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# Past Presidents of the Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>W. Pearce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>L.C. Charlesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>L.C. Charlesworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>R.W. Cautley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>A.C. Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>J.L. Cote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>H.H. Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>A.S. Weekes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>G.W. McLeod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>R.H. Knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>A.P.C. Belyea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>C.M. Hoar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>J.L. Doupe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>B.J. Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>O. Inkster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>C.M. Hoar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>R.H. Cautley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>E.D. Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>P.N. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>T.W. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>D.T. Townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>N.H. Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>C.B. Atkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>H.S. Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>A. Cormack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>W.E. Zinkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>W. Humphreys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>J.W. Doze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>R.M. Hardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>G.Z. Pinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>C.H. Snell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>J.H. Holloway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>R. McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>G.C. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>G.C. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>R. McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>C.W. Lester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>W.D. Usher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>D.K.F. Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>C.H. Weir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>W.A. Wolley-Dod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>L.O. Olsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>C.W. Youngs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>E.J. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>G.C. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>A.J. Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>G. Oslund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>W.E. Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>T.E. Rippon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>T.C. Swanby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>D.C. Holmberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>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. Loepky</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. Impy</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. Dabbys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>S.J. Longson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>A. Hittel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>D.R. Jaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>L.M. Pals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>G.K. Allred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>D.R. McWilliam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>J.G. Halliday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>A.W. Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>S.C. Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>D.H. VandenBrink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>R.M. Wallace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Image of R.M. Wallace, ALS President 2007-2008]
# Attendance at the 99th Annual Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.A. Pinkerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.M. Plante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B. Pollard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. Pominville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Porylo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.T. Powley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D. Prevost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Pyc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Quinlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.R. Rachynski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Radovanovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.E. Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.B. Rodney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.S. Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Sutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.J. Rasmussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.W. Roop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.D. Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C. Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.J. Rutherford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.A. Schirrmacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.W.M. Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Selander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.R. Jaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.T. Scovill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED MEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLED PUPILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.J. Amantea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.L. Baete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.J. Barvir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C. Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.C. Clapperton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. Corcoran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. Deis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. DeNeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Deschamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.W. Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.J. Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Gerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Boudreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.B. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFILIATE MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATE MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT MEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Life Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articled Pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer and Staff of the Association 2008-2009

PRESIDENT
R.O. Hall, Calgary

VICE PRESIDENT
D.R. George, Edmonton

PAST PRESIDENT
R.M. Wallace, Calgary

SECRETARY TREASURER & REGISTRAR
D.R. McWilliam, Calgary (2007-2010)

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL
J. Haggerty, Grande Prairie (2008-2010)
C.R. Petersen, Medicine Hat (2008-2010)
J.I. Maidment, Calgary (2008-2010)
R. Radovanovic, Stony Plain (2007-2009)
B.D. Ross, Calgary (2007-2009)

PUBLIC MEMBERS
R. Barnes, Medicine Hat (Council)
R. Palovcik, Sherwood Park (Practice Review Board)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
B.E. Munday

OFFICE STAFF
S.D. Armstrong ...................................... Executive Assistant
K. Barrett .............................................. Executive Assistant
T. Lacerte .............................................. Administrative Assistant
J.P. Ironstone ... Assistant to the Director of Practice Review
D.A. Phelan ............................ Information Services Administrator
A. Pluim ................................................... Technologist
M. Woywitka ........................................... Administrative Assistant
## 2008-2009 Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STANDARDS COMMITTEES</strong></th>
<th><strong>Chairman</strong></th>
<th><strong>Council Liaison</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline Committee</strong></td>
<td>R.M. Wallace</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice Review Board</strong></td>
<td>P.C. Stoliker</td>
<td>C.R. Petersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registration Committee</strong></td>
<td>D.M. Thomas</td>
<td>B.W. Gudim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary Panel</strong></td>
<td>J.E. Rasmuson</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical &amp; Biographical Committee</strong></td>
<td>R.H. Beaumont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nominating Committee</strong></td>
<td>R.M. Wallace</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development Committee</strong></td>
<td>M.D. Robinson</td>
<td>J.I. Maidment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Relations Committee</strong></td>
<td>B.M. Drake</td>
<td>B.D. Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety Committee</strong></td>
<td>B.G. Fleece</td>
<td>B.D. Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards Committee</strong></td>
<td>D. Gillis</td>
<td>J. Haggerty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee</strong></td>
<td>R.O. Hall</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OTHER COMMITTEES/GROUPS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ALSA/DOS/LTO Metis Settlements Liaison</strong></th>
<th>Members: (M. Bichai, R.O. Hall, D.R. George, D. Gillis, P.M. Michaud, T. Wywal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Convention &amp; Social</strong></td>
<td>B.E. Munday R.O. Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Legislation Ad Hoc</strong></td>
<td>A. W. Roop J.I Maidment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oil and Gas Ad Hoc</strong></td>
<td>D.A. Jamieson B.D. Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Real Property Report Ad Hoc</strong></td>
<td>R.M. Wallace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXTERNAL COMMITTEES</strong></th>
<th><strong>ASSMT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Liaison</strong>: R. Radovanovic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CAPP Geomatics and CAPP Resource Access</strong></td>
<td>Liaisons: S.C. Green, J.D. Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors (CBEPS)</strong></td>
<td>Members: L.M. Pals, B.W. Gudim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canadian Council of Land Surveyors (CCLS)  
Director: D.R. McWilliam  
Geomatics Engineering Liaison Committee (GELC)  
Members: R. Radovanovic, V.G. Hut  
TILMA (Trade, Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement)  
Members: B.A. Beairsto, L.M. Pals, R.W.M. Scott

Jeff Blatz, ALS  
Chairman, Future of the Association Ad Hoc Committee  
2007-2008

Stephen Green, ALS  
Liaison, CAPP Geomatics and  
CAPP Resource Access  
2007-2008

Al Jamieson, ALS  
Chairman, Oil & Gas  
Ad Hoc Committee  
2007-2008

Courtney Tripp, ALS  
Chairman, Professional Development Committee  
2007-2008

Jerry Rasmuson, ALS  
Chairman, Boundary Panel  
2007-2008

Rob Scott, ALS  
Chairman, Registration Committee  
2007-2008

Courtney Tripp, ALS  
Chairman, Professional Development Committee  
2007-2008

Rob Pinkerton, ALS  
Chairman, Standards Committee  
2007-2008
President Bob Wallace called the 99th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association at Chateau Lake Louise to order at 8:30 a.m. by asking the assembly to rise for the national anthem. He announced that the meeting will follow Robert’s Rules of Order and that Council Public Member Russ Barnes will act as parliamentarian until Ken Allred arrives. The assembly was also advised of the voting privileges of the different categories of membership.

Mr. Wallace introduced the Council members for 2007-2008 and indicated that the Association was fortunate to have a strong group of Alberta Land Surveyors elected to represent the profession. He added that Council has dealt with some tough issues over the past year. Mr. Wallace also introduced Practice Review Board Public Member Rudy Palovcik.

Greetings from the Fairmont Chateau Lake Louise were extended by General Manager David Bayne.

The following greeting was extended by Ms. Lyn Johnson of Professions and Occupations which is the department within Alberta Employment Immigration & Industry that is responsible for the Land Surveyors Act. It was noted that a representative from Professions & Occupations has attended every one of the Association’s annual general meetings in recent years.

Thank you for inviting me to attend the 99th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. It is always a highlight of my year to be able to attend.

It is my pleasure to bring greetings on behalf of Employment and Immigration. I would like to take a moment to tell you about the priorities of our ministry.

It comes as no surprise to many of you that it is tough to fill job vacancies. There is a high demand in many professions and I am sure that land surveyors are also feeling this challenge. As a result, the ministry priorities include increas-
ing the total of off-reserve labour force of Alberta First Nations, Metis and Inuit, increasing the number of international immigrants and temporary foreign workers and doubling the number of workers entering the provincial nominee program and, as well, helping newcomers to Alberta integrate and settle into the community by increasing the support services provided to them.

In addition to these priorities, Alberta Employment and Immigration is responsible for non-health legislation in this province. This means we work closely with the self-regulating organizations such as yours through our Professions and Occupations branch. From personal experience, I can say with confidence that your relationship with our branch is positive and productive. Much of the credit is due to the able representation provided by your Executive and specifically by Brian Munday. Your Association is regularly involved in consultations with government and I’m told that your input and work is always insightful and appreciated. You are helping to strengthen professional legislation to ensure that your profession and others provide safe, ethical and competent services to Albertans.

