russell Barnes is scheduled for the June 2005 Guardpost article.
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PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The PDC has developed a five-year plan of course topics along with a seminar checklist, budget form and course evaluation form. Each year, the Committee is to develop the next year of the five-year plan so that as we are at the end of the term we will always have the five-year plan ahead of us. The five-year plan of topics is listed below:

2005-2006
1. Getting It Right June 16-17
2. Administering Law- Edmonton
3. Land Titles Documents and Procedures- Calgary
4. Boundary The Establishments- Red Deer
5. Municipal Governments Act- Edmonton
6. Land Use Issues in Resource Development- Calgary
7. Getting It Right- Red Deer
8. Exam Preparation- Red Deer

2006-2007
1. Getting It Right- Edmonton
2. Administrative Law- Edmonton
3. GIS/LIS- Calgary
4. GPS- Edmonton
5. Data Management- Calgary
6. Getting It Right- Calgary
7. Getting It Right- Grand Prairie
8. Exam Preparation- Red Deer
9. Natural Boundaries- AGM Lake Louise

2007-2008
1. Getting It Right- Edmonton
2. Administrative Law- Edmonton
3. Project Management- Calgary
4. To be Finalized- Edmonton
5. Survey Act/Land Titles Act- Calgary
6. Getting It Right- Calgary
7. Getting It Right- Lethbridge
8. Exam preparation- Red Deer
9. Loss Prevention- AGM Lake Louise

2008-2009
1. Getting It Right- Edmonton
2. Administrative Law- Edmonton
3. Remote Sensing- Calgary
4. Marketing- Edmonton
5. Condominium Act- Edmonton
6. Getting It Right- Calgary
7. Getting It Right- Lloydminster
8. Exam Preparation- Red Deer
9. Boundary Re-establishments- AGM Banff
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Council Liaison:
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2009-2010
Still a work in progress by the Committee.

Locations and courses are subject to change as each committee receives its mandate as set by the council.

As you can see by the above outline, the Committee needs your participation in support of the courses as well as your volunteer help on the committee to assist in developing outlines, budgets and course objectives.

This year 2004-2005 we presented the following courses:
1. Getting It Right- Grande Prairie
2. Administrative Law- Edmonton
3. GPS- Calgary
4. Loss Control- Calgary and Edmonton
5. Media Training- Edmonton
6. RPR Seminar- Edmonton
7. Getting It Right- Edmonton
8. Exam Preparation- Red Deer
9. Leadership- AGM Jasper

The GPS Seminar developed and presented by Dr. Robert Radovanovic, ALS was an outstanding success with over ninety registrations. I would like to thank my Committee as well as Council for their time and effort.

PUBLIC RELATIONS
It was a busy and rewarding year for the Public Relations Committee with a broad scope of activity. The terms of reference mandated by Council for the Committee in 2004/2005 made for many diverse challenges and opportunities.

The following are some highlights from the work of the committee over the past year:

1. **Five Year Public Relations:** Many facets of both the business and the profession of land surveying have changed greatly in the last five years since the last PR plan was adopted in 1999. At the direction of the Committee, Brian Stecyk of Rose County Communications Ltd. was tasked with the review of the current plan and recommendations for moving forward into the next five years. A poll was conducted of a number of stakeholders in our profession: municipalities, energy firms, lawyers, realtors, landowners, developers, members and geomatics students. Results of the polling were presented to Council and to the Committee. At the time of writing of this report, Council had approved $15,000 for the development of the plan.

2. **Science Alberta Foundation ‘Made to Measure’ Crates:** Working with the Science Alberta Foundation, the Association sponsored two activity crates in 2003 for the ‘Science-In-A-Crate’ program targeted at the junior high schools. Developed at a cost of $25,000, the two ‘Made to Measure’ crates offer a number of

---
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activities for students using the principles of land surveying based on the Grade Eight mathematics curriculum. These crates were a significant success story for the Association with a high usage rate and consistently excellent student/teacher evaluations. Building upon this success, the Foundation approached the Association about funding an additional eight crates for the program at a further cost of $25,000. This request received the unanimous support of Council early in 2005. The eight new crates are expected to be completed and ready for circulation in the schools by the end of March 2005. The PR committee hopes to have one of the crates at the AGM, based upon availability. Like the teachers, we need to get in line for the resource.

3. Rural Stopping House Displays: As a centennial project, the Committee has worked with Rose County Communications over the last two years to develop a wall display of the colourful history of land surveying in Alberta. The display will greet travellers at each of the seven rural stopping houses operated by Alberta Transportation. At the time of writing, the display design has been approved with installation at the stopping houses expected prior to the AGM. Posters of the display will be available to members at the AGM.

4. Student Memberships: At the suggestion of the Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee, a pilot project inviting student memberships in the Association was implemented. The intent was to promote the profession more proactively at schools with a geomatics program. The membership will be open to any students with an interest in geomatics. They receive a copy of the ALS News and emails from the Association. The pilot project has been a resounding success with approximately one hundred memberships to date, including students from Colombia and Scotland. A bylaw amendment is being presented to members at the AGM to officially incorporate the student membership category.

The following is a summary of the other activities of the Public Relations Committee:

Media Training: A seminar on ‘Media Training’ was held in the Association office in December. A number of Committee members including Lew Rodney and Vince Ziegler learned the dynamics of communicating with the print and electronic media.

ALS News Articles: There have been four articles contributed by the Public Relations Committee.

ALSA Scholarships: Huong Nguyen and Lesley Ewoniak completed a thorough review of the ALSA sponsored scholarships with recommendations for restructuring some of the awards. To date, the review and the recommendations are still being reviewed by the Committee.
AUMA/AAMD&C Trade Shows: As of this report, the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (AUMA) trade show was held at the Shaw Conference Centre in Edmonton on November 17 and 18, 2004. Jules Brassard organized the ALSA booth with assistance from Lesley Ewoniak and others. The booth included a popular contest where entrants had to guess the municipality shown in a satellite image. As of this report, the Committee will be managing the ALSA booth at the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties (AAMD&C) trade show on April 4, 2005.

Educational Institutions: On October 25, 2004, Scott Partridge represented the Association at a career fair at Father Lacombe High School in Calgary. There was considerable interest in the association from the Grade Twelve students looking at options for post-secondary education. It is recommended that further participation in similar events should be investigated.

A BBQ for first year engineering students was held at the University of Calgary on November 15, 2004 to promote opportunities in land surveying and a career in geomatics. Organized by Sean Studer, the event was well received with a number of students electing to become student members of the Association in our pilot program.

On February 7, 2005 the Committee sponsored a Beef and Bun reception for Geomatics Engineering students at the University of Calgary. The event was well received with approximately ten members of the Association in attendance to answer student questions. Organizer Ross Woolgar noted that more members should attempt to get out to this worthwhile event in the future.

The following day, Damian Gillis managed the ALSA booth at the University of Calgary Career Day. While not as well attended as in the past (perhaps due to the fact that the majority of third and fourth year students had already found work), there were a number of inquiries about the Association and the process to obtain a commission as a land surveyor.

Meetings with the Cities of Calgary and Edmonton: At the time of writing, planning for these meetings was still underway. In past years, the meeting with the City of Calgary has been well received with significant input from both the membership and representatives of the city. Ross Woolgar is organizing the meeting for 2005. The meeting with the City of Edmonton has typically been more of a challenge, but Lew Rodney has taken up the gauntlet this year to move it forward.

MEEDT Brochure: Participation in the Metro Edmonton Economic Development and Trade (MEEDT) brochure is an ongoing item that is being organized by Brian Stecyk in conjunction with the County of Strathcona.

Photographic Library: The Committee has a budget of $500 to develop a photographic library for public relations. A professional photographer is available to the Association for taking photos of members and their employees in ‘staged’ settings.
Scout Jamboree 2005: With the cooperation of Scouts Canada and the ALSA, Scott Partridge of the PR Committee has been working to develop a handheld GPS program for Scouts attending the Scouts Brotherhood Jamboree at Camp Impeesa July 17 to 23, 2005. More than 300 youths are expected to participate in ‘Pirates of Camp Impeesa’ – a GPS geocaching adventure involving a search for 28 hidden ‘treasure’ caches along four different routes. One of the caches the Scouts will be looking for are the remains of a wooden post and pits at the N ¼ Sec. 11, Twp. 5, Rge. 3, W5M.

Geocaching: Geocaching is an activity where coordinates to ‘caches’ are published on the Internet, and members of the public use handheld GPS receivers to visit these coordinates to see what treasures await. The cache located at the coordinates may be a small container with a log book inside to record the visit, or it may by a ‘virtual’ treasure where the reward is simply the view. The PR Committee has established four geocaches that will be published shortly on the Association website. It is anticipated that other land surveying related geocaches will be added to the list in the near future.

High School Mathematics Competition: The Committee struck a working group to investigate the establishment of a competition for Alberta high school students enrolled in Pure Mathematics based upon the successful TrigStar program in the United States. Brian Munday has had preliminary discussions with the Mathematics Council of the Alberta Teachers Association (MCATA). There is significant interest in the idea from MCATA with offers to help with the promotion and resources. Suggestions to date include establishing three levels of the contest- the local high school, the school board, and provincial with the winner of the provincial competition receiving a scholarship. Huong Nguyen is leading the working group with effort ongoing into the next PR term.

Press Releases/Articles: A number of articles were prepared over the last year for distribution to the media as well as realty, developers and legal associations. These articles are available on the Association website. Included are:
New Surveyors’ President Looks to the Future—May 5, 2004
Why Do I Need a New One?—Aug. 4, 2004
How Do I Subdivide My Land?—Sept. 8, 2004
It Won’t Happen Without Alberta Land Surveyors—Nov. 1, 2004
No RPR Means Big Problems—Jan. 13, 2005

Alberta Centennial Project: A number of possible projects were assessed by the Committee early in the year, carried over from 2003/2004. Members of the committee spent considerable time and effort talking to both representatives of Fort Edmonton Park and Heritage Park in Calgary about opportunities to update the land survey related displays – The Dominion Land Titles Office at Fort Edmonton Park and the McVittie Cabin at Heritage Park.
While initial contact was encouraging, the opportunities to work with these agencies proved to be logistically difficult with the time and resources available.

The Committee will continue to work towards other opportunities for Alberta Centennial projects for the remainder of this term.

It has been a pleasure and an honour to serve as chairman of the Public Relations Committee for the past term. The dedication and drive of the members of the committee has been outstanding, especially the new “blood.”

**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 Ad Hoc Committee’s mandate is as follows:

1. Investigate and prepare a position paper on the Western Torrens initiative form 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 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 has held numerous meetings in the past year. The Committee drafted and submitted position papers on the Western Torrens Initiative and on the impact of title insurance in the real estate transaction, to Council. The Committee has also made recommendations to Council that arose from the formulations of the papers. As of this writing, Council is still considering the papers and associated recommendations.
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The Registration Committee operated with representation from members throughout Alberta. The Committee is split into two groups; the southern (10 members) and the northern (7 members). Council Liaison Grant Cross rounds out the Committee. At the time of writing this article (February 15, 2005), there are 68 articulated students and 14 affiliate members. There are 21 students/affiliate members dealt with by the northern sub-group and 49 are dealt with by the southern sub-group. The sub-groups operate as separate entities when dealing with the student interviews, project reports and qualifying exams. The full Committee has met four times so far this year to deal with items such as setting the professional exams and specific terms of reference for this year.

From May 1 to February 2, 2005, the Registration Committee has met 18 times to deal with the following:
- qualifying exams (21)
- applications for affiliate membership (6)
- requests for extensions (10)
- requests for reinstatement (2)
- approval of affidavits of service (more will be approved in March)
- requests for prior field service credit
- requests for project report topic approvals
- annual/initial interviews (more to be held in March)
- affiliate member resignation (1)
- transfers of articles (7)

There were 38 candidates who wrote 50 exams in the spring of 2004; 24 candidates wrote 31 exams in the fall of 2004.

The terms of reference for the Committee for 2004-2005 were:

**Formalize the formation of an examining committee sub-group.**
This was completed and the first set of exams set by that committee were written in the fall of 2004.

**Investigate making the practical exam a closed book examination.**
Many discussions were held on this subject by the full committee. There were no conclusions but the Committee felt that the practical exam for spring 2005 is very close to being a closed book exam. This item will be carried forward as a term of reference for next year.

**Consider the formation of an oral examination group.**
With the Committee being so busy, discussion took place at the first full meeting, with Committee members indicating how much involvement they wanted, or could commit to, on the Committee. At that time, some members indicated they could only do orals or only mark project reports. That is how the Committee has operated this year but no formal oral examination group was created.
Review annual interview process and interview forms along with approvals of affidavits of service with respect to relevant field and office time.

Suggestions for changes and improvements to the forms were suggested throughout the year and revised forms will be completed by the end of this term.

Determine the value of having articled students appear for an annual interview yearly.

The Committee felt that the initial interview was important as well as the last interview prior to the qualifying exam. The out-of-town students visiting Edmonton for thirty minutes each year was questionable. The Committee proposed changes to the interview process to make the annual interview optional at the student/principle and Committee’s discretion but Council opted for the status quo.

This year was the second full year of the two exam sittings. Results from the exams can be viewed in ALS News. The feedback from the articled students is that they are pleased to have the opportunity to attempt the exams twice a year. From a committee standpoint, two exams sittings added greatly to the workload. The dedicated exam sub-group helped in spreading the workload around.

The Committee is again looking for members to both help replace retiring members and to expand the size of the Committee. As mentioned above, the opportunity to only participate in the orals or the marking of papers was offered to the members. This gives them the chance to participate on the Committee while not burdening them with a large workload.