I understand that your Association has recently finalized an agreement with the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors to ensure compliance with the Trade, Investment and Labor Mobility Agreement—TILMA, as we like to call it. Implementing TILMA is a big part of this government’s spring session agenda. It introduced Bill 1 addressing this agreement in the Alberta legislature. TILMA is important because it takes down the barriers that hinder economic success between British Columbia and Alberta. In a nutshell, the agreement simplifies, diversifies and strengthens the way Alberta does business with British Columbia. Employment and Immigration recognizes that the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association undertook what could have been a very complicated situation and worked independently to develop the agreement a year in advance of the 2009 compliance date. Again, much of the credit is due to the able direction and representation by your Executive and Brian Munday.

I understand that a second historical event is occurring this weekend which is the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Alberta Society of Surveying and Mapping Technologies. This is yet another example of the progressive attitude and accomplishments of your association.

My colleagues in Professions & Occupations and I look forward to continuing our work with you for many years to come.
The assembly was asked to observe a moment of silence in respect for the following six Alberta Land Surveyors who passed away since the last annual general meeting:

- W.E. (Skinny) Bright (ALS 235) July 4, 2007
- P.J. (Pete) Timoschuk (ALS 217) August 20, 2007
- A. (Sandy) MacTaggart (ALS 481) February 29, 2008

Guests and visiting delegates were introduced.

Marie-Christine Robidoux, President
Association of Canada Lands Surveyors

Allan Chafe, President
Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors

Russell MacKinnon, President
Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors

Glenn Goss, President
Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors

Ken Campbell, President
Association of Ontario Land Surveyors

Wilson Phillips, President
Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors

Dale Rosnes, President
Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association

Neil Bennett, President; Chuck Salmon, Registrar;
Joe Johnson, Past President
Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors

Craig Brown, President
Montana Association of Registered Land Surveyors

Ben Petersen, President
Land Surveyors Association of Washington

John Russell, President
Idaho Society of Professional Land Surveyors

Sel Sanderson, President;
Sarah Cornett, Executive Director
Canadian Council of Land Surveyors

Clint Johnson, President
Alberta Society of Surveying & Mapping Technologies

President Wallace introduced honorary life, retired, associate and new members registered to attend the annual general meeting.
Present Wallace asked that the principals, or some representative from their firm, come forward to introduce articled students or affiliate members registered to attend this year’s annual general meeting.

The assembly learned that Dr. Naser El-Sheimy, the head of the Department of Geomatics Engineering at the University of Calgary will be attending the meeting and, as well, Dr. Mike Barry may also be in attendance. Dwayne Westacott, ALS, an instructor at NAIT was also introduced.

President Wallace advised that, a few years ago, the Association established a student member category with great success. He added that five geomatics students, or recently graduated students, are registered for the annual general meeting.

Mr. Wallace went on to introduce the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association staff to the membership.

He also indicated that the Association’s solicitor David Jardine and Public Relations Consultant Brian Stecyk of Rose Country Advertising & Public Relations will be in attendance.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Hagen, seconded by Mr. Woolgar, that the 2007 Report of Proceedings be adopted.*

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Wallace delivered the following address to the assembly:

> It has been an honour to represent the ALSA as your president this year. My travels took me across this great country of ours. I met a lot of people and cultivated a lot of new friendships. I learned a lot and, after a year, I feel well versed in many of the issues confronting the ALSA and those affecting our Canadian and American counterparts.

> Your Council had to deal with some very difficult scenarios and make some tough decisions this year. Our Council meetings were often long and hard on the head, but everyone on Council conducted themselves with the utmost professionalism and dedicated a lot of time and energy into keeping our Association on the rails.

> As we move on, the next Council is going to have to grapple with our funding problems, the CCLS National Surveyor’s Initiative, Director of Surveys issues and SPR, just to name a few.
The National Surveyors Initiative has been a CCLS committee that is looking at the formation of a national surveyors’ body that will truly look after the interests of all the fragmented associations across the country. It could quite possibly represent surveyors on a national level and provide continuing education and career awareness. Registration is another task that could, in time, be administrated by a national body. We are already part way there with most of the country soon to be members of CBEPS. This would eliminate the duplication of effort which exists in each province.

But—your Council wants Alberta to play an integral role in the formation of this national surveyors’ association. Since we are going to relinquish some autonomy in areas that we feel strongly about, we will only agree if it is in the best interest of Alberta. There is always give and take in the process of negotiation. The CCLS committee has done exceptional work to date but from here on, we have suggested that a member from each council participate in the CCLS committee. As the concepts evolve from the committee, they can be ratified by each provincial council.

Your Council has allocated time at each meeting to receive the Director of Surveys’ report and consider issues of mutual concern. The Director has been concerned about adherence to Section 47 regulations, the disposition of public lands and their registration at Land Titles. Council, on the other hand, has been concerned about the boundary resolution process and Section 9 surveys. We have been working with the provincial government to allocate funding for the boundary resolution process which could be administrated by the ALSA.

SPR is in a conundrum right now. We have not been able to hire a director and our acting director will be finishing his contract next week which leaves us with one term left with John Ironstone, assistant to the director. We need a full slate of personnel. Council recognizes that we have to be competitive, so we are prepared to offer an industry competitive salary plus our ALSA benefits package. We are flexible as to residence location. With today’s technology, a lot of administration can be done remotely. Another concern about the job is its perceived negative impression. It is a challenging and respected position. If you are at all interested, talk to Don George or John Ironstone and I am quite sure that either of them will discuss this position with you.

At this time, I would like to thank a few people that have assisted me this year. Where would we be without Brian Munday? He tremendously organized and has a genuine passion for our Association. He always sees the big picture.
and has nudged me when I’ve gone sideways, which happens now and again.

Thanks to the ALSA staff who do a lot of the bull work in the administration of our Association which allows us to spend our energy in those areas that will improve our Association. As I travel around the country, I see some of the associations that don’t have the staff we have and most of the people on Council and the presidents have to do a lot of work themselves that our staff does.

I’d like to thank Dick VandenBrink, Ron Hall and Dave McWilliam who have provided exceptional guidance on the difficult things we had to deal with over the last year. Also, kudos to all Council members who have devoted their time to run your Association.

Thanks to all the committee chairs and volunteers whose time and passion have produced some incredible results. To all of you, members, associate members and articled students and affiliate members, please volunteer. This Association is where it is because of committee work. Your success in your job as an Alberta Land Surveyor can be attributed to the proactive nature and hard work of previous volunteers. Don’t rely on other people—volunteer yourself. There are sign up sheets at the back or talk to any of the Council or committee members to get an idea of what may interest you.

Thanks to my partner at work, Arlin Amundrud, who has borne the burden of my absence.

Finally, I have to thank my family. Being president puts a big strain on the family. My girls have had to but up with an intermittent father at times. My wife is the one who has seen me through this whole process. Each trip she has had to hire a sitter and organize the family in our absence. She has also represented your Association and province with class. So I express my sincerest appreciation to my wife Kathy.

Thank you.

President Wallace asked that all the 2007-2008 Committee chairs stand and be recognized. He also recognized those members who serve on external groups.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Pals, seconded by Mr. Amundrud, that the Committee reports be received as circulated.*

*Motion Carried*

Mr. Wallace announced that Secretary Treasurer and Registrar, David McWilliam was unable to attend the meeting. He asked that the 2006-2007 Secretary Treasurer, Larry Pals present the financial statement for 2006-2007.
President Wallace indicated that he would like the assembly to spend some time discussing the 2008-2009 budget. He read notes to the assembly prepared by Secretary Treasurer and Registrar Dave McWilliam as follows:

When I became Secretary Treasurer one year ago, I and the newly elected Council, were faced, unknowingly, with what would prove to be a very difficult fiscal situation. By the time I got my “feet wet” in my new position, it was already clear that our working budget for 2007-2008 was a very optimistic one indeed.

The 2007-2008 budget anticipated having $253,000 in increased revenues over the previous year, and budgeted for an increase in expenses of almost $487,000. Well, one of those figures was closer to the truth than the other.

Because of the timing of our Council meetings, January 31, 2008 was the last budget report that Council was able to review before the AGM. January 31 is nine months into our year and our total revenues are down $200,000 from the same time last year, and down $390,000 from what this year’s budget projected as of January 31, 2008. Our expenses are proportionally lower also, but as of January 31, 2008 we forecasted a deficit of $150,000 at the end of the year.

Next year our revenues will be even lower if the indicators are correct, we must do something in reaction to this shortfall.

Since the last Council meeting, due in part to some belt tightening and some other unforeseen circumstances, indications tell us that we may now be almost at a breakeven situation. Time will tell when the final numbers are all in.

Since our January Council meeting, we have been working on the new budget for 2008-2009. What will our revenues be for the upcoming year? What are some of the influences affecting us while we prepare our next budget?

- A recent downturn in the economy which equates to decreased revenues from iron post and marker post sales, will likely require us to subsidize the SPR program in the future, that is, if we can’t make it more economical, while still keeping its effectiveness. We are currently projecting that we will be at a “break-even” point when comparing SPR cost to iron post sales for this coming year. This year is the first year that we have included indirect expenses into SPR. Mr. Wallace commented that the prevailing thought has been that the iron post sales subsidize the administration of the Association. That is the
way the financial statements have appeared in the past but rent and other expenses have not been allocated to SPR. All of you know in the operation of your firms, that each department gets allocated its fair share of these types of expenses. This has been done now and it appears that SPR breaks even with the amount of revenue that is brought in through iron post sales, contrary to the way we have thought in the past.

• Indirect expenses include a pro-rated amount for rent, support staff salaries and benefits, office expenses, and so on, based on the SPR operation’s costs compared to the whole office’s costs.

• Our outdated membership fees have not kept up with inflation nor have they kept pace with the cost of providing the services that our membership enjoys. We need to bring them up to a realistic level, or we need to lower the services that we provide.

• Our membership fees are currently $500 lower than the average charged by our sister organizations across Canada.

• Our regional meetings are running in a deficit situation—especially in Calgary. We are forced into raising registration costs and/or look at changing the venue to a more reasonably priced one. Calgary is the worst of the group, but all regional meetings are being subsidized from general revenues.

• The huge upswing in Alberta’s economy in the last few years has driven wages up at a rate much higher than the cost of living index, forcing us to revise the salaries we pay to our employees, and to re-evaluate the salaries we offer to attract new employees.

• Reduced returns on our investments—profit seen in the market place have been in a sector where our conservative investment policies do not allow us to invest. Granted we have not lost from the more recent volatility either. Is capital preservation all we want?

As the year progressed, Council was kept aware of the impending deficit, and the consensus was that we should react, but not over-react. A request was sent to all non-statutory committees asking them to live within 80% of their existing budget. We tried to do our best while still living up to our statutory obligations and Council’s prior commitments. Council agreed to tap the Financial Stabilization Fund for whatever shortfall was encountered at the end of the 2007-2008 year.

The Financial Stabilization Fund is our Heritage Fund for rainy days. A fund created to “cushion the blow” of a situa-
tion just like this—cushion us while we work to amend our fiscal management of our resources.

That being said, Council now has a better idea of what we may be facing in the future. We believe we will see iron post/marker post revenues equal to those seen in 2001-2002. Total revenues that could be $500,000 less that we had in 2006-2007, and $700,000 less than was budgeted for in the 2007-2008 year. These numbers are somewhat misleading since operating expenses will also be down, but it paints an accurate picture for the reduction of our projected revenues.

That, coupled with our inability to raise membership fees any higher than what our bylaws allow, means that Council is still in a very tight situation for this upcoming year. Our inability to raise revenues from existing sources means one of two things—cut services or tap the Financial Stabilization Fund to top up an otherwise deficit budget. Council has decided to cut some services where we believe we can readily do so, and show you the size of the resulting projected deficit situation for 2008-2009.

In a few moments, we will be introducing a bylaw amendment to allow increases to our membership fees; increases that will bring us up to a more realistic level. However, this will not help us this year, as our annual fees are set in March and payable at the end of April within the existing bylaw limitations. Even with the current increase in fees that was billed to you in March, assuming that we maintain the proposed committee costs, and SPR costs shown in the budget that is before you, we will be running a $261,564 deficit.

Council has decided that it needs to react now and will be considering some cost saving measures. We have already considered things like tele-conferencing. As a test case, the new GPS Guidelines Working Group will be a virtual committee. We need to become more innovative and hopefully we can save some money in the process.

Council is in the process of negotiating a new deal with the provincial government—a deal that would see an increase of the surcharge for iron posts and marker posts to account for inflation from 1988 to present day. The government replied that they would like to see us oversee monitoring Section 47 plans for compliance, and to establish a field note and dormant plan repository. At this point, we are looking into the additional costs that these responsibilities may incur, and negotiations are proceeding.

If I can remind you of our discussion last year, the membership does not “approve” the budget for the upcoming year; Council is charged with that task, and the budget before you has been approved by Council. However, I am
putting the budget for 2008-2009 on the floor for discussion now, and Council will be influenced by your input today, and even though the budget has been approved, it can be amended based on what we hear today.

Do you want to run a deficit budget? Do you want to drastically reduce the services offered to the membership? We need to hear from you today!

To a question posed by Mr. Hagen, Mr. Munday advised that the iron post sales for the 2007-2008 year are down from what was budgeted but have settled into a more normal level without the extreme highs and lows. The projected deficit for the $150,000 may not occur because posts sales in February 2008 were higher. Traditionally, post sales in March are lower and pick up again in April.

Mr. Hagen asked whether Council has considered revamping and streamlining the SPR process with the addition of a continuing education component which could be funded by charging for courses.

Mr. Wallace advised that the situation with the Systematic Practice Review Program will be discussed later on in the meeting.

Mr. Pals indicated that a financial committee, a few years ago, suggested that a “rainy day fund” be set up. He asked whether it is time now to draw from that Financial Stabilization Fund.

President Wallace responded that the Association will draw from the Financial Stabilization Fund to equalize the deficit. What the Association is faced with, however, is the question of whether this is an average year or a bad year and how should the Association forecast the future. If it is an average year, the Association will need to reduce costs by cutting services and/or increase fees.

It was stated that the fact that members are not involved in setting up meetings, including the annual general meeting, and doing minutes allows the members to make better use of their time in actually doing committee work.

President Wallace stated that if the Association loses any staff members, members will be taking minutes and committees will have to be reduced.
Mr. Amundrud felt that the Association is experiencing an average year and needs to take action in reducing some costs and increasing revenues.

Mr. Maltais did not see the current situation as an emergency and felt that the Association should use its funds to balance the budget.

Mr. Pals indicated that it is very difficult to project post sales because it depends on so many variables. He added that when he was Secretary Treasurer, the actuals were always over budget with the amount of revenue brought in. Mr. Pals advised that this year, the projections have gone the other way. The Financial Stabilization Fund was set up to deal with exactly this kind of situation.

Mr. Wallace commented that, from what he heard, members seem to like the level of service offered by the Association. He further commented that it appears that the Association needs to look at other ways of generating revenue, one of which is to raise membership fees.

Mr. Stoliker asked for a summary of fee increases over the last few years.

Mr. Munday advised that when he first began his employment with the Association in the late 1990s, the fees were $500 per member and increased over the years to $700 for the 2008-2009 year. He went on to say that the Convention Levy has remained stable at $100 for the last seven years, the CCLS Levy has gone up slightly, the U of C Levy no longer exists, and the CBEPS Levy is new this year. With all the levies, the cost per member is approximately $900.

Mr. Stoliker felt that amount was “peanuts” for the level of service that is received by the members. He added that he felt the membership fees should be raised and was in favour of using money from the Financial Stabilization Fund to cover some of the deficit but not all.

Mr. Fretwell asked if Council had an idea of the effect the increase in fees would have on the 2009-2010 budget.

President Wallace suggested that this information will be available during discussion on Recommendation #1.
Mr. Hudema asked the members for comments on a sticker levy on plan registration as a possible revenue generator as is done in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Hagen indicated that he would be against a sticker levy as it is not fair to all groups. He felt that increasing membership fees was a better alternative.

A comment was made that the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors has an electronic checklist that helps with risk management and practice review.

Mr. Haggerty felt that, in the interest of economic stability for the ALSA, the sticker idea was a good one.

President Wallace introduced the exhibitors participating in the 99th Annual General Meeting. He indicated that, not only are they exhibitors, but they are also golf tournament and AGM sponsors. One representative from each exhibitor firm addressed the assembly.

It was announced that the early bird prize winner for the complementary evening stay at the Fairmont Chateau Lake Louise was Kevin Grover, ALS.

President Wallace introduced Mr. Peter Sullivan, Surveyor General of Canada.