This Committee is educational and allows the members to meet fellow ALSs and the articled students. During our discussions at meetings, many members indicate how much they have learned and enjoyed their time on the Committee. I would encourage all members to consider serving one three-year term on the Registration Committee during their professional career.
STANDARDS

In 2004-2005, the Standards Committee held seven meetings in Red Deer and two telephone conference call meetings. This year, the Committee was comprised of 24 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 remains as ongoing.
2. Liaise with Land Titles Office. Remains ongoing.
3. RE: Public Lands Dispositions - investigate a digital plan submission process and investigate georeferencing disposition plans. Subcommittee is working with the Director of Surveys on this item and it remains a work in progress with timelines for implementation directed by Alberta Sustainable Resource Development.
4. Implementation of corner recordation database is in the testing stages and should be finally implemented by the AGM.
5. Restructure the MSP into two parts. Motion forwarded to Council and item was sent back to Committee for more work and was sent back to Council for their approval.
6. Review draft standards on integrated surveys from the Canadian Council on Geomatics and provide comment back to Council. The Committee will continue to receive information on this item and forward information as it comes in following required discussion.
7. Review Part D, Section 5.1.2 of MSP as to whether or not ASCM’s in unsurveyed territory when not tied to the survey fabric can be considered to be good evidence. This item has generated considerable debate revolving around survey standards vs. survey control and will continue to do so in the upcoming year.
8. Investigate the inclusion of abbreviations for railway plans in the MSP. Consensus is that they should be included within the abbreviations section of the MSP. Finalization of this will continue in the upcoming year.
9. Investigate improper use of ground coordinates for section 47 plans and make recommendations to Council. A recommendation will be forwarded to the AGM for consideration by the membership.
10. Buried Facilities:
   a) review the current political, economic, social and technological environment concerning buried facilities, ground disturbance and safety procedures in Alberta.
   b) review the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association past position on buried facilities and the need for a buried facilities act in Alberta
c) prepare a position paper and make recommendations to Council with respect to buried facilities and ground disturbance. The position paper and recommendations must address possible changes to Alberta Land Surveyors’ procedures, changes to the procedures of the facility owners and others, and changes to legislation and regulations. The position paper must address all area of an Alberta Land Surveyor’s practice. This issue continues to be investigated and debated at length at the Committee level.

Public Lands Disposition Subcommittee
In 2004-2005, the Public Lands Disposition Subcommittee held six meetings in Edmonton as of the date of this report (February 15, 2005). This year, the Subcommittee was comprised of seven members, including the Director of Surveys.

The Subcommittee worked on the following issues:

1. Investigate a digital plan submission process for Public Lands Dispositions:
   Reviewed ASRD’s Digital Disposition Plan Standards document. Some issues being discussed:
   - file format (AutoCAD drawing file vs. shape file)
   - Will Public Lands mapping be in conjunction with the EUB and LTO mapping?
   - If a client is submitting the final documents and the digital files, how can the ALS be sure that the file has not been altered?

2. Investigate georeferencing disposition plans:
   Reviewed using a fixed ATS version and holding the ATS coordinate (UTM NAD83) for one section corner and rotating drawing to match the specified section line.

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.

At the 2000 AGM, the membership recommended to Council 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. The Ad Hoc Committee would also be dealing with boundary uncertainties, but would specifically focus on Section 9 of the Surveys Act.

The terms of references for the Ad Hoc Committee and the Committee’s results are:
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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.**

The review was conducted and found that Section 9 as it stands, serves its intended purpose, if it is applied properly. Other boundary uncertainties may be left unresolved or undetected and this in turn led to the development of the Boundary Resolution Process.

2) **Define the term “error in a survey.”**

“Alleged error in survey” and “boundary uncertainty” are defined in the Boundary Resolution Process document.

3) **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.**

The Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the document and added Question 4f.

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.**

A proposed revised Intent and Application document is attached to the recommendation. The Intent and Application document has added the reference to the Boundary Resolution Process, added a reference to the Metis Settlements Land Registry, removed a reference to re-plotting schemes and resolution by civil action. Question 4f has been added. It is also recommended that the Director of Surveys adopt updated intent and application guidelines for Section 9 of the Surveys Act.

5) **To investigate and review the current working application of Section 9 to determine if it is consistent with the “Intent and Application” document.**

The Boundary Resolution Process would ensure that only situations that meet the criteria in the Intent and Application document are forwarded to Council for a recommendation to the Director of Surveys for a Section 9 investigation.

6) **If Section 9 is not sufficiently broad to deal with the resolution of boundary uncertainties, to draft amendments to Section 9.**

The Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee felt that amendments to Section 9 are not necessary at this time as the survey error investigation process can work when applied.

7) **Make recommendations back to Council.**

A recommendation to initiate the Boundary Resolution Process has been submitted to Council as part of this rationale document.

The Committee developed the Boundary Resolution Process, a two-part process with mediation and a Boundary Panel, to review and help resolve boundary uncertainties between Alberta Land Surveyors.
At the 2004 AGM, the membership overwhelmingly supported the general intent of the Boundary Resolution Process. In the past year, the Committee has been very active and held five meetings to finalize the process and complete the terms of reference.

The Boundary Resolution Process, as mentioned, is a two-part process. Part One involves mediation to help resolve differences in profession opinions between Alberta Land Surveyors that result in boundary uncertainties. The mediation step is to bring parties together to help facilitate a solution. It is hoped that the mediation process will help address a number of boundary uncertainties and that only difficult cases or cases where mediation doesn’t apply would continue in the process.

Part Two, the Boundary Panel, has been set up to deal with boundary uncertainties when mediation fails or when it does not apply. The Boundary Panel will consist of experienced Alberta Land Surveyors and may include a public member, all appointed by Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. The Panel has no legislated powers (at this time), but will be responsible for investigating each case and recommending solutions for the boundary uncertainty. The Boundary Panel may decide that Section 9 of the Surveys Act should be applied in certain cases (based on an updated intent and application document that has been developed by the Committee), in others it may suggest alternate solutions. The Committee may not give an opinion on where the boundary is, but help the Alberta Land Surveyors involved resolve the boundary uncertainty.

As the number of boundary uncertainties is unknown at this time, the Committee decided to ask Council to pass the recommendation as a pilot project and allow the Boundary Resolution Process to proceed for one year, with an operating budget of $10,000. This was suggested to allow the ALSA to learn more about the nature of the problems, the solutions to these and to amend the Boundary Resolution Process as required. The Committee felt that the process itself will be an evolution that may eventually lead to amendments to the Surveys Act or other statutes if required to assist in resolving outstanding boundary uncertainties.

Council approved the pilot project and the Association is now preparing to develop the administrative systems to make this work. The Association is also looking for volunteers from the membership to populate the Boundary Panel.

At the end of one year, the Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee will reconvene to evaluate the results of the pilot project and make recommendations for changes or even if to continue.

The Committee feels that it has completed its terms of reference as assigned by Council and has developed a process that provides Alberta Land Surveyors an avenue to solve boundary uncertainties.

I would like to thank all of the committee members for their input and hard work over the past year.
The start of the year saw a carryover of the CCLS proposal for the national board of examiners. There were certain issues with the largest being the automatic provision of a certificate of completion upon providing proof of graduation from a CCLS fully accredited university or college.

The ALSA initially supported this proposal and later rescinded the support at its Council meeting of March 26, 2004. The WCBE also withdrew support for this proposal at their meeting of April 19, 2004.

In September 2004, the ACLS proposed a new agreement with the WCBE with the intent that a new memorandum of understanding with the four western provinces would be a large step toward a truly national board.

This information was circulated to the various associations representatives and a conference call was held where the proposal was discussed as to the current situation, the recommended model and the transition of existing WCBE candidates to candidates of the new board of examiners.

Three methods of determining financial support by the various parties were presented.

The ACLS took the information from this conference call and were to fine-tune the proposal based on feedback received from representatives of the various associations of the four western provinces.

The WCBE held its annual meeting in Calgary on November 22, 2004 following the morning meeting of the ACLS. A joint luncheon provided the opportunity to meet and also allow the ACLS to update WCBE as to the state of the revised proposal and that additional financial proposals would be provided.

An additional conference call did occur in December 2004 to discuss a revised proposal. This particular proposal presented eight financial options. The financial support proposed was a variation to the previously proposal discussed by the various representatives during the September conference call. The variation was the inclusion of articled pupils as well as the membership of each association.

This seemed the most reasonable method since the provinces with fewer students and members would not be burdened to the extent of the larger organizations.

Again ACLS digested the information and was to put some final numbers together and request a conference call meeting in early 2005. A further meeting was held in February and a recommendation will be considered at the March 1st Council meeting.
RATIONALE DOCUMENT
for the motion pertaining to ALSA student membership

1. What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
   This recommendation would have a direct cost of printing and mailing **ALS News** and other ALSA periodic material for circulation to Student Members and this would be an ongoing financial commitment. The overall cost would be inconsequential.

2. What is the genesis for the recommendation?
   From a presentation of a geomatics student to Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee which outlined the lack of connection between ALSA and students and how students have many questions about land surveying but do not know where to get the answers.
   From open forum discussions within Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee as how to get the high schools students who are strong in mathematics and sciences to consider Geomatics.
   From a two day think tank deliberation of ALSA Council on the topic of *The Future of the Association*.
   From an open forum discussions within the Public Relations Committee regarding methods to peak the interests of students in Geomatics.

3. Was anyone outside the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
   A trial membership drive was conducted at the U of C, NAIT, SAIT and through the ALSA website. As of February 23, 2005, 104 students have applied for Student Memberships.
   University of Calgary - 72
   Lethbridge Community College – 10
   NAIT – 8
   SAIT – 2
   Other – 12
   2 – BCIT (British Columbia); 1 - Buck Mountain Central High School (100 km west of Wetaskiwin); 1 - Distrital University (Bogota, Colombia); 1 - Hariat Watt University (Edinburgh, United Kingdom); 1 - Lakehead University (Thunder Bay, ON); 1 - Northern Lakes College (Various campus throughout Northern Alberta); 1 - Ryerson University (Toronto, ON); 1 - University of New Brunswick; 1 - College of the North Atlantic (Newfoundland); 1 - McMaster University (Hamilton, ON); 1 - New Brunswick Community College
   Online Applications Received Through the ALSA Website – 71
4. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   To high school students – to make them aware of geomatics as a profession.
   To geomatics students - to make them aware of land surveying and the process to a commissioned.

5. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
   Directly – to insure the future of land surveying and geomatics.
   Indirectly – to raise the awareness of geomatics to the public as an enjoyable career choice.

6. How is the recommendation in the public interest?
   Land surveying and geomatics serve the public and therefore the ALSA should ensure the ongoing of the profession.

RATIONALE DOCUMENT
for the motion pertaining to curve information
1. What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
   There are no hard costs in addition to the time spent by the members of the Standards Committee, Council, etc. There are no ongoing financial commitments required.

2. What is the genesis for the recommendation?
   This issue arose from a letter sent by Mr. Brian Minto to Mr. Pratt, which was published in ALS News in the June 2004 issue. In this letter Mr. Minto pointed out that there may be situation where survey plans create non-tangential curve boundaries and that there appears to be no explicit requirement for these curves being labeled as such and no requirement for their respective radial or chord bearings be shown. At the September 9th 2004 Standards Committee meeting this issue was discussed and as a result, this motion has been drafted.

3. Was anyone outside the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
   Mike Michaud, the Director of Surveys, and Tim Grusie with Land Titles were both consulted as they are members of the Standards Committee. Mr. Grusie questioned whether or not there was an expectation that Land Titles check to see if the plans are labeled with the proper information and reminded the Committee that the LTO is not there for plan checking purposes. Mr. Grusie also asked if there was an expectation that this be included in the Land Titles Office Procedures Manual.

4. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   The overall intent of the recommendation is to clarify the standard practice in the labeling of non-tangential curve on survey plans.
5. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?

The problem that this motion is trying to solve is that Part D, Section 1.4 of the Manual of Standard Practice appears to be adequate for tangential curve but inadequate for some non-tangential curves. However, it should be noted that when a curve on a survey plan is non-tangential as a result of a retracement of an existing boundary, Part E, Section 3.11 requires either the chord or radial bearing be shown. Therefore this proposed additional requirement should pertain to new boundaries that are non-tangential as a result of unique circumstances.

6. How is the recommendation in the public interest?

This recommendation is in the public interest because this change to the Manual of Standard Practice should result in plans of surveys being prepared that are clear and unambiguous.

RATIONALE DOCUMENT
for the motion pertaining to grid co-ordinates

1. What problem is trying to be solved?

The coordinates shown and the coordinate datum used on delayed posting plans pursuant to Section 47 of the Surveys Act are not consistent from plan to plan. This could lead to confusion and or misinterpretation of the coordinate positions by other practitioners or other users of the coordinate data, possibly resulting in boundary uncertainties.

2. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?

The intent of the motion is to provide guidance to the members of the Association in the preparation of this type of plan and to promote consistency in the coordinate systems and datum being used on the plans of survey.

3. What is the genesis for the recommendation?

Systematic Practice Review, in the course of their reviews, have found some Section 47 plans containing coordinates that are assumed, ground or other types that are not on the standard NAD83 Grid coordinate systems that are normally used for surveys in Alberta.

4. Was anyone outside of the Association contacted?

The Director of Surveys was consulted at a meeting of March 16, 2004. The Director of Survey Registration for the Land Titles Office and the Director of Surveys are members of the Standards Committee and took part in the discussions and recommendations. Additional input on this recommendation was received from the Director of Surveys Office in October 2004.

5. How is this in the public interest?

The use of standardized, recognizable coordinates incorporated into the plans prepared by our Association members provides
6. **Financial Costs**

There are no perceived costs for the Association itself, other than administrative in the amending the Manual of Standard Practice.