The Director of Surveys, Mike Michaud, was introduced to the assembly and addressed the assembly as to the activities of the Surveys & Technical Services Section for the past year as follows:

The Section is made up of the Land Surveys Unit which has a staff of nine. There are two ALS positions vacant at the present time. There is also a Control Unit which has a staff of two as well as Technical Services with a staff of eighteen and a small staff of four that create the Section’s systems.

Highlights from the Land Surveys Unit are:
- completed five official surveys, additional three in progress;
- initiated one Section 34 re-survey (ATS Land Key);
- four formal investigations:
  — Smoky Lake County — under appeal;
  — Red Deer County — surveyor solution pending;
  — Municipal District Bonnyville — finalizing initial review;
  — Municipal District of Foothills — review nearing completion.
• Part 2/Part 3 monuments – proposed amendments to Surveys Act with Alberta Law Reform Institute;
• Alberta/British Columbia Boundary Commission—bi-annual meetings:
  —recognition of Sunshine/Crowsnest Pass surveys;
  —developing policies and procedures for boundary surveys.
• Scanning Project—plans and working township correspondence files;
• completed 55 medium size projects (surveyors, landowners, and so on);

Highlights from the Geodetic Control Unit include:
• nine Survey Control projects completed;
• four City of Calgary HPN expansion;
• four City of Edmonton vertical maintenance;
• one GPS base station network around Calgary;
• support for integration of several GPS base stations in southern and north central Alberta;
• Town of Beaumont—development of an HPN;
• establishment of GPS base station network in the Calgary region (Calgary x 2, Airdrie, Strathmore, Okotoks, and Cochrane);
• developing action plan for vertical readjustment of the province ASC network (2010 implementation);
• developing Oracle Web Forms for MASCOT Survey System for May 2008.

Highlights from Technical Services include:
• DIDs mapping ahead of schedule - AltaLIS.com;
• full electronic submissions;
  —EZE, VCE, REA, SML - May 2007
• statutory iron post, marker post;
  —DRS - April 2007
  —SML, REC, MLL - October 2007
• LiDAR pilot projects (total of 12);
• SME sketch plan requirements updated October 2007;
• PNT, CNT, ISP, CNC, HRS, new sketch plan requirements added November 2007;
• RDS content requirements updated November 2007;
• processing applications and amendments (- 30%);
• $300K to survey department disposition reservations (DRS).

Highlights from the Electronic Support Unit include:
• implemented ‘plan maintenance’—October 2007;
• implemented ‘fee management’—March 2008;
• developing standards for ESRI shape file submissions for GOA reservation plans;
developing sub-systems to distribute all dispositions plans on SPIN 2 (implement 2010);
Land Standing Automated System; (LSAS) replacement project initiated (implement 2011).
Future developments include:
• Special Areas—DIDs mapping discussions ongoing;
• Metis Settlements—Cadastral and DIDs mapping discussions initiated;
• monumentation standards for public land dispositions - your input requested.

David Hagen asked whether it was possible that a monument be developed for dispositions only. This monument could be used as a revenue source for the Association. As well, the obligation of filing a plan at Land Titles would not need to occur as it would be a non-statutory monument specific to dispositions.

Mr. Michaud responded by indicating that the fundamental question that needs to be answered is whether these types of surveys are done under the Surveys Act or not. That in turn, would point towards what type of monumentation could be used.

Mike Fretwell referred to the calibration baseline and advised that there is construction in the immediate area and a sign has been placed directly on line. He asked whether there are any plans to do anything about the calibration baseline in the near future.

Mr. Michaud responded that discussions took place with respect to the Calgary baseline. During the last review, it was concluded that the baseline is still usable for cadastral surveying but is not recommended for use for high precision surveys. It is acknowledged that construction will interfere with the calibration in time. Mr. Michaud went on to say that the cost to replace the baseline is in the area of $80,000 and there is some debate as to whether it is a good use of funds. He added that the issue can be looked at again if things change faster than anticipated.

President Wallace announced that, unfortunately, Mona Bichai, who took over from Tim Grusie at Alberta Land Titles is not able to be here with us this year. He indicated that he had the opportunity to meet her at a liaison meeting held earlier this month and we look forward to her input. Some of the discussions with Ms. Bichai were very encouraging and
the ALSA hopes to continue that dialogue and enhance its relationship with the Land Titles Office on areas of mutual concern.

It was MOVED by Mr. Hudema, seconded by David Mar-quadrt, that Section 52(1) of the Association Bylaws be amended as follows:

PART 8
FEES, DUES & LEVIES
52 (1) The following fees, dues and levies shall be paid to the Association:
(a) on application for registration as an Alberta Land Surveyor, surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership; .........................$50.00  $500.00
(b) for registration with the Association as an Alberta Land Surveyor, surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership; ......................$200.00  $200.00
(c) for an Alberta Land Surveyor, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council; .........................$700.00  $1,200.00
(d) for retired membership, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council; .........................$100.00  $200.00
(e) for associate membership, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council; .........................$200.00  $200.00
(f) for affiliate membership, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council; .........................$100.00  $200.00
(g) for a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council .........................$500.00  $1,200.00
(h) for the filing of articles of service or a lesser sum as may be fixed by Council until the articles are terminated, .......$50.00  $100.00
(i) for the filing of each transfer of articles of service ...............$50.00  $100.00

Recommendation #1
(see Appendix E for Rationale Document)

Terry Hudema, ALS
(j) for late payment of any fees, dues or levies .......... $200.00 $200.00
(k) for reinstatement, in addition to other fees, dues and levies payable, .................. $500.00 $500.00
(l) for pupils, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by Council .......... $100.00 $200.00
(m) for branch offices, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by Council......................... $1,000.00

(2) Each Alberta Land Surveyor shall pay to the Association, in addition to his annual fee for active membership, an annual levy of $500 or such lesser amount, if any, as may be fixed for any year by the Council.

(3) Not later than March 15th in each year, the Association shall mail notices to all members, stating the amounts of the membership fees and the levy payable for the next year.

(4) The annual membership fees and annual levies become due on April 1 in each year and are payable on or before April 30.

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

President Wallace indicated that all the proposed increases in fees are maximum amounts.

Concern was expressed that increasing retired membership fees may result in a loss of retired members.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Hagen, seconded by Mr. George, that the retired membership fee be left at $100 per year:

Amendment Carried

Mr. Hagen suggested that that the corporation and/or partnership fee be based on the number of ALSs employed rather than just a flat rate.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Stephens, seconded by Mr. Halliday, that section (m) be deleted.

Amendment Defeated
Mr. Stephens commented that this fee is unfair as there are firms whose branch offices become part of small communities and provide a local public service. He did not feel there was a need to tax the larger firms.

Mr. Marquardt disagreed with the amendment indicating that, in his firm, each of the branch offices undergoes a review under the SPR program. He felt this fee would assist in funding the SPR initiative.

Mr. Hagen commented that branch offices are separate entities which do use resources of the Association.

Dr. Radovanovic pointed out that the proposed branch office fee would increase revenues for the ALSA by $37,000 which is a substantial sum.

Mr. Lachance supported the amendment. He felt that the larger firms are being taxed in many of the fee categories.

In response to a question on what the rationale was for the added fee, Mr. Wallace indicated that Council felt that a branch office receives SPR support from the ALSA and should be treated the same as a head office.

Mr. Holmlund commented that it was his understanding that the SPR program was funded by post sales, not by fees. He also felt that the $1,000 fee per branch office was unreasonable.

President Wallace indicated that, according to the research done by Council, SPR being totally funded by post sales is a misconception.

Mr. Halliday suggested that the post sales should be funding the SPR program. He added that he realized that the program is in a situation of flux at the present time and if the post sales do not fund the program, the ALSA needs to look at a different way of providing the service. Mr. Halliday did not feel that the proposed fee was warranted.

Mr. Oh felt that the Financial Stabilization Fund should be used to offset any budgetary shortfalls, rather than adding a new fee.

Mr. Jaques spoke against the amendment as he felt that the proposed fee is an attempt have all members aid in the solving of the ALSA’s financial situation.
AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Pals, seconded by Mr. Doyle, that the fee in Section (m) be reduced from $1,000 to $300.

AMENDMENT MOVED by Mr. Holmlund, seconded by Mr. Stephens, that $300 be changed to $1.

Amendment Defeated

Main Amendment Defeated

Mr. Hagen spoke against the amendment and commented that the $1,000 was the maximum fee that the Association could institute. He added that Council, in its discretion, could charge any fee up to that amount.