Costs to the membership in complying with this guideline should not be significant. In all instances, the survey would need to be integrated with survey control as part of the requirements of the Surveys Act. Coordinate values for Survey Control Markers are readily available in both 3TM and UTM formats from the Director of Surveys Office.

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT**

for the motion pertaining to a compendium to the Manual of Standard Practice

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

In 2003, the membership approved the Commitment to Property Damage Mitigation but had reservations about putting it in the Manual of Standard Practice. Concern was expressed about putting the document in the Manual of Standard Practice and whether it would increase liability. Some members had concerns that Systematic Practice Review would assess compliance against the Commitment to Property Damage Mitigation document.

Then President McWilliam advised the membership that the issue of having a reference section in the Manual of Standard Practice would be a term of reference for the Standards Committee for the 2003/2004 term.

The Standards Committee felt that there is other reference material (besides these four items) that members should be aware of. They include Practice Review Board Interpretations, historical acts, old copies of Good Practice Resolutions and the Manual of Good Practice and various ALS News articles from over the years. However, the Manual of Standard Practice binder would become too big and unmanageable if all of those documents were placed in it.

The Standards Committee, therefore, recommended that the ALSA website, in essence, become the compendium of resource material for Alberta Land Surveyors and their staffs. Alberta Land Surveyors would be encouraged to print the relevant reference information, depending on their type of practice, for inclusion in their own Manual of Standard Practice. A list of reference material, including the specific website address, may be included in the Manual of Standard Practice.

2. **What is overall intent of the recommendation?**

The intent of the recommendation is to give practitioners access to more reference material. By taking it out of the Manual of Standard Practice and having this information online, the reference material may be updated quickly and efficiently.
The four items making up the compendium are already on the ALSA website or the Director of Surveys’ website. Some of the information contained in the current Manual of Standard Practice, such as Bulletin 38, is not complete as the reference is only to “See Bulletin 38.” However, the ALSA website already contains a zip file of Bulletin 38 itself. The Control Survey Standards and Specifications section does not contain control survey standards but a link to the Director of Surveys’ website.

By adding a list of the reference material available on the ALSA website practitioners will have easy access to a greater variety of information than what is currently provided in the Manual of Standard Practice. The list may look like this:

In addition to the material contained in the Manual of Standard Practice, there is other reference information with which Alberta Land Surveyors and their staffs should be familiar.

Please include the relevant reference information depending on your type of practice in your Manual of Standard Practice following this page.

This reference information is located on the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association website and includes (but is not limited to the following):

Commitment to Property Damage Mitigation
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/bestpract.htm#The%20Alberta%20Land%20Surveyors%20Commitment%20to%20Property%20Damage%20Mitigation

Boundary Surveys Act
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/historical.htm#Boundary%20Surveys%20Act

Bulletin 38
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/zip/bulletin.zip

Control Survey Standards

Court Decisions
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/court.htm

Dominion Re-surveys Act

Good Practice Resolutions: 1980 to 1988
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/historical.htm#Good%20Practice%20Resolutions:%201980%20to%201988

Good Practice Resolutions: 1959 to 1977
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/historical.htm#Good%20Practice%20Resolutions:%201959%20to%201977
History of Re-establishing from Road Plans (1942 Surveys Act)
To be added

Indian Reserves Surveys
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/historical.htm#Indian%20Reserves%20Surveys

Land Surveyors Act: 1910 to 1981
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/historical.htm#Land%20Surveyors%20Act:
%201910%20to%201981

Manual of Instruction for Survey of Canada Lands
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/historical.htm#Manual%20of%20Instructions%20for%20Survey%20of%20Canada%20Lands

Manual of Standard Practice
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/historical.htm#Manual%20of%20Standard%20Practice

Oil & Gas Related Legislation & Information
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/historical.htm#Oil%20&%20Gas%20Related%20Legislation%20&%20Information

Practice Review Board Interpretive Bulletins
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/interpretation.htm

Surveys Act: 1922 to 1987
http://www.alsa.ab.ca/historical.htm#Surveys%20Act:%201922%20to%201987

Practitioners should use the search feature on the ALSA website to find relevant articles that were printed in ALS News or other ALSA publications. http://www.alsa.ab.ca/search.htm

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

In January 2003, Council passed a motion that the Standards Committee review the concept of restructuring the Manual of Standard Practice into two separate volumes. The motion was the result of the debate on putting The Commitment to Property Damage Mitigation document into the Manual of Standard Practice.

In February 2004, the Standards Committee recommended to Council that the Manual of Standard Practice be restructured into a single volume with two parts with part one containing standards governing field and office procedures and part two containing a compendium of information referred to on the ALSA website. Council endorsed the Standard Committee’s recommendation.
In March 2005, Council approved putting Bulletin 38, Control Survey Standards and Specifications, History of Re-Establishing from Road Plans and The Commitment to Property Damage Mitigation in a compendium to the Manual of Standard Practice and this was considered a housekeeping matter.

4. Was anyone outside of the membership consulted?
The Director of Surveys (Mike Michaud) and a representative from the Land Titles Office (Tim Grusie) are members of the Standards Committee. The Association’s webmaster, Dawn Phelan, attends all of the Association’s Standards Committee meetings.

5. How is the information in the public interest?
This recommendation allows for the orderly access to information by Alberta Land Surveyors and their staffs.

6. What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
There would be no ongoing financial commitments.

RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to an amendment to the Surveys Act to give governing status to Part 3 monuments placed at non-monumented Part 2 positions.

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation?
During the 2001/2002 term, Council requested that the Practice Review Board develop an interpretive bulletin regarding intersecting quarter lines. While developing this bulletin, the Practice Review Board discussed the public’s reliance on monuments that do not have any official status under the legislation. Mr. Lawrence Kluthe, then Public Member on the Practice Review Board, observed that the public accepts all monuments surveyors place as governing and questioned what protection the land owner has; especially when later it is found that there are multiple monuments in the general area.

Mr. John Wallace wrote a Guardpost article, published in the March 2002 issue of ALS News. Mr. Wallace’s article (Appendix A) arose from discussions at Practice Review Board meetings during the development of the Board’s Interpretive Bulletin 6-2002 “Intersections with Quarter Lines” (Appendix B). This article was part of the inspiration for the new business motion that was proposed and passed at the 2002 Annual General Meeting:

Motion from 2002 Annual General Meeting:
It was MOVED by Mr. Hudema, seconded by Mr. Jamieson, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association assign a committee of the ALSA to review a method which allows monumentation placed under section 44(3) and 26(1)(2) and (3) of the Surveys Act to have official status.
Subsequent to the Annual General Meeting, Mr. Hudema clarified the intent of the motion by indicating that:

The intent was that the initial Part Three monuments placed at unmonumented Part Two corners, i.e.: north quarter on a blindline, centre of sections, or at legal subdivision corners be granted the same status as a Part Two monument after being confirmed, the proper procedure was followed in placing the monument(s). Should the monument(s) be destroyed, it would be re-established in the same manner as a destroyed Part Two monument and the re-established monument would carry the same weight as a re-established Part Two monument.

Quoted from August 29, 2002 Council Meeting Minutes

The Practice Review Board had developed a motion prior to the AGM but revised it slightly to reflect the discussion at the 2002 Annual General Meeting in regards to the new business motion. This revised motion, as follows, was presented to the August 29, 2002 Council meeting:

Motion from the Practice Review Board:
It was MOVED by Mr. Bruce, seconded by Mr. Kluthe, that the Practice Review Board recommend that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association consider a change of legislation that will enable any section, quarter section or legal subdivision corner not monumented under Part 2 of the Surveys Act and subsequently monumented under a Part 3 survey, to assume the same status as if it was monumented under Part 2.

The rationale document for the Practice Review Board’s motion is attached as Appendix C.

Excerpt from the Practice Review Board’s March 18, 2002 meeting minutes:
Mr. Kluthe indicated that he has a difficulty with surveyors placing a monument and not having it govern. He questioned why the monuments are being put there if they do not govern. He went on to say that, as a landowner, he has to accept what the surveyor places as what governs. He questioned what protection the landowner has, especially when later it is found that there are two, three or four posts all in the general area.

The 2002-2003 Council then established the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee to investigate the feasibility of the motions and make recommendations. It was noted that there would be representatives of both the Standards Committee and the Practice Review Board on the new Ad Hoc Committee.

2. What alternatives were considered?

After a year of deliberations, Chairman Terry Hudema made a presentation to the 2003 AGM on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee. It was not a recommendation but a presentation to help the Ad Hoc Committee get feedback. The proposal, in 2003, was that a monument shall have governing status if a second Alberta Land Surveyor confirms that the placed monument of the first Alberta Land Surveyor is within acceptable survey tolerances as of the date
of the survey and it has been accepted for ten years as marking the corner. The Ad Hoc Committee received the support to continue looking at the issue as a whole. However, the membership strongly indicated that the methodology proposed required changes as it was felt the ten year clause was cumbersome and impractical.

The Ad Hoc Committee received comments on the proposal from the Association’s solicitor in August 2003. These comments, in conjunction with the feedback from the membership at the AGM and comments received from the Practice Review Board and the Standards Committee indicated to the Ad Hoc Committee that a new direction was required as it was felt that the proposed process was not practical and left many situations unanswered.

In the 2003/2004 term, the Ad Hoc Committee abandoned the concept of the ten year period and took a different approach based on legislation in Manitoba which dealt with notification. The main objective of this draft required a notification and confirmation process. The intention was to have all affected landowners notified by the original surveyor when placing a monument in a non-monumented Part 2 position. A second surveyor would then conduct the survey to confirm the monument in question as if they were the initial surveyor. Essentially, two surveyors going through the same process to draw the same conclusion thus confirming the initial position should be grounds for giving it Part 2 status. The Alberta government no longer has a formal plan examination and approval process with respect to registered plans and the responsibility is currently on the surveyors to be correct. The Director of Practice Review was considered but determined not to be the proper person to be involved in the approval and confirmation process. The negative aspects of confirming a monument were argued and some concerns were raised about people delaying making a decision when there was conflict.

The Legislation Ad Hoc Committee, at the 2004 AGM, put forward the idea that Alberta Land Surveyors would be required to notify affected landowners before any established or re-established monument would govern. The issues were passionately discussed at the 2004 AGM. It became apparent that it would never be passed if the wording of the proposed change to legislation kept the notification process in. A number of Alberta Land Surveyors expressed concern about the proposed process and the length of time required it would take to notify landowners. The membership was evenly split in a straw vote on the Committee’s concept. The Committee felt that it would need substantial support from the membership in order to pursue legislative amendments.

The Ad Hoc Committee took the membership’s comments at the 2004 Annual General Meeting into consideration during their review of the proposed wording in the 2004/2005 term. A re-draft was created, eliminating all the references to confirmation and notification. The consensus of the Committee was to give governing status to a monument placed at a non-monumented Part 2 position once the plan has been registered at land titles. The Part 3 monuments previously placed in Part 2 positions are sometimes being accepted, even though the current Act does not give them governing status.
Consideration was given to the fact that monuments placed in non-monumented positions prior to the date of enactment would require the surveyor to verify the position prior to accepting the monumented position. There was some mention of acceptable standards for monuments found and whether the surveyor would have to call them out or could accept them if they were within tolerance. It was suggested the Manual of Standard Practice could contain an article stating what the tolerances for the day were.

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?

The overall intent of the recommendation is to give governing status to Part 2 positions that were not previously monumented when posted under Part 3 of the Surveys Act. In the end, any non-monumented Part 2 location that is monumented would then govern once the plan showing the monument was registered.

If a monument is placed after the date of enactment at a position not previously monumented under Part 2, then that monument would be given governing status once the plan was registered.

If a monument was placed on or before the date of enactment at a position not previously monumented under Part 2, then an Alberta Land Surveyor must first verify the position of the found monument. If verified, the monument would govern once the plan showing the monument is registered.

The Ad Hoc Committee recognizes that a definition of verified would be required and would likely be included in the definitions section of the Manual of Standard Practice.

The proposed sections 39.1(3) and 39.1(4) are based on existing wording in Part 2 of the Act.

The recommendation reflects the actual practice of Alberta Land Surveyors today.

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

The Ad Hoc Committee felt that is was necessary for the members of the Ad Hoc to first agree on a process and wording. Second, the Ad Hoc Committee would consult with the membership of the Association and its various committees and Council to obtain support for the proposal. Consultation would then be sought from the Association's attorney and any other appropriate resources. And finally the Committee, with the support of the Association would proceed with discussions with external stakeholders.

The Ad Hoc Committee met with the Director of Surveys Office in 2002 to better understand and address their concerns. A draft of the 2002/2003 wording was forwarded to their office for comment in February 2003 and a response was received in May 2003. The Director’s Office indicated they did not support the proposed changes with their major objection being related to the potential movement of existing boundaries.

It was also indicated that the wording suggested that the “best available evidence” would not be used in certain instances. The Office also indicated they had no documented knowledge of public confusion with respect to the present procedure of monument
status. The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the concerns and used them as reference in the ongoing development of the wording. The Director was also contacted in 2004 to discuss the committee’s intended direction. He indicated that it appeared to be positive however his office would reserve their comments until they had a chance to review the draft wording. The 2004/2005 draft wording, along with the draft rationale documents were forwarded to the Director’s Office in December 2004. A response was received in January 2005 which reiterated the Director’s Office did not support the changes. The Director’s Office raised eight issues. A response to their letter was sent in February 2005. Copies of the Director of Surveys’ letters and the Committee’s response are attached in Appendix D.

The Standards Committee, the Practice Review Board and the Association’s solicitor commented on the draft that went to the 2003 AGM. As well, the membership offered their feedback at the 2003 and 2004 AGMs. All feedback was considered by the committee in their deliberation to develop the final wording.