Mr. Longo expressed concern about Section (g) indicating that firms vary in size from one land surveyor up to more than thirty. He felt that charging $1,200 per firm was unfair for the small one-person operation and some of them may not be able to meet the fee obligation. Mr. Longo felt that the fee should be left at $500 for a one-person firm and that a sliding fee scale be developed for those firms that have more than one land surveyor.

Mr. Winton commented that larger firms put in more posts which amounts to increased revenue for the ALSA.

Mr. Lachance also suggested that the Financial Stabilization Fund be used to address any financial shortfall. The fees then could be increased in a more reasonable fashion.

President Wallace did not feel that Council would charge the maximum fees right away but over a period of time.

Dr. Radovanovic spoke in favour of the motion. He commented that the SPR program is supposed to be funded by the sale of posts and the posts are paid for by the people who are actually having the surveys done. Dr. Radovanovic went on to say that it is an unreliable source of income which is difficult to predict. The ALSA is currently in a deficit situation and has the choice of tapping into its reserves or it can make some fundamental changes as to how income will be generated. He suggested that that he believed that income should be generated by increased membership fees. Dr. Radovanovic indicated that Council went through much effort to try to address the situation. He felt that the increase of the fees was reasonable considering all the other expenses involved in running a firm. He went on to say that the branch
offices do not operate as separate offices but they are separate income-generating units.

Mr. Holmlund indicated that, over time, post sales have been a fairly reliable source of revenue for the ALSA to enable it to have the reserve funds that it does. He did not understand Council’s rationale in changing how the ALSA is funded because of an off year in post sales. Mr. Holmlund did not feel there has been a trend in decreased revenues and did not see it as being a big issue. He suggested that the fees be left as is and see what happens in the future. Mr. Holmlund commented that when the ALSA is in financial trouble so are its members.

**MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED**

52 (1) The following fees, dues and levies shall be paid to the Association:

(a) on application for registration as an Alberta Land Surveyor, surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership; ..................$50.00 $500.00

(b) for registration with the Association as an Alberta Land Surveyor, surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership; ..................$200.00 $200.00

(c) for an Alberta Land Surveyor, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council; ..................$700.00 $1,200.00

(d) for retired membership, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council; ..................$100.00 $100.00

(e) for associate membership, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council; ..................$200.00 $200.00

(f) for affiliate membership, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council; ..................$100.00 $200.00

(g) for a surveyor’s corporation or surveyor’s partnership, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by the Council ..................$500.00 $1,200.00
(h) for the filing of articles of service or a lesser sum as may be fixed by Council until the articles are terminated .............. $50.00 $100.00
(i) for the filing of each transfer of articles of service ............... $50.00 $100.00
(j) for late payment of any fees, dues or levies .............. $200.00 $200.00
(k) for reinstatement, in addition to other fees, dues and levies payable, ...................... $500.00 $500.00
(l) for pupils, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by Council .............. $100.00 $200.00
(m) for branch offices, a sum not exceeding annually or a lesser sum as may be fixed by Council ...................... $1,000.00

(2) Each Alberta Land Surveyor shall pay to the Association, in addition to his annual fee for active membership, an annual levy of $500 or such lesser amount, if any, as may be fixed for any year by the Council.

(3) Not later than March 15th in each year, the Association shall mail notices to all members, stating the amounts of the membership fees and the levy payable for the next year.

(4) The annual membership fees and annual levies become due on April 1 in each year and are payable on or before April 30.

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

Motion Carried

Mr. Wallace announced that the annual general meeting of the Alberta Society of Surveying & Mapping Technologies will be held on May 9th and 10th in Wetaskiwin. He encouraged members to support the meeting either through direct financial sponsorship and/or through allowing staff to attend. He went on to say that in 2007, the ALSA and ASSMT held a joint Council meeting which was a great opportunity to get some dialogue going and share discussion. President Wallace added that the Association’s Future Committee also held a number of meetings to work toward a memorandum of understanding between the ALSA and ASSMT. Before the signing of the MOU, Mr. Wallace asked the President of ASSMT, Clint Johnson, to provide information on some of the activities of ASSMT.

---

Mr. Johnson addressed the assembly as follows:

On behalf of the Alberta Society of Surveying and Mapping Technologies, I’d like to take this opportunity to thank the ALSA for allowing me to speak. It’s a truly monumental occasion to have a 99th AGM and it is a pleasure to be here.

If you will allow me to, I’d like to discuss some of the relevant highlights of the past year. Cathy Bleay has recently joined us in the capacity of Executive Assistant. While Cathy is our only paid staff member, she is nowhere near adequately compensated for the time and effort she dedicates on our behalf. She has been a very welcome addition and ensures that our day-to-day operations as well as our longer term member commitments run efficiently.

Our regular membership dues have been increased to $100 this year. Membership dues increases are often difficult decisions to make but, as this is our sole source of revenue, it is essential for our continued existence.

As a volunteer organization, we are accustomed to seeing people give tirelessly of their valuable time. This year we have experienced the retirement of two of our most valuable and long-term volunteers. Mr. Ken Berg has retired from the panel of examiners and Mr. Hugh Furber has retired from his most recent position as our registrar. These individuals have a combined involvement with the ASSMT which spans over fifty years. They have seen our organization through prosperity and through hardship. Although they will sorely missed, I thank them for their time and wish them well in their future endeavours.

One of the long-standing relationships that is very important to us is our relationship with the colleges and technical institutions. SAIT, NAIT, Lethbridge College and Olds College continue to assist us in many capacities. Among other things, they allow us the opportunity to address students and enlighten them about our Society and the benefits of certification and membership. In return, we advocate on their behalf, serve on the advisory councils and assist with other initiatives when the opportunity presents itself. We have increased our bursaries to the four institutions to $500. Those will take effect in the upcoming year and will be available to students who are also members of the ASSMT.

ASSMT continues to maintain a close working relationship with the Alberta Geomatics Group via an MOU that we signed in 2005.

We have been generating a regular publication for distribution in the form of our Link newsletter. Our other means of communication with the members remains our website at
ASSMT.ab.ca. This is a valuable resource to find out more about events, our membership and our certification process.

ASSMT has been very fortunate to have our liaisons attend various ALSA committee meetings. The importance of this relationship cannot be overstated. This allows us to remain informed and pass relevant knowledge to our membership. We have also had the good fortune of having Mr. Tim Harding as the ALSA liaison. Besides being a vocal advocate, Tim has been cognizant of the importance of his role in ensuring that we remain aware of information critical to our members. I’d like to thank Tim for a job well done.

Without a doubt, one of the most significant events of the last year was the co-Council meeting between the ALSA and the ASSMT. This meeting allowed for a better understanding of each of our respective organizations and the challenges we face going forward. This gesture speaks volumes for the mutual respect and understanding between our groups. Although this was the first meeting of its kind, I trust it won’t be the last.

Our current membership stands at 331 regular, associate and student members. We are very proud of the new certifications which we continue to issue but we also acknowledge that we have the potential to certify a great number of people in our industry. To date, the ASSMT has largely operated on the premise of self-imposed importance. Although we feel that membership offers value through networking opportunities, distribution of industry-related information, exposure to similar organizations and increased industry exposure, certified members recognize that true validation comes not from within your own organization but from recognition outside of your organization. I suggest this partly comes from the people in this room. As employers, as managers, as senior representatives of our industry, it is imperative that you recognize the importance of certified and credible employees and the potential that this affords. Demanding a benchmark of training and experience is a sign of a model organization. Our goal should be to create a membership that candidates aspire to and that industry demands. It would be difficult to imagine going to the dentist when the hygienist isn’t certified and, similarly, it would be difficult to image going to the doctor when the x-ray technicians aren’t certified. Yet we continue to accept that the majority of our employees are not certified.

What does the future hold? As the role of the land surveyor evolves and increasing responsibilities are placed elsewhere, we need to make sure that the most competent people are the ones assuming this intermediate role giving those that may not aspire to be Alberta Land Surveyors, a recognized
career opportunity to better allow us to retain some of the people that might otherwise pursue other career aspirations.

With any change in the present model, we must introduce new standards of care. This may also allow the introduction of an expanded discipline process. The logical distribution of liability must be combined with the ability to be held accountable for actions. We will be required to think in new ways to adapt to the needs that exist today and try and anticipate the needs of the future.