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

Unbeknownst to the public, under the current Surveys Act, there are monuments with different status. This means that some monuments govern while some do not and the public is unable to determine which monuments have governing status. From the public’s perception, any monument a surveyor places has governing status. The Ad Hoc Committee is trying to create a consistency for monument acceptance and the proposed legislation will give governing status to all monuments placed at previously non-monumented positions.

The public expects that if there is a survey monument in the ground, it defines that position. At the 2003 AGM, Mr. Hudema stated further, in his opinion, it is the responsibility of the members of the ALSA, as being those responsible for the definition of boundaries, to recognize the monuments as the public is doing.

6. How is the recommendation in the public interest?

One of the most important benefits of the recommendation is the preservation and densification of the survey fabric. Additionally, the recommendation is in the public’s interest as it would ensure that land owners could rely on the survey monuments in the ground as being evidence of the property boundary without any question or confusion.

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

If approved, there would be costs associated with ongoing committee work to liaise with the government to see the amendments through the legislature. Additionally, the Ad Hoc Committee will require a legal opinion on the revised proposed wording. There also would be ongoing costs associated with eventual changes to the Manual of Standard Practice.
Serving on the Practice Review Board for the past couple of years has proven to be both an educational and an enlightening experience.

As most members are aware, part of the mandate of the Board includes evaluation of an individual practitioner’s compliance to the existing legislation by which we are all governed. Consequently, a significant amount of the Board’s time is spent discussing portions of this legislation. More specifically, the majority of discussion focuses on the Surveys Act and the Manual of Standard Practice. Some of the points made during these discussions have made me question certain portions of our existing legislation. “Is the public’s best interest being served by our present Surveys Act and application of same through our Manual of Standard Practice?”

The reasoning is as follows (Please note that sections of the Surveys Act quoted are from RSA 1988). Part 2, Section 26 of the Surveys Act clearly outlines how land surveyors are to establish the position of LSD and quarter section corners, which fall within the interior of previously surveyed sections...

26(1) If an east-west section line does not have a road allowance adjacent to it and if a monument has not been placed at a quarter-section corner on that east-west section line, then the position of that quarter-section corner is the point that is midway on a straight line connecting the section corners lying on either side of the quarter-section.

(2) If no monument has been placed at the centre of a section, the position of that centre is the point of intersection of the straight lines joining opposite quarter-section corners.

(3) If no monuments have been placed to mark the corners of legal subdivisions, the corners are the midpoints of the boundaries of the quarter-sections and the intersections of the straight lines joining those midpoints...

Part 3, Section 40(3) of the Act then requires land surveyors to monument not only the above corners whose positions have been established but, in addition, any Part 2 monument (i.e.: original township) which cannot be found and is required to be re-established...

40(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).

There are no current costs nor would there be any additional costs to the public. Giving governing status to positions that were not previously monumented will likely reduce the cost of surveys for the public.

8. What would happen if the amendment was enacted?

The Manual of Standard Practice will need to be amended to reflect amendments to the Act.

Appendix A

Guardpost Article by J. Wallace, ALS

Serving on the Practice Review Board for the past couple of years has proven to be both an educational and an enlightening experience.

As most members are aware, part of the mandate of the Board includes evaluation of an individual practitioner’s compliance to the existing legislation by which we are all governed. Consequently, a significant amount of the Board’s time is spent discussing portions of this legislation. More specifically, the majority of discussion focuses on the Surveys Act and the Manual of Standard Practice. Some of the points made during these discussions have made me question certain portions of our existing legislation. “Is the public’s best interest being served by our present Surveys Act and application of same through our Manual of Standard Practice?”

The reasoning is as follows (Please note that sections of the Surveys Act quoted are from RSA 1988). Part 2, Section 26 of the Surveys Act clearly outlines how land surveyors are to establish the position of LSD and quarter section corners, which fall within the interior of previously surveyed sections...

26(1) If an east-west section line does not have a road allowance adjacent to it and if a monument has not been placed at a quarter-section corner on that east-west section line, then the position of that quarter-section corner is the point that is midway on a straight line connecting the section corners lying on either side of the quarter-section.

(2) If no monument has been placed at the centre of a section, the position of that centre is the point of intersection of the straight lines joining opposite quarter-section corners.

(3) If no monuments have been placed to mark the corners of legal subdivisions, the corners are the midpoints of the boundaries of the quarter-sections and the intersections of the straight lines joining those midpoints...

Part 3, Section 40(3) of the Act then requires land surveyors to monument not only the above corners whose positions have been established but, in addition, any Part 2 monument (i.e.: original township) which cannot be found and is required to be re-established...

40(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).
(a) shall mark the position with a new monument, and …

Subsequent land surveyors, however, are required to disregard these non-governing monuments. For further instructions, please go back to Part 2, Section 26 of the Act where this whole odyssey began. And so on and so on… The landowners (that is, the public) are meanwhile under the mistaken impression that the monuments that were placed by professional land surveyors “govern” their title boundaries.

Wait, it gets better! The Surveys Act does not differentiate between Part 3 surveys conducted to effect title (i.e.: subdivision) and surveys conducted to effect an interest in the land (i.e.: right-of-way). According to Part 3, Section 41(4) of the Act.

41(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.

In other words, the monuments to define subdivision boundaries that are established during the course of a subdivision survey will govern the newly-created parcel. These same monuments, however, can never govern a titled parcel created under Part 2 of the Act. Consequently, if subsequently these monuments were found incorrectly placed in relation to governing Part 2 monuments, a boundary uncertainty is created. Whereas, the auxiliary monumentation left during the course of the same survey (i.e: quarter section or LSD corners) will never govern but may very well mislead the public as to the actual location of their property boundaries. For example, in Figure 1, monuments placed at positions B and C govern the limits of Lot 1, Block 1. They do not, however, govern the position of the N/S quarter-section line. Likewise, although Part 3, Section 40.3 of the Act requires us to monument position A in the diagram, this monument will never govern since it was not placed under Part 2 of the Act (see PRB Interpretation Bulletin 1995-1).

Similarly, monuments placed along a right-of-way boundary during the course of a right-of-way survey only govern the actual boundary of the newly created right-of-way. These would include the monuments placed at intersections with previously surveyed boundaries as required by Part 3, Section 41(1)(ii) of the Act.

The issue is further compounded with the requirements as outlined in Part C, Section 3.4.1 of the Manual of Standard Practice…

When surveying boundaries that intersect surveyed section or quarter-section lines, intersection shall be made using the nearest section or quarter corners on each side of the point of intersection. If the monuments at these corners are lost, these lost corners and all section and quarter section corners between the survey evidence utilized to re-establish the lost corners, shall be re-established and monumented, giving due consideration to all available evidence.
In other words, we are required to re-establish any lost original Part 2 monument with monuments that do not govern the property corners which they are meant to depict. For example, in Figure 1, the monument placed at position D does not necessarily govern the position of the N¼ of section 22. A subsequent surveyor may disagree with the re-established position of the quarter-section monument and, for the purpose of his survey, establish the N¼ in a different position.

Who benefits from the requirements for all of this monumentation? It is my opinion that the public does not. The public believes the monuments, which exist in the ground, are on the boundaries of their property. Although, in most cases, another surveyor will in fact confirm the position of the monuments, there are a number of instances where a retracement survey will establish the boundary in a different position. Movable boundaries can only result in the land surveying profession losing credibility with the public. It is also my opinion that the survey fabric is not enhanced by the establishment of these non-governing iron posts. The physical act of establishing more monumentation does not necessarily equate to improvement of the survey fabric. The relationship of all intersections presently required to be monumented could still be shown on a plan of survey, without actual monumentation being required. Consequently, the survey fabric could still be maintained.

Basically, there are two possible solutions to this issue. The first and ideal solution would be to allow monuments, which are placed in the ground and shown on a plan of survey, to govern. I realize this is contradictory to everything land surveyors have come to believe with respect to the “doctrine of original monumentation” and fundamental survey law. We have, however, already determined we can create a boundary uncertainty with a plan of subdivision under Part 3 of the Act. What is the difference, should a boundary uncertainty be created with a re-established Part 2 monument as required under Part C, Section 3.4.1 of the Manual of Standard Practice or with monuments placed under Part 3, Section 40(3) of the Act? This solution would certainly require substantive legislative changes. Sanction would be required similar to official plan status or re-survey status under existing legislation. Is this too big a leap for cadastral land surveyors to even consider? Ironically, sanction similar to the above would have to be provided should a coordinate based cadastre ever be implemented within rural areas of the province. Although a retracement survey could determine coordinates on existing governing monuments, coordinates would still be required for all positions of lost original monuments placed under Part 2 of the Act. Isn’t this an interesting thought?

Should the first solution not be viable, then we, as professional land surveyors, should at least consider placing fewer monuments that do not govern property boundaries. We could continue to show the same information on our plans as we presently do, just not monument the positions.
The final option would be to maintain the “status quo” and continue to plant thousands of meaningless monuments every year. This might even preclude future implementation of a coordinate based cadastre within the province of Alberta. A coordinate based cadastre would most likely require reliable and repeatable GPS technology. In the future, reliable GPS observations may not be possible. Surely, the weight from all the “non-governing” iron posts would eventually create a wobble in the earth’s axis!

The opinions expressed in the foregoing article are those of the author and not necessarily those of the ALSA or the Practice Review Board.

ALS News Article by K. Allred, ALS

When Do Monuments Govern?
(Referenced in Director of Surveys’ letter provided on page 120.)
The current debate in the ALSA is centred upon the question “When do monuments govern?” In particular, the argument relates to the establishment of the N 1/4 on a blind line. It was very interesting to read a 25 page mostly verbatim set of minutes of a recent meeting of the Ad Hoc Legislation Committee where the Committee and the Director of Surveys had an obviously extensive debate on the subject. It is clear that there are a host of different opinions on this very complex issue and, if we are to resolve it, we need to come to some consensus on some basic issues. I offer the following comments in an attempt to suggest some basic principles that need to be considered in order to ensure that we are all on the same wavelength.

Part 2 Surveys:
Under the Surveys Act, Part 1 establishes the general thrust of survey legislation and jurisdiction in Alberta. Part 2 sets out the framework for Surveys of Public Land in Unsurveyed Territory, Part 3 Surveys other than Part 2 and Part 4 deals with Miscellaneous items.
Surveys of Public Land in Unsurveyed Territory applies to the initial surveys of the Province of Alberta that subdivide Crown land into parcels that can be disposed of to the public. Without Part 2 surveys, no legal interest can pass from the Crown to a private party. Once a patent is issued to a private party, that party has a vested interest in a legally definable parcel of land. That parcel is defined by the Part 2 survey monuments placed along the road allowances and the various sections in Part 2 that verbally describe the boundaries of quarter sections, LSDs, and so on. Section 26(1) very clearly defines the position of a quarter-section corner along a blind line.
The boundaries of the SE 1/4 of section 20 are therefore defined by two monuments at the NE and SE corner of the quarter section, the midpoint between the monument at the SE corner of section 20 and the monument at the SE corner of section 19 (after allowing for the road allowance), and the intersection between that midpoint and the monument at the north 1/4 of section 20 with a straight line joining the monument at the E 1/4 of section 20 and the E 1/4 of section 19. (In all cases, we are speaking of original monuments.)

The legal boundaries of the SE 1/4 are abundantly clear. If a surveyor is engaged to establish those boundaries, his instructions are clear and there is only one solution.

Now, I think we all agree that we cannot sell what we do not own. Similarly, we cannot subdivide what we do not own. So if the owner engages a surveyor to subdivide the SE20 and that surveyor makes a mistake and sets the midpoint of the south boundary of section 20, ten metres west of the midpoint, he is in effect attempting to subdivide part of the SW20 as well as the SE20. In fact, by the subdivision of the SE20 and part of the SW20 the owner of the SE20 is illegally appropriating part of his neighbour’s land. And I think we all agree in law that he cannot do that.

Now let’s say that the subdivision of the SE20 is divided into two eighty acre lots, each one with frontage on the road allowance, and rearage on the quarter line. When the owner of the SE20 sells the most southerly lot (let’s call it Lot A), a gore of 10 metres tapering to 7.5 metres of the SW20 is also included in the lot. In law, you cannot sell what you don’t own. The owner of the SW20 still owns to the midpoint on the blind line but the bona fide purchaser of Lot A is entitled to all of Lot A which is governed by monuments on the ground.

The midpoint is still the midpoint, and I would suggest that a court would rule that you can’t sell what you don’t own, and the boundary of Lot A is based on the midpoint regardless of the Part 3 monuments placed. Now the purchaser of Lot A likely has an action against the owner of the SE20 and through him the surveyor, but he has no claim against the part of the SW20 that is purportedly within Lot A.

This is an attempt to simplify the situation but I think the principle is clear, and I don’t think you can legislate a retroactive provision that will take away someone’s land without compensation.

Legislating a Tolerance: It may be feasible to legislate a tolerance as Saskatchewan has done through Section 29 of the Land Surveys regulations whereby they have established certain standards of accuracy based on the dates of surveys and the standards of practice in those eras. I think the courts would accept a standard of accuracy as a means of determining where the true corner is or was originally located. Courts don’t like to deal with trivialities, and if the monument was established based on reasonably acceptable stand-
ards at the time, I am sure the courts would accept that as reasonable. But blunders will not likely be accepted.

**Part 2 vs. Part 3 Surveys:** The argument is the same for Part 2 surveys as Part 3 surveys. In fact, the example I have described is really a Part 3 survey defining a point that is defined based on Part 2 methods and monuments.

The same principles apply - you can’t subdivide what you don’t own. The difference is that under Part 3, surveys for subdivisions, every corner is monumented and hence you don’t have corners defined by written definitions. Essentially, a quarter section is a form of a legal description - same as a metes and bounds description or a description describing the west half of a parcel.

**Standards of Accuracy vs. Evidence of Original Monumentation:** Concern has been expressed where a midpoint has been established from original section corners which are now missing and have been re-established. Now, we have an entirely different situation. The midpoint which now does not fit with the re-established section corners is likely the best evidence of the location of the midpoint and may even be the best evidence for the re-establishment of the original section corners.

**Ancient Blunders with Complex Subdivisions Encroaching:** Let’s assume the above-noted situation in the SE20 happened sixty years ago and the entire SE20 is now subdivided into urban lots with improvements right up to the quarter line. Now the situation is extremely complicated with multiple owners; probably no original parties to the subdivision being alive; and in general, a real mess. The courts have another couple of solutions in this regard. They could look towards adverse possession, acquiescence, estoppel, conventional line or some other remedy to resolve a problem of this magnitude. But it’s not the surveyor’s job to resolve the problem, only to determine the best evidence and report the facts.

**Boundary Adjudication Board:** When the new Surveys Act was passed in 1988, the intention of Section 9 was to establish a Boundaries Adjudication Board (BAB) to attempt to adjudicate on these types of problems or “survey errors” as they seem to be labeled. Section 9 was carefully designed so that it could be a “court of first instance” which would hopefully give all parties an opportunity to be heard in an informal setting and, hopefully, the BAB would apply reasonable legal principles to come up with a fair solution to these types of problems. If the parties were not satisfied with the result, an appeal could be made to the courts but hopefully the Section 9 process would look after most of the cases.

Unfortunately, the administration of Section 9 seems to be avoiding the use of this method and forcing problems into the courts. Also, because of expensive and slow court procedures and relatively low land values, most of these problems likely get swept under the rug, only to be uncovered many years later when things are often much more complex, and likely involving more parties.
Conclusion: This issue seems to have been raised by a concern expressed that the public should be able to rely on monuments placed by a professional land surveyor and that those monuments should govern.

In point of fact, Part 3 monuments do govern—if they are placed correctly! And that is the job of a professional surveyor—to ensure that there are enough redundancies in the survey to ensure certainty that the boundary was established correctly! Remember, redundancy is the means by which errors and blunders may be trapped!

A surveyor, just like any other professional, is engaged to render a professional opinion. This is not a question of blind trust but rather a question of skilled practice in exercising one’s professional responsibility and getting it right!
Appendix B

Interpretive Bulletin 6-2002: Intersection With Quarter Lines

PRB Interpretation

The Council of the ALSA has requested that the Practice Review Board publish
Board interpretations on recurring survey-related issues. For the information of the
membership. The Board’s interpretations of these issues are unanimous at the time
the interpretation is written.

Intersections with Quarter Lines

Section 45(1) of the Surveys Act requires the placing of monuments at every intersection of
the boundary lines with every surveyed boundary of the parcels affected by the new survey.

There is no question about the requirement to intersect quarter lines which were surveyed under
Part 2 of the Act and shown as a solid line on the official township plan or not intersecting when
crossing quarter lines that were never “run.” The quandary occurs when crossing quarter lines
which were “run” for some reason subsequent to the issue of the official township plan. Currently
some surveyors are monumenting these intersections while others are not.

To provide for consistent methodology, it is the opinion of the Practice Review Board that
intersections and monumentation with quarter lines not shown as surveyed on official township
plans are not required.

Commentary

Pursuant to the Surveys Act, it is clear that every “surveyed boundary” crossed by a new survey
must be intersected and monumented. The problem arises as to what is a “surveyed boundary.”
The Dictionary of Canada Law defines “survey” as follows: “The determination, measurement
and establishment of boundaries of land.” When “running” a quarter line for what ever purpose,
it is evident that the surveyor is determining the boundary to the best of his ability; he is also
measuring that boundary, but is he establishing that boundary? Black’s Law Dictionary defines
“establish” as follows: “To settle, make or fix firmly; place on permanent footing; found; create;
put beyond doubt or dispute; prove; convince. To exact permanently. To bring about or into
existence.” It is obvious that by “running” a quarter line, the surveyor is certainly not fixing the
location of the boundary. Any monuments placed on the quarter line will not define the actual
location thereof but will only represent the surveyor’s opinion of its position. Clearly, any survey
subsequent to the issuance of the official township plan cannot create a new quarter line; it was
created by the confirmation of the plan itself. Surveys which create new boundaries must
therefore be intersected in accordance with Section 45(1) of the Surveys Act. Any survey
which “runs” a quarter line should be considered as a tie line only. Surveys which create a new
boundary coincidental with a quarter line must be intersected only for that portion of new
boundary crossed.

This interpretation was approved by the Practice Review Board of the Alberta Land Surveyors’
Association at its meeting on March 14, 2002. Feedback from the membership is invited, and
should be addressed to the Chairman, Practice Review Board, at the ALSA, #2501, 10004 - 104
Avenue, Edmonton, AB T5J 0K1 (Fax: 1-780-429-3374; E-Mail: info@alsa.ab.ca).
Practice Review Board Motion Rationale Document
(including supporting material)

1. What is the origin for the recommendation?
Council requested the Practice Review Board develop an interpretative bulletin regarding intersecting quarter lines. The Practice Review Board discussed the issue at their November 14, 2001 meeting and then again at their January 16, 2002 meeting. At this meeting it was suggested “that a statement could be added to the Manual of Standard Practice that would indicate whether intersections with quarter section lines would have to be monumented or not, with the backing of the Director of Surveys, provided that nothing added to the Manual of Standard Practice contravenes the Act.” Subsequently, at the March 18, 2002 meeting, the Practice Review Board approved the PRB Interpretation 6-2002 “Intersections with Quarter Lines” which was then sent to the membership.

The discussions held at the previous meetings regarding the interpretive bulletin generated a Guardpost article written by Mr. Wallace and published in the March 2002 issue of ALS News. The article is provided after the letter written by Mr. Michaud. [Article provided as Appendix A.]

At the March 18, 2002 Practice Review Board meeting PRB Interpretation 6-2002 was discussed further. It was noted that Mr. Wallace’s Guardpost article and a proposed motion from Mr. Bruce were of the same opinion. After further discussion and review of the diagram provided by Mr. Bruce, attached after the Guardpost article, Messrs. Bruce and Kluthe put forth the motion for Council. [Diagram provided after letter from Mr. Michaud.]

2. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
The recommendation would require a change in the legislation so that any section, quarter section or legal subdivision corner monument which was not monumented under Part 2 of the Surveys Act, and which is subsequently monumented under a Part 3 survey, would assume the same status as if it was placed under Part 2 of the Surveys Act. The repetitive work currently required and confusion on the part of the public would be alleviated when the legislation was changed.

3. Was anyone outside the Association contacted?
The Chairman of the Practice Review Board was in contact with the Director of Surveys, as referenced in question #1. The response letter from the Director of Surveys is provided with the rationale document.

Mr. Kluthe, who sits on the Practice Review Board to provide an outside perspective as the Public Member, was not only consulted but was instrumental in putting forth the motion. Mr. Kluthe’s opinion, as expressed in the minutes of the March 18,
2002 Practice Review Board meeting, was quite strong and raised very valid issues.

Excerpt from March 18, 2002 Practice Review Board Meeting Minutes
Mr. Kluthe indicated that he has a difficulty with surveyors placing a monument and not having it govern. He questioned why the monuments are being put there if they do not govern. He went on to say that, as a landowner, he has to accept what the surveyor places as what governs. He questioned what protection the landowner has, especially when later it is found that there are two, three or four posts all in the general area.

4. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
The intent of the recommendation is to change the legislation to give every section, quarter section and legal subdivision monument not previously placed under Part 2 of the Act and subsequently placed under Part 3 Section 44(3), the same status as if the monument was established under Part 2 Section 26 of the Surveys Act (RSA 2000).

5. How is the recommendation in the public interest?
The recommendation is in the public interest by providing the public with monuments on which they can rely on. Additionally, it is possible that this could result in a significant cost decrease to the public with respect to future surveys on that parcel of land.

6. What are the financial costs of the recommendation?
There is no cost to the Association apart from the time and money required changing the Act.
March 12, 2002

Our File: ALSA

Mr. John Van Berkel, ALS
Chairman, Practice Review Board
2301 CN Tower
10004-104 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 6K1

Dear John:

Re: Iron Post on Blind Line

In response to your letter of February 27, 2002 regarding the concern of iron posts placed at the north ¼ on a blind line, I would like to provide some general comments for consideration by yourself and the Practice Review Board as follows:

The PRB Interpretation titled “Position of North Quarter-Section on Blind Line” numbered as 1995.1 generally reflects what we currently advocate regarding the issue of the status of a monument placed under Part 3 of the Surveys Act. I believe that our current view is consistent with those of past Director of Surveys.

There are provisions currently under the Surveys Act (Sections 39 to 43 and 48) that would allow our Minister to confirm monuments for purposes of officially defining any required corners. Section 34 of the Surveys Act allows myself to confirm monuments in areas that are crown land containing no existing interests that could be adversely affected. It is recognized that the use of these provisions are not very practical for most cases because of the formal nature of the legislated process.

Development of a less formal process is not supported at this time in dealing with this matter. The current formal process is required to ensure that any existing interests in land are not adversely affected.

I would be pleased to discuss this matter in more detail if you feel that it would beneficial to the Practice Review Board. I am prepared to attend one of your meetings if arrangements can be made.

Sincerely,

P. Michael McHarg
P. M. (Mike) McHarg, ALS, CLS
Director of Surveys

PM/RM
Correspondence With The Director of Surveys

Appendix D

May 15, 2003

Mr. Terry W. Hudena, ALS, CLS, P.Eng.
Chairman, Legislation Ad Hoc Committee
Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association
2501 CN Tower
1000 10th Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta, T5J 0K1

Dear Mr. Hudena:

Re: ALSA Legislation Ad Hoc Committee

Thank you for clarifying that the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee is responsible for the proposed draft amendments to the Survey Act. In response to your February 11, 2003 and March 20, 2003 letters, I provide the following concerns, comments and questions.

The office of the Director of Surveys does not support the proposed changes to the Survey Act with respect to the status of Part 2 and Part 3 monuments.

Our major objections continue to be related to the potential movement of existing boundaries. A long-standing fundamental principle in land surveying supports the doctrine that established boundaries are to be maintained to protect the public’s interests and for the orderly management of land. The boundaries in question have all been established by Part 3 surveys. Your proposed amendments suggest in certain instances these boundaries would be moved to accommodate the existing position of monuments. A second long-standing fundamental principle in land surveying is the concept of “best available evidence”. Again, your proposed amendments suggest the best available evidence will not be used in certain instances. What is the Association’s legal basis/argument for the proposed changes to the Survey Act?

Recent discussions with land surveyors suggest the real issue is the amount of time and effort required to confirm previously monumented corners, for example at the centre of a section or the north quarter section on the blind line. A second issue appears to be the lack of a consistent approach when applying tolerances in determining the governing status of these same monuments. Resolution of these two issues is best accomplished by education and detailed standards within the Manual of Standard Practice, not legislation changes.

Public confusion with the present procedure is one of the reasons the Committee has suggested for the proposed amendments. This office does not have any such information or knowledge. If the Association has documented information from the public supporting this reason, we would appreciate receiving copies.

We are prepared to discuss the proposed amendments to the Survey Act in more detail, at the Committee’s convenience.

Sincerely,

P. Michael Michaud
P. M. (Mike) Michaud, ALS, CLS
Director of Surveys
Surveys & Technical Services Section
PMD/RC
January 19, 2005

Our File: Legislation

Mr. Terry W. Hudema, ALS, CLS, P.Eng.
Chairman, Legislation Ad Hoc Committee
Alberta Land Surveyors Association
Suite 1000, Phipps-Mckinnon Building
10020-101A Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta, T5J 3G2

Dear Mr. Hudema

Re: ALSA Legislation Ad Hoc Committee

Thank you for your December 10, 2004 letter regarding Part 2 and Part 3 monuments and the request for feedback on proposed changes to the Surveys Act. The office of the Director of Surveys does not support these changes, which are fundamentally the same as what the committee proposed last year. Our major objection continues to be related to the potential movement of existing boundaries.

In our May 15, 2003 letter to you, we outlined several concerns, comments and questions, but have not received a response. In order to better understand the committee's position, we would appreciate a response to the following.

1) Does the committee agree the boundaries in question have all been defined by Part 2 surveys/monuments (e.g. original township survey)?
2) Does the committee agree that section 26 of the Surveys Act defines, for example, the position of the N ¼ on a blind line?
3) Does the committee agree a monument placed in error (outside survey tolerance/blunder), for example, at the N1/4 of a section on a blind line, cannot govern and should not govern? If it would govern, wouldn't we be moving a landowner's boundaries?
4) What is the committee's rationale for disregarding the principles of 'best available evidence' (e.g. N ½ on the blind line placed by not using the best available evidence).
5) How does the committee propose to deal with multiple postings at the same corner?
6) Appendix A includes the guardpost article by J. Wallace, A.L.S. Has the committee reviewed and considered the basic principles outlined in the March 2003 ALS News article 'When Do Monuments Govern, by O. K. Allred, A.L.S.?'
7) What is the committee's legal basis / argument for the proposed changes to the Surveys Act. (e.g. moving landowner's boundaries).
8) What documented information from the public does the committee have, suggesting there is a problem with Part 2 and Part 3 governing monuments?

The committee’s rationale document states the public, as a whole, expects that if there is a survey monument in the ground near a corner, that the monument defines part of their parcel boundary. This office fully agrees with that concept (assuming it was placed by a land surveyor for the purpose of defining a boundary). We believe that landowners should be able rely on all monuments placed by surveyors (for the purpose of defining boundaries), irrespective if they are Part 2 or Part 3 monuments.