Change is very often initiated from outside influence. This model seldom allows for those affected to have much influence on the process. The need for change was recognized by our organizations almost simultaneously. To that end, ALSA and ASSMT have engaged each other in a respectful and collaborative way to see how we can adapt and yet maintain complete control of how this change occurs. This was not mandated by outside influence but by the proactive efforts of our organizations. We can be proud that we were neither told when or how to meet this objective.

The result is what I see as the single biggest accomplishment, not just for the past year, but potentially for our existence. The memorandum of understanding recently validated by our respective councils, stands as a testament to our ability to work together. Through this document, we have created a framework to better protect the public interest, to potentially further expand the profession and to define scope of expertise. We also built membership value and we engaged the changing needs of our dynamic economy.

This MOU is not the accomplishment of a single person or a single group of people. It is the product of the right type of thinking by all of us and the right environment to make this happen. This continued progressive thinking will allow us to build beyond this document and truly strive to build a model arrangement. I look forward to what the future has to offer in this regard.

Thank you for your continued support and I hope that the next year provides even greater mutual benefit for the ALSA and the ASSMT.

Mr. Johnson invited the assembly to attend the ASSMT AGM in Wetaskiwin.

President Wallace asked ASSMT President Clint Johnson to join him in signing the memorandum of understanding between the ALSA and the ASSMT. Barry Bleay, Past President of ASSMT was also asked to come forward as he was instrumental in the drafting of the MOU.
President Wallace announced that, at the January Council meeting, CCLS Executive Director Sarah Cornett and Brian Ballantyne spoke about a concept for the future of the profession. It was a thought-provoking presentation on a national surveyors’ organization. He added that the year has been a busy one for the Canadian Council of Land Surveyors as they have been working on that issue, issues relating to the syllabus through the Board of Examiners Coordinating Committee, and, as always, professional liability insurance matters.

CCLS President Sel Sanderson and CCLS Executive Director Sarah Cornett were asked to proceed with their presentation.

On behalf of the member associations, the CCLS Board of Directors and Executive, Mr. Sanderson thanked ALSA President Bob Wallace for the invitation to attend the annual general meeting and wished incoming President Ron Hall a successful year. He also acknowledged the current ALSA CCLS Director Dave McWilliam, past CCLS Director Larry Pals, and Monroe Kinloch who has served in the Professional Liability Insurance Committee for a number of years.

Mr. Sanderson advised that there is a task force studying the possibility of CCLS being reinvented as a different organization. He went on to say that the success of the new organization will rely on volunteerism. Mr. Sanderson made a presentation to past CCLS Director Larry Pals in recognition of his many years of service.

CCLS Executive Director Sarah Cornett addressed the assembly as follows:

The representatives on CCLS right now are:
Sel Sanderson, President; Denis Blais, Vice-President; Bert Hol, Past President; Dave McWilliam, ALSA Director;
Sarah Cornett, Executive Director.

The Canadian Council of Land Surveyors was created by the presidents of the surveyors’ associations in the mid-seventies to provide a national network for their associations.

The presidents wanted a forum to continue the discussions they had at annual meetings such as this one, and a structured means to follow through on the ideas generated at those forums.

Today all eleven surveyors’ associations in Canada are part of this national network and work together through the CCLS forum.

At a special presidents’ forum on the future, sponsored by CCLS in February 2007, the presidents of every associa-
tion reconfirmed the intrinsic value to their association, and to their membership, of actively participating in a national forum.

As written in the mission statement, CCLS is a national consensus-based enabling forum providing proactive leadership to its member associations.

It is a forum that enables the participating associations to meet and discuss issues that are relevant to the profession, sharing ideas and working towards common solutions to the challenges the profession faces. The present governance model gives CCLS the authority to invite discussion and promote solutions. This means that CCLS is the catalyst for change, however, the authority to commit to long-term solutions to challenges rests with the member associations.

The member associations are central to CCLS. The associations themselves created and make up the national forum. The board of directors is made up of one director for each member association. Through the board, the associations prioritize issues, build consensus, and develop their national strategic direction. Staff currently includes myself as Executive Director and I have recently relocated to St. Albert. I work 3/4 time and CCLS has a part-time assistant located in Ottawa which shares office space with ACLS.

Building a national agenda and moving forward on national issues is an iterative process and is dependent on interaction, participation and communication amongst all associations. There are many common issues and many possible approaches. Progress depends on a pooling of ideas, expertise, and resources of councils, committees, volunteers, and staff of the associations.

Your Association is involved in ongoing national initiatives. Most of you will be familiar with the professional liability insurance program. The committee of six surveyors that oversees the program has a lot of information and expertise about professional liability insurance. They are available to talk to any of you about insurance issues, regardless of whether or not you are insured through the CCLS program. If they can’t answer your question directly, they will be able to direct you to the best source of the information you need.

The Professional Liability Insurance Committee and your Professional Development Committee presented a risk management seminar yesterday. I understand that the seminar was sold out, so if you were not able to attend, I have put the handouts from that seminar at the back of the room in the blue folders. The presentations will be compiled and e-mailed to your executive director for distribution.
The Committee also produces the Loss Prevention and Practice Management Guide. It contains information about many aspects of surveying related to preventing and dealing with insurance claims. The Guide is posted on the CCLS website and is available to all of you in a series of PDF files that you can download at any time.

The Board of Examiners Co-coordinating Committee is, as the name implies, a co-coordinating body for the Boards of Examiners across Canada. This includes the Atlantic Board, CBEPS, and the Ontario and Quebec association boards. This committee also administers the national accreditation program for university level surveying programs.

The Labour Mobility Monitoring Group meets annually to discuss the implementation of the Mutual Recognition Document signed by every Canadian surveying association. Every association is represented in the group. The agreement was developed by the associations in 2000 to comply with the Labour Mobility Agreement amongst the provincial and territorial governments. The Committee is currently looking at TILMA and how it may affect labour mobility issues in other regions of the country and the input of your Association and the BC Association is greatly appreciated.

Celebrating excellence in the field of geomatics in Canada, the David Thompson National Geomatics Awards was introduced in the winter of 2006-2007. This year, the awards will be presented in Victoria, BC in May during the ACLS national surveyors’ conference and the Canadian Hydrographic Conference. Information on last year’s winners and this year’s program and conference is available at either the CCLS website or the ACLS website.

The Strategic Planning Committee of CCLS meets regularly to monitor the associations’ national agenda and make recommendations about priorities and co-ordinated approaches to that agenda. It receives input from all associations and provides big picture information to the associations, through the CCLS Board of Directors.

Communication and networking amongst the member associations is the key mandate of the CCLS. There are many forums facilitated or accessed by CCLS for this purpose including the CCLS Board itself, the association administrators’ forum, the presidents forum, the CCLS website, and all of the various committees under CCLS.

Your Association is currently involved in three main strategic priorities on the national agenda, one of which is the future of the profession initiative.

A task force on the future of the profession was formed in October of 2006 after an initial discussion at a president’s
forum at the Association of Nova Scotia Land Surveyors annual general meeting. The task force produced a discussion paper, facilitated a presidents’ teleconference, sponsored a half-day expanded presidents’ forum, and developed a vision for a national coordinated approach to safeguarding the viability of the surveying profession. There are two main strands within the vision. One is a broad, inclusive national definition of professional surveying that includes all for the professional work that surveyors do and are best qualified to do. The other is a national governance model that would challenge us to work together, pooling resources nationally and tackling issues in a more coherent and timely fashion. Presentations of this broad vision have now been made to all association councils in order to generate discussion at the association level.

At this time we have a very broad vision, many questions and a need to bring the vision into sharper focus, build some concensus and find a model that addresses the many questions. President Bob Wallace referred to this initiative in his report this morning and in our introduction here, making the point that your Council insists on direct input. This is also what CCLS is all about. It does not exist without direct input from the associations.

As I noted earlier, CCLS can provide a catalyst, but only the associations can build the solutions and commit to action.

A career awareness website is online now. The site was developed by a team of surveyors representing the public awareness committees of several associations including the ALSA. It catalogues and provides direct links to all of the career awareness tools of every association as well as outside sources. It provides the ALSA with access to what all of the other associations are doing in the area of career awareness. This year a youth website is planned which is targeted at high school age kids. It will provide that first splash of information to attract young people to the profession and lead to the more detailed career information on the current site and at the association sites. Both of these sites are tools designed for the associations to use as part of their own career awareness initiatives.