Your rationale document also indicates the committee met with the Director of Surveys office in 2002, and that the Director of Surveys has been kept informed of the general concepts under discussion and only informal discussions have occurred since the 2002 meeting. What it fails to do is acknowledge the concerns, comments and questions of this office as outlined in our May 15, 2003 letter.

We would be pleased to discuss the proposed amendments to the Surveys Act in more detail, at the Committee’s convenience.

Sincerely,

P. M. (Mike) Michaud, ALS, CLS
Director of Surveys
Surveys & Technical Services Section

PMM/RC
February 22, 2005

Mr. P.M. (Mike) Michaud, A.L.S., C.L.S.
Section Head/Director of Surveys
Government of Alberta - Sustainable Resource Development
Public Lands and Forests Division
Surveys & Technical Services Section
9915 - 108 ST 2nd FL Petroleum Plaza S Tower
Edmonton, AB T5K 2G8

Dear Mr. Michaud:

RE: ALSA Legislation Ad Hoc Committee

The Committee wishes to thank you for your review and comments with respect to our latest draft and rationale documents. The Committee is disappointed that your office does not support the proposed change. We agree the fundamentals of the proposed legislation are the same as in all of the previous drafts i.e.: all monuments placed by land surveyors should govern the position they are intended to mark. This has been the basis of the Committee’s deliberation since its inception. It is the principle the members directed us to achieve.

As stated in both your January 19, 2005 and May 15, 2003 letters, your main objection continues to be related to the potential movement of existing boundaries. The Committee has discussed this issue at great lengths since its inception and the consensus has always been that any potential movement of existing boundaries is no greater than exists under present legislation. In fact, under the proposed legislation, we feel that there will be less potential for movement in the future as more governing monuments, which will define any boundary, are more likely to remain in existence over time.

Currently, it is our understanding, from our meeting and discussions, that it is your office’s opinion that a monument placed at the N ¼ on a blind line should be accepted if the monument is within survey tolerance of the position where it was intended to be placed. You also stated that a N ¼ monument which has been in existence for a long period of time and has been accepted by other surveys as being the N ¼, even though it may be outside acceptable tolerance, should be accepted as the N ¼ post. It is the Committee’s opinion that both of these situations result in potential movement of existing boundaries. Every re-establishment of a Part 2 monument has the same potential. As all surveyors are aware, the actual position of the monuments defining positions shown on Part 2 survey plans quite often do not match what is shown on the township plan.
When monuments are re-established, surveyors attempt to place them in the positions placed by the original survey after considering the best available evidence. Quite often, the dimensions shown on the plan are the best evidence, yet this may not be where the original monument was in fact placed which is the position we are trying to re-establish. This situation has the potential of moving boundaries as well. What has to be realized is two fold. First, the public accepts the monument placed by a land surveyor in the field as being the point it is intended to monument. Second, any potential movement of boundaries is kept to an absolute minimum because of the diligence of the land surveyor. The Committee does recognize that blunders can occur and the proposed legislation allows for the correction of blunders in re-establishments and where original Part 2 evidence is subsequently discovered.

In response to your eight questions in your January 19, 2005 letter, we offer the following comments:

1) The Committee does agree the boundaries in question have all been defined by original Part 2 surveys/monuments. However, time has resulted in a loss of much of the original Part 2 monuments. As these monuments continue to be destroyed, the ability to establish these positions comes into question when re-established Part 2 monuments, which do not have governing status, must be used to establish the boundaries.

2) The Committee is in full agreement that Section 26 of the Surveys Act defines the N ¼ on the blind line from original Part 2 surveys/monuments. The Act also instructs the surveyor to place monuments at positions that were defined under Part 2 and previously not monumented (Section 44). These monuments, however, are still only the surveyor’s opinion of the position of these corners. Regardless of the Practice Review Board’s interpretation and practice of surveyors of accepting these Part 3 monuments if within acceptable tolerance, the Surveys Act does not support this as is.

3) The Committee reviewed this situation extensively. The end result was that the monument placed incorrectly would still govern until such time as the courts ruled otherwise. The Committee’s opinion was that the public does not know the location of an unmonumented position until such time as a monument is placed at the position. If a land owner is of the opinion the monument is in the wrong location, they can have it checked and if a surveyor placed a monument in error, then land owners would have the ability to take the appropriate action with the surveyor if they so desired.
Again referring above to the body of the letter, we currently have procedures, which are contrary to the current Surveys Act, being followed which have the potential to move boundaries.

4) The Committee does not understand what basis the Director’s office uses to make this statement. The Committee has always used the principle of “best available evidence” in all its deliberations and, to the best of our knowledge, in the proposed legislation wording. We would ask that you please clarify what specific wording you are referring to.

5) In the case where multiple monuments placed prior to the enactment of the Act are discovered, the surveyor discovering the multiple postings would have to verify which monument, in their opinion, is in the correct position; this verification would include the assessment of evidence used in the survey. The monument, verified by the surveyor as being in the correct position, would gain governing status once the monument is shown on a registered plan. The same principles would apply to re-established monuments.

After the date of enactment of the Ad Hoc Committee’s proposed amendments, if a monument is placed at an unmonumented position, the monument would have governing status after the registration of the plan. If a subsequent survey places a second monument at the position and the first exists, only the first monument would have governing status. This is consistent with the principles of best available evidence.

6) The Committee has reviewed G.K. Allred, A.L.S.’s article When Do Monuments Govern and in general agree with the article. We, however, do not agree with the statement made in his conclusion “Part 3 monuments do govern – if they are placed correctly.” The Act does not state this. The monument placed is only the surveyor’s opinion of where that position is. Subsequent surveyors may agree with the opinion of the previous surveyors but the post does not have governing status under the current Act.

7) The Committee’s basis/legal arguments for the proposed changes are as stated in Section 1 of the rationale documents. We are acting under the direction of the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association in response to the direction from the membership by motion under new business and by motion from the Practice Review Board.
Mr. P.M. (Mike) Michaud, A.L.S., C.L.S.
February 22, 2005

Under the current situation there is a potential for boundaries to move as
the monuments do not govern the positions they purport to mark. Many
of the original monuments have been re-established. The current
technology has provided land surveyors with the ability to place these
monuments more accurately than in the past. In the future, this will
reduce the likelihood of the boundary moving. Additionally, the increase
in the number of governing monuments will only work to strengthen the
survey fabric.

8) The only documented evidence we currently have is from the rationale
document provided by the Practice Review Board which quotes an
excerpt from their March 18, 2002 meeting minutes which states:

    Mr. Kluthe indicated that he has a difficulty with surveyors placing a
monument and not having it govern. He questioned why the
monuments are being put there if they do not govern. He went on to
say that, as a landowner, he has to accept what the surveyor places
as what governs. He questioned what protection the landowner has,
especially when later it is found that there are two, three or four
posts all in the general area.

As well, all members of the Committee related situations where they
have had potential clients indicate they have seen the pins at the N \( \frac{1}{4} \) or
centre of section, which in their minds, should reduce the cost of a
survey. When advised that these monuments do not govern and they
cannot be accepted until they are first verified by doing a complete
survey they have trouble understanding this. In their minds, many must
think we are just trying to run up their bill. Mr. Kluthe also mentioned in
discussions, he has had other members of the public question him on
similar situations.

The public has been trained to believe if there is a monument at or near
the corner of a parcel that it is the corner. It is time for legislation to
make this true.

In your first paragraph of page 2 (January 15, 2005 letter) you state “we believe
that land owners should be able to rely on all monuments placed by surveyors
(for the purpose of defining boundaries) irrespective if they are Part 2 or Part 3
monuments” It is the Committee’s opinion that the proposed legislation allows
this to become a reality.
Mr. P.M. (Mike) Michaud, A.L.S., C.L.S.
February 22, 2005

We have refined the rationale document to address the issues of communication with your office. We trust this letter addresses the issues raised in both of your letters and that our responses will give you a better understanding to allow you to reconsider your current position.

The Ad Hoc Committee welcomes your comments and would appreciate receiving them by March 15, 2005.

Yours truly,

Terry Hudema, A.L.S.
Chairman, Legislation Ad Hoc Committee

TH/dp
Recommendation #5(b)  

RATIONALE DOCUMENT  
for the motion pertaining to the amendment of the Surveys Act to give governing status to re-established Part 2 monuments and re-established Part 3 monuments placed at non-monumented Part 2 positions.

1. What is the genesis for the recommendation?  
During the 2001/2002 term, Council requested that the Practice Review Board develop an interpretive bulletin regarding intersecting quarter lines. While developing this bulletin, the Practice Review Board discussed the public’s reliance on monuments that do not have any official status under the legislation. Mr. Lawrence Kluthe, then Public Member on the Practice Review Board, observed that the public accepts all monuments surveyors place as governing and questioned what protection the land owner has; especially when later it is found that there are multiple monuments in the general area.

Mr. John Wallace wrote a Guardpost article, published in the March 2002 issue of ALS News. Mr. Wallace’s article (Appendix A) arose from discussions at Practice Review Board meetings during the development of the Board’s Interpretive Bulletin 6-2002 “Intersections with Quarter Lines” (Appendix B). This article was part of the inspiration for the new business motion that was proposed and passed at the 2002 Annual General Meeting:

Motion from 2002 Annual General Meeting:  
It was MOVED by Mr. Hudema, seconded by Mr. Jamieson, that it is recommended that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association assign a committee of the ALSA to review a method which allows monumentation placed under section 44(3) and 26(1)(2) and (3) of the Surveys Act to have official status.

Subsequent to the Annual General Meeting, Mr. Hudema clarified the intent of the motion by indicating that:

The intent was that the initial Part Three monuments placed at unmonumented Part Two corners, i.e.: north quarter on a blind line, centre of sections, or at legal subdivision corners be granted the same status as a Part Two monument after being confirmed the proper procedure was followed in placing the monument(s). Should the monument(s) be destroyed, it would be re-established in the same manner as a destroyed Part Two monument and the re-established monument would carry the same weight as a re-established Part Two monument.

Quoted from August 29, 2002 Council Meeting Minutes

The Practice Review Board had developed a motion prior to the AGM but revised it slightly to reflect the discussion at the 2002 Annual General Meeting in regards to the new business motion. This revised motion, as follows, was presented to the August 29, 2002 Council meeting:
Motion from the Practice Review Board: It was MOVED by Mr. Bruce, seconded by Mr. Kluhle, that the Practice Review Board recommend that the Council of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association consider a change of legislation that will enable any section, quarter section or legal subdivision corner not monumented under Part 2 of the Surveys Act and subsequently monumented under a Part 3 survey, to assume the same status as if it was monumented under Part 2.

The rationale document for the Practice Review Board’s motion is attached as Appendix C.

The 2002-2003 Council then established the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee to investigate the feasibility of the motions and make recommendations. It was noted that there would be representatives of both the Standards Committee and the Practice Review Board on the new Ad Hoc Committee.

During the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee, it was determined that it would be advantageous for re-established Part 2 or Part 3 monuments in Part 2 positions to also be granted governing status. This was reconfirmed during the 2004/2005 session. The initial directive to the committee to evaluate changes to the legislation which would give equal status to Part 3 monuments placed in non-monumented Part 2 positions was intended to equalize the status of monuments and eliminate the two-tier system in which some monuments have governing status and others have no status whatsoever. The public is not generally aware of the differences in status of the monuments located on the boundaries of their land. Therefore, in order to be consistent it is essential that re-established Part 2 monuments or Part 3 monuments in Part 2 positions be granted governing status. The Committee proceeded to evaluate the issue and proposed amendments to the existing statute to grant status to re-established monuments.

2. What alternatives were considered?
   a) Do not grant governing status to re-established monuments because they are not original evidence and there is some possibility that original evidence could still be found.

   This alternative was rejected because it would continue to perpetuate the placement of monuments which have no status in defining boundaries.

   b) Grant governing status to re-established monuments after a period of 10 years and/or confirmation by an independent second survey.

   The proposal brought forward to the AGM in 2003, was that a monument shall be granted governing status if a second Alberta Land Surveyor confirms that the placed monument of the first Alberta Land Surveyor is within acceptable survey tolerances as of the date of the survey and it has been accepted for ten years as marking the corner. However, the membership strongly indicated that the proposed methodology required changes. It was the opinion of the membership that the ten year clause was cumbersome and impractical.
The Ad Hoc Committee received comments on the proposal from the Association’s solicitor in August 2003. These comments, in conjunction with the feedback from the membership at the 2003 AGM and comments received from the Practice Review Board and the Standards Committee indicated to the Ad Hoc Committee that a new direction was required as it was felt that the proposed process of confirmation due to a specified period of elapsed time and/or confirmation by a subsequent survey was not practical and left many situations unanswered.

c) Grant governing status to re-established monuments after registration of the plan of survey at the Land Titles or Métis Settlements Office, but require notification of all affected landowners by registered mail and provide opportunity for any objections to the location of the monument to be heard and evaluated prior to registration of the plan.

In the 2003/2004 term, the Committee took a different approach based on existing legislation in Manitoba which dealt with notification of landowners by registered mail and public notice to the community and abandoned the concept of the ten year period. The committee wanted to ensure that the process that would result in monuments being granted governing status was rigorous and transparent. The Manitoba procedure ensures that affected individuals are adequately informed of the re-established boundary locations when the proposed re-establishment does not fit with lines of occupation and that anyone having information which may contribute to properly locating the boundary in its historic location is able to contribute to the re-establishment (process). Manitoba’s registration procedure is supervised by the Registrar General. Any plans which re-established Part 2 monuments would be reviewed by the Registrar General. In the absence of this office or an equivalent body in Alberta, it was proposed that a second independent survey would be required to confirm the location of the re-established monuments prior to the granting of governing status.

Essentially two surveyors would be evaluating all existing evidence and determining the appropriate method of re-establishment in order to arrive at the same location for the re-established monument. The second plan of survey would note the plan number that was being confirmed and the monument would have governing status retroactively from the registration date of the first plan.

There was substantial discussion around the process of confirmation and potential delays in registration of plans due to conflicting opinions on the location of the boundary.

The Legislation Ad Hoc Committee brought the revised procedure, including notification, to the membership at the 2004 AGM. The issues were vigorously debated and it became apparent that the proposed amendments would likely not be passed by the membership if notification was required in the process of granting governing status to monuments. Specific concerns expressed by a number of Alberta Land Surveyors included delays due to time required for notification of landowners. In addition, consultation with landowners is already a part of the hierarchy of evidence and would be utilized as needed in determining the appropriate location of the re-established position. The membership was evenly split in a straw
vote on the proposed procedure but supported the Committee’s further deliberations to refine the proposed amendments and review the required procedures. The Committee felt that it would need substantial support from the membership in order to pursue legislative amendments.

d) Grant governing status to re-established monuments after registration of the plan of survey, but provide the caveat that traces of the original monument would still supersede the re-established position if subsequently located.

The Ad Hoc Committee took the membership’s comments at the 2004 Annual General Meeting into consideration during their review of the proposed wording in the 2004/2005 term. A re-draft was created, eliminating all the references to confirmation and notification. The consensus of the committee was to give governing status to a re-established monument placed at a Part 2 position or a Part 3 monument at a non-monumented Part 2 position once the plan has been registered at the appropriate Land Titles Office or Métis Settlement Land Registry. In current survey practice the Part 3 monuments previously placed at Part 2 positions and re-established Part 2 monuments are being accepted as marking the boundary even though the current Act does not give them governing status.

Consideration was given to the fact that re-established monuments placed prior to the date of enactment would require the surveyor to verify the position prior to accepting the monumented position. Guidelines would need to be established for acceptable tolerances. It was suggested that the Manual of Standard Practice could contain additional information regarding tolerances for surveys during various historical eras. Also, additional information on the procedures followed in performing particular types of surveys, such as road widenings, during particular eras could be included.

3. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?

This recommendation deals with the re-establishment of Part 2 monuments. Any re-established monument would govern once the plan showing the monument was registered at a Land Titles Offices or Métis Settlements Land Registry. Subsequent discovery of the original monument or traces of the original monument would continue to govern the position and invalidate the re-established position of the monument.

If a monument is placed after the date of enactment at a re-established Part 2 position or a Part 3 monument established at a non-monumented Part 2 position, then the monument would be given governing status upon plan registration.

If a monument was re-established in a Part 2 position on or before the date of enactment, then an Alberta Land Surveyor must verify the found monument in order for the monument to govern. The monument will be given governing status upon registration of the new plan showing the verified position.

The Ad Hoc Committee recognizes that a definition of verified would be required and would likely be included in the definitions section of the Manual of Standard Practice.
4. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?

The Ad Hoc Committee felt that it was necessary for the members of the Ad Hoc to first agree on a process and wording. Second, the Ad Hoc Committee would consult with the membership of the Association and its various committees and Council to obtain support for the proposal. Consultation would then be sought from the Association’s attorney and any other appropriate resources. And finally the Committee, with the support of the Association would proceed with discussions with external stakeholders.

The Ad Hoc Committee met with the Director of Surveys Office in 2002 to better understand and address their concerns. A draft of the 2002/2003 wording was forwarded to their office for comment in February 2003 and a response was received in May 2003. The Director’s office indicated they did not support the proposed changes with their major objection being related to the potential movement of existing boundaries.

It was also indicated that the wording suggested that the “best available evidence” would not be used in certain instances. The Office also indicated they had no documented knowledge of public confusion with respect to the present procedure of monument status. The Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the concerns and used them as reference in the ongoing development of the wording. The Director was also contacted in 2004 to discuss the committee’s intended direction. He indicated that it appeared to be positive however his office would reserve their comments until they had a chance to review the draft wording. The 2004/2005 draft wording, along with the draft rationale documents were forwarded to the Director’s Office in December 2004. A response was received in January 2005 which reiterated the Director’s Office did not support the changes. The Director’s Office raised eight issues. A response to their letter was sent in February 2005. Copies of the Director of Surveys letters and the Committee’s response are attached in Appendix D.

The Standards Committee, the Practice Review Board and the Association’s solicitor commented on the draft that went to the 2003 AGM. As well, the membership offered their feedback at the 2003 and 2004 AGMs. All feedback was considered by the committee in their deliberation to develop the final wording.

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

The public expects that if there is a survey monument in the ground, it defines that position. At the 2003 AGM, Mr. Hudema stated further, in his opinion, it is the responsibility of the members of the ALSA, as being those responsible for the definition of boundaries, to recognize the monuments as the public is doing.

Under the current Surveys Act, there are monuments with different status. This means that some monuments govern but that some do not and the public is unable to determine which monument does or does not have governing status. From the public’s perspective, any monument a surveyor places has governing status
and defines a boundary. The Ad Hoc Committee is trying to create an environment in which all monuments can consistently be accepted as defining the boundaries on which they are located. The proposed legislation will give governing status to all monuments placed at re-established Part 2 positions or a Part 3 monument at a non-monumented Part 2 position.

6. **How is the recommendation in the public interest?**
   One of the most important benefits of the recommendation is the preservation and densification of the survey fabric. Additionally, the recommendation is in the public’s interest as it would ensure that land owners could rely on the survey monuments in the ground as being evidence of the property boundary without any question or confusion as to the status of an individual monument.

7. **What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?**
   If approved, there would be costs associated with ongoing committee work to liaise with legislative drafts people and lobby the government to see the amendments brought before the legislature and enacted into law. Additionally, the Ad Hoc Committee will require a legal opinion on the revised proposed wording. A review of the case law regarding re-established positions would also be valuable to identify any additional concerns. There also would be ongoing costs associated with necessary changes to the Manual of Standard Practice to ensure adequate historical information to support re-establishment procedures based on the standard of practice during the placement of the original monuments.

   There are no current costs to the public, nor would any additional costs to the public be anticipated by granting governing status to re-established monuments. Any costs due to subsequent discovery of original evidence would be borne by the surveyor or by his/her insurance provider.

8. **What would happen if the amendment was enacted?**
   The Manual of Standard Practice will need to be amended to reflect amendments to the Act.
### DRAFT RE-WORDING FOR THE SURVEYS ACT

**Bolded text is new.**

**Part 3**

**Surveys Other Than Under Part 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Section Heading</th>
<th>Current Section #</th>
<th>Current Wording</th>
<th>New Section Heading</th>
<th>New Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument placed after date of enactment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.1(1)</td>
<td>A monument placed at a corner (a) referred to in Section 26(1), (2), (3) or (4) or (b) of any Section or Quarter Section corner not monumented under the original Part 2 surveys shall fix and govern that position if a plan of survey showing such is registered after enactment date at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metic Settlements Land Registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument shown as placed on plan prior to or on date of enactment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.1(2)</td>
<td>A monument shown as placed on a plan of survey registered at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metic Settlements Land Registry on or prior to enactment date; at a position (a) referred to in Section 26(1), (2), (3) or (4) or (b) of any Section or Quarter Section corner not monumented under the original Part 2 surveys shall fix and govern that position if the found monument is verified and is shown on a plan of survey registered after enactment date at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metic Settlements Land Registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Section Heading</td>
<td>Current Section #</td>
<td>Current Wording</td>
<td>New Section Heading</td>
<td>New Section #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.1(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All boundary lines surveyed or established using the monuments referred to in subsections (1) and (2) shall be defined by these monuments as shown 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. (See current section 37 under Part 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.1(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every parcel surveyed using the monuments referred to in subsections (1) and (2) shall consist of all the land included between the several monuments which determine 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. (See current section 37 under Part 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.1(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A monument referred to in subsections (1) or (2) shall govern the position as if it were placed as an original Part 2 monument and shall not be questioned in any court. (See current section 41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurvey of 625 or 32 ha in municipality</td>
<td>29.1(6)</td>
<td>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 is desirable to re-survey and place monuments at the corners of parcels surveyed in accordance with section 29 or 32.</td>
<td>39.2(1)</td>
<td>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 is desirable to re-survey and place monuments at the corners of parcels surveyed in accordance with section 29, 32 or 39.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Section Heading</td>
<td>Current Section #</td>
<td>Current Wording</td>
<td>New Section Heading</td>
<td>New Section #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(2)</td>
<td></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 that purpose at the corners of the land.</td>
<td>39.3(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(3)</td>
<td></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>
<td>39.2(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Any person</td>
<td>39.2(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(4)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>who claims to know the position of any of the survey monuments defining the land to be re-surveyed, or</td>
<td>39.2(4)(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(4)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>who claims to be in possession of information whereby the position of monuments can be established.</td>
<td>39.2(4)(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>may, before the commencement of the re-survey, notify the Minister by registered mail of the information that person's possession regarding the matters referred to in clauses (a) and (b).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(5)</td>
<td></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 that person's possession with regard to it.</td>
<td>39.2(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Director, or a surveyor appointed by the Director, shall</td>
<td>39.2(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/Section Heading</td>
<td>Current Section #</td>
<td>Current Wording</td>
<td>New/Section Heading</td>
<td>New Section #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(6)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>commence the re-survey in accordance with</td>
<td>39.26(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>this Act not less than 2 weeks after the last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>publication of the notice under subsection (3),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(6)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>place monuments to mark the corners of the</td>
<td>39.26(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>re-surveyed land, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39(6)(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>submit a plan and other records respecting</td>
<td>39.26(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the re-survey to the Minister;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of re-survey</td>
<td>40(1)</td>
<td>On receipt of the plan and other records</td>
<td>40(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under section 39(6), the Minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40(1)(a)</td>
<td>shall publish notice of it in the issue of The</td>
<td>40(1)(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alberta Gazette and once each week for 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consecutive weeks in a newspaper that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>circulates in the neighborhood of the land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>re-surveyed, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40(1)(b)</td>
<td>shall specify in the notice a day, not less</td>
<td>40(1)(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>than 2 weeks from the date of the last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>publication of the notice, on which the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and other records will be considered and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parties affected by it may be heard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40(2)</td>
<td>After the hearing under subsection (1), the</td>
<td>40(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minister may either confirm the re-survey or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>direct that any amendments or corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that the Minister considers necessary be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>made, and shall confirm the re-survey as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amended or corrected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40(3)</td>
<td>On confirmation by the Minister of the</td>
<td>40(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>re-survey, the Director shall amend the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>official plan accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40(4)</td>
<td>The monuments established by the re-survey</td>
<td>40(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mark the boundary lines of the land re-surveyed for all purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Section Heading</td>
<td>Current Section #</td>
<td>Current Wording</td>
<td>New Section Heading</td>
<td>New Section #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No review of re-survey</td>
<td>41</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 making the original survey are subsequently found or their positions proved by other evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing of re-survey</td>
<td>42(1)</td>
<td>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></td>
<td>42(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42(2)</td>
<td>On receipt 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></td>
<td>42(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for re-survey</td>
<td>43(1)</td>
<td>All expenses for a re-survey shall be paid to the Minister by the municipality on whose resolution the re-survey was made, on receipt of an invoice from the Minister, which may be varied from time to time during the progress of the re-survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td>43(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45(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>
<td>45(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45(3)</td>
<td>If the municipality pays only a part of the expenses out of general funds, it may order that the remainder be placed on the tax roll as an additional tax against the property affected by the re-survey, in proportion to the assessed value of the property as shown on the last assessment roll and that amount shall be collected in the same manner as taxes on land.</td>
<td></td>
<td>45(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Section Heading</td>
<td>Current Section #</td>
<td>Current wording</td>
<td>New Section Heading</td>
<td>New Section #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-establishment of Part 2 survey monument</td>
<td>44(1)</td>
<td>When a surveyor is required to re-establish the position of a monument placed in the original survey in accordance with section 29 or 32 but cannot be found, the surveyor shall do so from the best available evidence respecting the position of the monument.</td>
<td>Re-establishment of Part 2 survey monument or Part 3 monument in a Part 2 position</td>
<td>44(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(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 the corner’s position in relation to those monuments of the original or subsequent surveys that can be found, in a manner that carries out the evident intention of the original survey as shown in the original field notes and the official plan of record in the Director’s office.</td>
<td>44(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 corner’s position in relation to those monuments of the original or subsequent surveys that can be found, in a manner that carries out the evident intention of the original survey as shown in the original field notes and the official plan of record in the Director’s office or on a plan registered at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(3)</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>44(3)</td>
<td>A surveyor who re-establishes the position of a monument in accordance with subsection (1) or (2), 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(3)a</td>
<td></td>
<td>44(3)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(3)b</td>
<td></td>
<td>44(3)b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Section Heading</td>
<td>Current Section #</td>
<td>Current Wording</td>
<td>New Section Heading</td>
<td>New Section #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(4)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A monument re-established at a position referred to in Section 44(1)(2) or (3) shall fix and govern the position, if a plan of survey, showing such, is registered after enactment date; at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(4)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A monument re-established on a plan of survey registered at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry or prior to enactment date, at a position referred to in Section 44(1)(2) or (3) shall fix and govern that position if the found monument is verified and is shown on a plan of survey registered after enactment date at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(4)(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A monument placed in accordance with Section 44(1)(2) or (3) shall govern the position or if it was placed as a Part 2 monument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If evidence of an original monument is found at a corner referred to in section 29, 32, or 39 after the position has been re-established in accordance with sections 44(1), (2) and (3), then the position of the original monument shall govern and the re-established monument shall no longer have governing status.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing boundaries</td>
<td>45(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>If a survey for a plan that is required to be registered at the Land Titles Office or filed at the Metis Settlements Land Registry, the surveyor shall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45(1)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>make the positions of the boundary lines to be established by placing monuments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45(1)(a)(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td>at every change of direction and the beginning and end of every curve, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Section Heading</td>
<td>Current Section #</td>
<td>Current Wording</td>
<td>New Section Heading</td>
<td>New Section #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(1)(a)(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td>at every intersection of the boundary lines with every surveyed boundary of the parcels affected by the new survey, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(1)(b)</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>For the purposes of subsection (1)(c)(i), all curves shall have a constant radius.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(3)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notwithstanding subsection (1), a surveyor, when surveying a right of way that is to be bounded by parallel lines 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>when surveying a right of way that is to be bounded by parallel lines 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 width shown on the plan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(3)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>when surveying the boundaries of a subdivision, 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(3)(c)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>to at least 2 monuments of known elevation in the geographical positioning system placed within or adjacent to the boundaries of the parcel for that purpose, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(3)(c)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>and shall relate the locations of them to the external boundaries of the parcel within which the space lies, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>45(3)(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>when surveying the boundaries of condominium units other than bare land units as defined in the Condominium Property Act, 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>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 proportional 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-establishment of Lot 3 survey monument</td>
<td>46(1)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>46(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>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 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>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 Act, shall mark the position with a new monument, and.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(3)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>shall prepare and within 90 days after the completion of the survey submit to the Registrar a plan of survey showing the method by which the position was re-established and shall certify that the survey was made in accordance with this Act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46(3)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>shall prepare and within 90 days after the completion of the survey submit to the Land Titles Office or the Metis Settlements Land Registry, a plan of survey showing the method by which the position was re-established and shall certify that the survey was made in accordance with this Act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration or filing of non-monumented survey plan</td>
<td>47(1)</td>
<td>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 filing at the Metis Settlements Land Registry if sufficient survey control markers exist in the vicinity of the survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47(2)</td>
<td>Subject to subsection (4), 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>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>47(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A surveyor who submits for registration a plan pursuant to subsection (1) shall, within one year from its registration or within a longer period of time specified by the Director,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(3)(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(3)(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>file 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(4)</td>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notwithstanding subsection (3), if the surveyor who submitted a plan pursuant to subsection (1) ceases to be registered as an Alberta Land Surveyor, or for any other reason fails to satisfy the requirements of subsection (3), some other surveyor appointed by the Director may carry out the requirements of subsection (3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurvey of all land in municipality</td>
<td>48(1)</td>
<td>The council of a municipality may, on the application of 50% of the registered owners of the land to be affected, 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sections 39 to (6), 40(1), (2) and (4), 41, 42 and 43 apply to a re-survey under this section.</td>
<td></td>
<td>48(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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R.D. (Reid) Egger