Lack of common national entry standards is a deterrent to attracting students to the profession. The harmonization of entry requirements began at a national forum of the associations sponsored by CCLS in 2003. A lot of important work has been done in the past four years, primarily through the Boards of Examiners and coordinated through CCLS. Larry Pals will present a detailed report on the current status of
this work and it is on your agenda as the syllabus presentation later in the meeting.

There are specific recommendations made by the expert team that made up the task force. The team included the boards of examiners, which represents all of the associations and six universities across the country. The authority to set entry standards and their requirements rests solely with the associations and so it is the associations that will consider these recommendations and make their decision.

Many common issues have been raised by associations in the past few years. Each of these issues are national in scope because developments in one region will influence future developments in other regions. These issues are being monitored by the associations that are most directly involved and information is being disseminated to the other associations through the CCLS forum.

The next annual meeting of CCLS will be on September 6-7, 2008 in Winnipeg, immediately following the Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors annual meeting. A special discussion and brainstorming session on the future of the profession is in the planning stages and it is hoped that all the association presidents will participate. The annual meeting is open to any interested surveyor who would like to observe the proceedings and take part in the discussions.

In closing, I’d like to say that the amount of discussion happening at your national forums is probably the most I’ve seen in my ten years with CCLS. This is really encouraging and I hope it continues. It is always a challenge communicating across Canada with eleven different association councils but with good will and continued debate, I think positive things are happening.

My final message is that CCLS is not them. CCLS is all of us trying to communicate, discuss and work towards a common future. Thank you for taking part.

It was MOVED by Mr. Pinkerton, seconded by Mr. Jamieson, that a new Part D, Section 5.11 be created in the Manual of Standard Practice as follows:

5.11 A surveyor performing a wellsite (MSL – maximum 2 hectares) disposition plan amendment shall locate and confirm by measurement sufficient evidence within, on or defining the disposition to allow the determination of the boundaries and shall:

.1 Indicate pre-existing disposition survey evidence as found, restored or re-established and,

.2 Indicate the actual field dates of the amendment field survey in accordance with Part E, Section 4,
Mr. Pinkerton advised that the recommendation dealt with Public Lands’ “to” and “from” dates on certifications. He went on to say that the topic originated from new business brought forward by the Director of Surveys questioning when a new survey should start and when old surveys should end when dealing with disposition amendments. The recommendation limits the affidavit date to two years for an MSL amendment for a disposition of less than two hectares in size. Very large oils sands dispositions can be dealt with in a different fashion. Mr. Pinkerton advised that all of the previous amendments associated with a plan can be downloaded through IHS. The recommendation is an attempt to clarify what is required from an Alberta Land Surveyor who performing an MSL amendment. He added that the recommendation is an attempt to clarify what public lands is expecting from land surveyors.

Mr. Oh commented on clients’ concerns with respect to doing business in the province of Alberta at the present time.

Mr. Pinkerton responded that the Standards Committee discussed the 24 month time limit at length.

Ms. Ewoniak asked if there is an LOC attached to an MSL that is being amended would it need to be retraced as well.

Mr. Pinkerton responded that the change to the MSP only deals with the MSL. He asked the Director of Surveys to respond.

Mr. Michaud responded that if land surveyors just want to amend a wellsite, it can be done on a separate plan.

Responding to a question by Dr. Radovanovic on the rationale for the 24 months, Mr. Pinkerton advised that the Committee discussed ideas from anywhere from nine months to five years. The Committee reached a consensus of 24 months.

Dr. Radovanovic asked what should be done if a client asks for amendment to a wellsite plan three years later.
Mr. Pinkerton responded that, in that case, the wellsite should be retraced and any evidence not found should be re-established. In other words, an entire new survey would need to be done.

In response to a question on the status of MSLs other than wellsites, Mr. Pinkerton responded that the recommendation does not deal with anything other than wellsite MSLs.

Mr. Gillis pointed out that the rationale document references advising the ERCB of the change to the wellsite certification. He asked whether the ERCB will differentiate between wellsite on Crown and private lands.

Mr. Pinkerton advised that the ERCB will not get involved with this recommendation as it deals mainly with a public lands issue. The ERCB will still look for a one year survey date associated with wellsites.

Mr. Dupuis felt this was an attempt to apply the two year span to all public land dispositions. He went on to say that this only applies to an amendment to a wellsite plan, so the original wellsite could still span a longer period of time. He asked for an explanation of how come the amendment has a two-year span but not the original survey.

Mr. Pinkerton responded that the Standards Committee dealt with the recommendation from a monumentation perspective. He went on to say that if an amendment is required to a wellsite plan, Public Lands expects that all the evidence as found will be shown for that amendment as well as the new spikes placed. The two-year time frame does not affect the original survey; only the amendment.

Mr. Dupuis indicated that he had experienced rejections by SRD in trying to amend just the MSL when an LOC is attached. SRD wanted the amendment to contain both, even if the LOC is not being amended, so that they do not have two plans of record.

Mr. Pinkerton reiterated Mr. Michaud’s response that just the MSL can be amended resulting in one plan associated with the LOC and one with the MSL.

Mr. Lachance asked for clarification in a situation where a wellsite has been surveyed and, at some period in time, work proceeds on the wellsite and the client finds that some extra work has to be done such as putting a cut-off on one of the
corners. He asked whether the original survey has to be re-traced if all the corners are found on the wellsite.

Mr. Pinkerton argued that the monuments govern and no further ties should be required as long as all of the monuments have been found.

Mr. Michaud concurred that once all four corners of the well are found and shown, the requirements of the Manual of Standard Practice would have been met and there is no need to retrace all the other ties.

It was MOVED by Mr. Pinkerton, seconded by Mr. Hagarty, that Part D, Section 5.9 be revised and that a new Part D, Section 5.9.10 be created in the Manual of Standard Practice as follows:

Remote Sensing for Public Land Dispositions and Wellsites on Private Land

5.9 An Alberta Land Surveyor preparing a disposition plan for public lands or wellsites on private land based upon remotely sensed survey data such as LIDAR shall:

.4 Identify the data collection technique prominently in the plan heading title block. Example: (LIDAR Survey)

.8 Prepare the plan following the General Requirements for Plans, Part D, Section 1 and if the survey includes public land, the approving authority’s plan requirements.

.9 If the survey includes public land prepare a monumented plan of survey within the time frame specified by the approving authority. The as-built plan shall be prepared in accordance with Part D, sections 5.8 and 5.10 and the approving authority’s plan requirements.

.10 If the survey includes private land prepare a monumented plan of survey based upon non-remotely sensed techniques within the time frame specified by the approving authority (the ERCB) in accordance with the provisions of sections 5.1.1, 5.2.1, 5.2.2 and 5.6.

Motion Carried

Mr. Pinkerton spoke to the motion by advising that Council asked the Standards Committee to investigate this topic after being advised that the ERCB had concerns about how a LiDAR survey is performed on private lands. He went on to
say that, previously, this section of the Manual of Standard Practice, only dealt with public lands. The Standards Committee put forward a recommendation to update the section to include private lands. Mr. Pinkerton pointed out that the recommendation also includes that Council liaise with the ERCB as to its timing with a final plan of survey.

Mr. Stephens advised that land surveyors have to apply to do a pilot project for LiDAR surveys on Crown lands. He went on to say that there is some control for the process on Crown lands because it is being reviewed by SRD.

Mr. Pinkerton advised that the checks and balances were discussed extensively at the Committee level and it was felt that the ERCB had more clout than Public Lands. He added that Mr. Stephens was correct in that there would be no initial application requesting a pilot project. Mr. Pinkerton suggested that if the EUB is expecting a final plan and it is not there at audit time, it has the clout to deal with the situation whereas Public Lands does not.

It was MOVED by Mr. Pinkerton, seconded by Mr. Partridge, that the Part C, Section 2 of the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

The following section deals with standards for GPS the guidelines for Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) measurements and associated computations performed for cadastral boundary definition surveys. GNSS includes the Global Position System (GPS), GLONASS and any future satellite positioning systems. For the purposes of this Manual, all references to GPS will refer to the use of any combination of GNSSs.

When using GPS, there are numerous error sources in static and Real Time Kinematic (RTK) GPS measurements that must be considered by the practitioner. Detecting and mitigating these sources of error during a GPS survey is necessary to produce accurate and verifiable results. Some of the primary error sources in a GPS survey are user error, multipath, satellite geometry, atmospheric delays, and incorrect initializations.

Typical user errors include data entry error and measurement blunders (i.e. incorrect antenna height).

Multipath is site-specific problem typical at locations where there is an obstructed sky view at the GPS receiver. Sat-
ellite signals are reflected off nearby surfaces of objects causing inaccuracy in the position.