M. (Michael) Fretwell
H.J. (Harvey) Goosens
D.E. (David) Gosling
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S.P. (Sirt) Lin

Appendix "F"
Mr. Nelson asked the new members to stand and delivered the following address:

It is my pleasure to congratulate you on your accomplishment and to welcome you as Alberta Land Surveyors. As president, it is my duty to charge you with your obligations as professionals. This year, we welcome twenty-nine new members into the profession. As you look forward to a career that is both rewarding and challenging, we can also look back at the history of land surveying in this province. As you read Judy's book or you look up some of the more extensive biographies of Alberta Land Surveyors, you will see words like professional, dedicated and caring being used. "He never compromised his ethics" is something we often hear about some of the people that we look up to.

As we go through our busy lives we will meet people and run into situations that might try to sidetrack us. From ideals, just being busy does not mean those things go by the wayside. Professionalism is a human trait that we must subconsciously employ to be truly effective. You have chosen the lifestyle of a professional—it is always with you and cannot be left at 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 and have proved that you learned how to learn. You will continue to learn—not just the kind of learning that you get from books, although that is important—but the kind that comes from experience; the kind of learning that comes from realizing you are the one signing the plan and you are the one and no one else is responsible for it.

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 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 fifty, sixty or seventy percent of the time just doesn't cut it. 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 impartially to the public. Essential to this is the public's trust in the surveyor. Never betray that public trust.

Just the year we celebrate our past but we also celebrate our future—and that is you, the new Alberta Land Surveyors. You have a duty to be involved in Association affairs, keep it viable and ensure it carries on successfully in the years ahead. That means participating in Association activities.

Ladies and gentlemen, once again, would you please show your recognition of the hard work that these professionals have demonstrated and help me welcome them, again, into this profession.
Appendix "H"

**50 Year Pin Recipient**

From left to right: Al Nelson, Jim Clark, Katie Clark, Nancy Nelson

E.J. (Jim) Clark, ALS (Hon. Life)

25 year pins have been sent to Alberta Land Surveyors, I.J.P. (Jim) Stuart, W.J. (Bill) Mintz and T.P.K. (Tim) Chan who were unable to attend this year’s AGM.

25 Year Pin Recipients

B.R. (Brian) Wetter, ALS
Presentation of the Professional Recognition Award to D.B. (Dunc) Gillmore, ALS (Hon. Life) 
by Fred Cheng, ALS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Each year, the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association offers three awards designed to honour Alberta Land Surveyors who have brought distinction to the individuals themselves to the surveying profession or to society in general through extraordinary service or achievement.

This year, I have the honour to nominate and present this prestigious professional recognition award to one of our very own. I am here to honour an excellent field surveyor, a past president and an honorary life member of the Association to receive this year's award.

This individual was born in Upper Chelsea, Lunenberg County, Nova Scotia in 1931. He completed his high school education in Bridgewater and went on to receive his land surveying training from the Nova Scotia Land Surveying Institute in Lawrencetown and graduated in 1950. Upon graduation, he travelled to Alberta and began his employment with Phillips, Hamilton Land Surveyors. This company is now known as Hamilton & Olsen Surveys Ltd.

He began his articleship with Mr. Buck Olsen, another honorary life member, and obtained his Alberta Land Surveyors' Association commission in 1956. He then went on to obtain his Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Dominion land surveying commissions.

His employment with Hamilton & Olsen included a variety of experiences. He gained a reputation as an excellent field person and an excellent project manager. He worked on many interesting projects including the trans-mountain pipeline in the early fifties. His other expertise includes the survey of mineral claims in the Northwest Territories, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. In 1960, he left Hamilton & Olsen and took up employment with the federal government in Ottawa where he was responsible for the surveying of several Indian reservations in northern Manitoba.

In 1962, he returned to the private industry in Edmonton where he established his own professional practice which he owns and operates today. In Alberta, he gained a reputation as Mr. Township because of his extensive township survey experience. He has successfully undertaken and completed numerous other official survey projects such as resurveys, settlements and inspections in northern Alberta.

Over the years, he has served the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association in various capacities including the following:
• member of the ALSA Council;
• member of the Registration Committee;
• member of the Education Committee;
• member of the Discipline Committee for two terms;
• member and Chair of the Practice Review Board.

Other committee he served on included ASSMT, LIS, RPR and the Oil & Gas Ad Hoc Committee. Last, but not least, he is a past president of this Association. In addition, he has moderated numerous educational seminars for the Association and has been a master of ceremonies for numerous ALSA events.

He is renowned for his pragmatic approach in handling difficult issues and is notorious for his great sense of humour. Over the years, many of us have come to enjoy his added humour and shared wisdom at our regional meetings and annual general meetings.

Throughout the course of his professional career he has mentored and trained a number of people of which six of them have successfully achieved their Alberta Land Surveyor commissions. They are: Bob Riley, Lyall Pratt, Don Wilson, Andrew Lee, Duncan Gillmore Jr. and myself. I am proud to admit that he has been my role model for the past twenty-odd years.

His opinion on land surveying matters is well respected and sought after by a variety of individuals from the newly commissioned to experienced land surveyors, and from counties and municipalities to different levels of government. He is currently one of the lead authors for a chapter of the ALSA survey law text. At the moment, his writing hand has been suffering from arthritis but I am confident that once he is finished writing that chapter, the end product will be a labour of love.

He is married to Pearl and they have four grown children with families—John, Alex, Duncan Jr. and Marcie Joe. They have ten grandchildren—five boys and five girls. As I understand, all of the children are in the audience today except for Marcie Joe who is a special education teacher and was not able to be here today.

Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in recognizing Mr. Duncan Burhoe Gillmore, better known as Dunc Sr. for his almost fifty years of signal and dedicated service to the Association, the public and the land surveying profession in western Canada.

Mr. Gillmore addressed the luncheon as follows:

I’d like to thank the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for giving me this prestigious award and I would like to say it has been an interesting forty-nine years since I received my commission.

I would like to thank all the Directors of Surveys starting way back with Carl Lester and Wally Youngs down to the present for helping me whenever I had trouble with surveys and sort of bailing me out. I’d like to thank Buck Olsen, who I articulated to and I would also like to thank my wife and family for putting up with a workaholic all these years. I would also like to thank Systematic Practice Review for keeping me on my toes these last years.

Thank you again.
We are blessed in this Association with many bright, thoughtful and hard working people. Every once in a while one of those persons stands out indelibly amongst all others. This year's recipient has a varied and colourful past including having spent a few terms in eastern Canada. It would seem that even that sentence hasn't spoiled or tainted this individual.

With every really good person you like to praise their virtues. We did find one flaw in this individual. He isn't a very good hockey player—Mr. Brian Munday.

Mr. Munday has been with our organization for eight years and his accomplishments are not only numerous, but noticeable from the manner in which the office functions through the daily operations of committees to the skills displayed in getting through an AGM, even with me at a microphone—that is truly magnificent. Brian is virtually invisible, just making things happen almost magically. That is accomplished not through just skill but through careful planning and a really hard work ethic. Should we all have such capabilities, there would be no telling what we could achieve together.

I will not waste a lot more time, other than to read the inscription that says, "in recognition of outstanding contribution to the integrity of the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association and to unselfish assistance of Council and committees."

Mr. Munday addressed the luncheon as follows:

Thank you very much, Al. It was truly unexpected and I can't help but think you made a mistake. It is truly a pleasure for me to work for all the members and the Association. What I try to do is put the same level of effort and care into what I do as what do you every day. Really, this recognition just doesn't go to me but should really go to all the staff because my job is really made a whole lot easier by all the staff that we have. Matt Parrish, who is back in the office, Lyall and Don, Dawn, Michelle, Sharon and Cindy all make my like a lot easier and make it fun to go to work every day.

Thank you very much, Al and thank you to the Association and I look forward to continuing to work for you, the membership.
Mr. Ken Berg was born in Edmonton, graduated from Fort Saskatchewan High School and, in 1963, he graduated from the Land Surveying Technology Program at SAIT. He then articled to Honorary Life Member George Walker from 1963 to 1965. In 1966, Ontario beckoned and he moved by Oshawa, articling there and receiving his commission as an Ontario Land Surveyor in 1970.

Ken returned to Alberta, started as an instructor at NAIT in 1970. His first class only has seven graduates. It included John Van Berkel and Peter Lapainis who went on to receive their ALS commissions. The following year Ken was commissioned as an Alberta Land Surveyor—#354.

Over his thirty-one years at NAIT, he instructed over eight hundred students in various courses. Approximately thirty students went on to receive their ALS commissions while others went on to receive other commissions and degrees. Ken has served under four different NAIT presidents.

Ken was, of course, active in the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association serving on various committees including the Planning, Education, Professional Development and Public Relations Committees, and the Getting It Right redesign team. He served on the Board of Examiners for the ALSA and was chairman of the panel of examiners for ASSMT. He served on the ALSA Council from 1990 to 1992. Today, he is a director with the J.H. Holloway Scholarship Foundation.

Ladies and Gentlemen, please join me in welcoming Honorary Life Member Ken Berg.

Mr. Berg addressed the luncheon as follows:

It is an absolute honour to be presented with this recognition and I thank the Association very much. I thank all the students that went through the program at NAIT and in fact, there are three new ALSs here today that went through the program—Don Hanson, Leanne James and Mike Fretwell.

Again, a great honour, and I thank the Association very much.
Mr. President, honoured guests and fellow colleagues:

It is a great pleasure to stand before this assembly this afternoon. Actually, as I have indicated many times before, it is a great pleasure at my status in life to stand anywhere on any afternoon. But, this afternoon is a special celebration—the provincial centennial—and I’d say it’s an extra special year.

In the late 1990s, the Historical and Biographical Committee was charged with the mandate of producing a book which would capture a history of surveying in Alberta. Early in the Committee's deliberations, an index and the content of the proposed chapters was struck followed by a title for the publication, *The History of Surveying in Alberta*, this was later modified to *Laying Down the Lines*.

In order to produce a book of this calibre, it demanded a fair good bunch of special attention. It was recognized at the early stage that we would need some special help, namely in the area of conducting interviews, researching and gathering archival information in order to publish a book that would be worthy of the Association's name. After much searching, the Committee found that special help in the name of one person, Judy Lamour, who filled the role of project coordinator, consultant, researcher and finally, as author.

This was a major undertaking by Judy as it involved familiarizing the Committee with interviewing techniques, researching historical records and organizing and coordinating the storage of historical artifacts. Judy's research ability was exercised to the fullest, sometimes going over and beyond what was expected of her. The guidance and direction provided to the Committee during the compilation, the writing and printing of the book is immeasurable. Without a doubt, Judy Lamour has more first hand information and knowledge of the Association's beginnings and its members from grass roots to the present.

On behalf of the Association, I say thank you for your dedication and support in making *Laying Down the Lines* a book of reality which we are proud of.

Ms. Lamour addressed the luncheon as follows:

Thank you very much, Bob. Needless to say, I am completely taken aback and very surprised. I would just like to say how much I have enjoyed working for your Association. It has truly been a wonderful experience. I am deeply honoured by this presentation and simply delighted.

Thank you all very much.
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