An insufficient number of visible satellites, or their positions relative to the user, can result in a poor geometrical solution of the position. Atmospheric conditions can cause disruptions and delays in transmission of the signals from the satellites to the receiver.

Initialization refers to the ambiguity resolution of the satellite signal carrier – the determination of the integer number of wavelengths between the GPS receiver and the satellite, a process that is critical to achieving centimeter level results from kinematic surveys. Other GPS error sources can cause an incorrect initialization or integer count, which results in a position error.

Due to the complexity of GPS measurement and data reduction processes, these guidelines focus primarily on assessing the reliability and accuracy of these surveys. As GPS techniques evolve and new methodologies become available, the burden of proof that these guidelines or their intent are complied with rests with the practitioner assuming responsibility for the plan.

2.1 GPS surveys will be assessed as horizontal (2D) and/or vertical (1D) surveys for the purposes of accuracy measure.

2.2 The measure of accuracy for surveys conducted in whole or in part with GPS techniques, shall comply with Section 1.

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

2.4 The position of every monument included in a GPS survey either found or placed shall be verified with sufficient redundant observations or comparison with published information (i.e. registered plans, survey control). This applies to both static and kinematic surveys.

.1 Monuments observed by radial observations shall be checked using commonly accepted method(s) for redundancy. Examples include:

• Radial ties from another known station.
• Independent measurements by conventional survey methods.
• Point re-occupation with separate observation parameters and an independent initialization.
2.5 The map projection for a survey shall be suitable and validated.

Motion Carried

Mr. Pinkerton informed the assembly that Council directed the Standards Committee to update the Manual of Standard Practice with regard to current practices. He went on to say that the recommendation extensively updates the preamble of the GPS section and provides acceptable methods of ensuring redundancy in radial observations.

Mr. Pinkerton advised that, at the regional meetings, many members were curious as to what was meant by separate observations. The Standards Committee defined this a separate observational parameter. Examples would be a change in the initialization location or a difference in time between observations.

Student member Aaron Shuffletoski noted that there has been discussion and fear about the accuracy of GPS. He felt that what is lacking in the Manual is the output of the information that is gathered. Mr. Shuffletoski commented that plans are a pretty accurate representation of what occurred in the field and those plans could be used to get an idea of the intent of the surveyor, how the survey was performed and for re-establishment purposes. With GPS, coordinates are arrived at and scaled and there is no information of how the information was gathered in the field. Mr. Shuffletoski suggested that perhaps the concern should be more towards displaying the GPS information on the plan.

Mr. Forsyth felt that the motion was more of a Practice Review Board interpretation as it is almost a textbook type of section.

Mr. Pinkerton responded by indicating that the Standards Committee tried very hard not to give the section a textbook appearance and tried to encourage the membership to do these types of surveys correctly. He added that their intent was to inform the memberships of a couple of ways that the Committee feels are correct, but not necessarily how to actually complete the task. Mr. Pinkerton advised that the list is not exhaustive.

Mr. McArthur asked for clarification on Section 2.5 that states that the map projection for a survey shall be suitable and validated.
Mr. Pinkerton responded that the statement suggests that the map projection should be checked to ensure that it is an appropriate one for the job.

It was MOVED by Mr. Pinkerton, seconded by Mr. Matthysen, that Part C, Section 4.4 of the Manual of Standard Practice be amended as follows:

Remote Positioning Data

4.4 In addition, for surveys done partially or completely using remote positioning techniques or satellite positioning techniques, the field records shall include the following:

1. observation procedures, raw data and logistics;
2. reduction procedures of the observed data, including software versions;
3. processed remote positioning data from which cadastral survey measurements are derived.

Motion Carried

Mr. Pinkerton advised that the Standards Committee, during its update of the Manual, found that satellite positioning techniques were omitted from the field notes portion.

President Wallace asked Larry Pals, former CCLS Director and a member of the CCLS National Forum on Entry into the Profession and the new CBEPS chairman, to make a presentation regarding the Core and Electives Syllabus Proposal.

Mr. Pals addressed the assembly as follows:

This presentation is prepared by CCLS so that we can start to talk about the proposed new syllabus which may take three to five years to get in place. We have universities that currently have accreditations and it will not be an instant process.

It all started in 2004 at a national forum in Winnipeg that I attended. At that forum, there were six resolutions that were discussed and agreed upon by all of the attendees. The following items have been completed:

Resolution #1: Recommended a national exemption study that would identify all possible courses available at post secondary institutions that would qualify as equivalent to a syllabus item.

Resolution #2: Recommended a policy review at the association level to continue to issue certificates of completion to graduates of the CCLS board accredited programs.
This review took place and the recommendation was accepted so that all Boards continue to recognize the accredited programs.

**Resolution #3:** Recommended a policy review at the association level to consistently require certificates of completion from the regional boards. Again, the aim was more national consistency and clarity for prospective candidates.

**Resolution #5:** Made recommendations to streamline the process of qualifying through the examination process. These are the exams administered by CBEPS to complete the academic requirements outlined in the syllabus for those candidates who have not graduated from an accredited university program.

**Resolution #6:** Made recommendations to support candidates in the articling process.

Resolution #4 was to review the existing syllabus.

There are five regional boards, APBELS (Atlantic Board of Examiners for Land Surveyors); WCBELS has been replaced by CBEPS (Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors, ACLS (Association of Canada Lands Surveyors), AERC (Ontario Academic and Experience Requirements Committee) and the OAGQBE, which is the Quebec Board of Examiners.

An individual needs to have a certain body of knowledge. That body of knowledge has previously been decided to be at the university level. There is no intent in this change of syllabus to lower that standard.

A task force met in the fall of 2007. Representatives were present from CCLS, University of Calgary, AOLS Academic & Experience Requirements Committee (AERC), Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Land Surveyors (CBEPS), Atlantic Provinces Board of Examiners for Land Surveyors (APBELS), University of New Brunswick, BCIT, and York University. Representatives from Ordre des arpenteurs-géomètres du Québec (OAGQ), Laval Université and Ryerson University were unable to attend.

On behalf of CBEPS, that task force decided that it would put forward the following structure: core subject areas that must be covered by all candidates and, electives subject areas that can be chosen by the individual candidate. CBEPS does not necessarily set exams for all the electives, but may grant institutions the right to put on a particular accredited course.
Core syllabus items include:
C1: Mathematics;
C2: Least-Squares Estimation & Data Analysis;
C3: Advanced Surveying;
C4: Coordinate Systems & Map Projections;
C5: Geospatial Information Systems;
C6: Geodetic Positioning;
C7: Remote Sensing & Photogrammetry;
C8: Land Use Planning & Economics of Land Development;
C9: Cadastral Studies;
C10: Survey Law;
C11: Business Practices & the Profession.

In Alberta and probably Saskatchewan, hydrography is not needed. It could be that the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association only requires those eleven subjects and no electives. Would the associations then have to look behind the certificates? In Ontario, hydrographers are licensed, so the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors is a proponent of removing hydrography as one of the core syllabus items. We are proposing that the syllabus be a core of eleven and possibly the following electives:
E1: Spatial Databases & Land Information Systems;
E2: Hydrographic Surveying;
E3: Environmental Management;
E4: Advanced Remote Sensing;
E5: Advanced Photogrammetry.

There may be the option for educational institutions to apply to CBEPS to have post-secondary advanced geomatics courses approved.

All of the authority rests with the associations. I was going to make this presentation to Council, but they did not have the time to spend on it at that time. I asked for the opportunity to make this presentation to the members as information. Council will have to have some discussions on the issue.

The first step is adoption in principle by the boards of examiners, then adoption in principle by the associations. There will also need to be consultation with post-secondary institutions as there could be some changes to their programs and their accreditations could be affected. A detailed syllabus development will also need to be done.

The goal is to create a clear path to becoming a surveyor, reduced roadblocks to candidates, and the ‘right’ bar for new professionals. Much work has been done, but there is still a lot of work that still needs to be done. I hope that this information is of benefit and I think that I have people here today who are willing to answer questions.
Mr. Hagen asked whether the issue of the hydrographic requirements have been solved.

Mr. Pals responded that all he is doing today is pointing out some of the discussion that has to take place. He commented that there are a number of provinces that do not need hydrography. One of the conditions for Ontario to come on stream was that it wanted hydrography removed from the required syllabus.

Mr. Salmon from Victoria, BC advised that, from his perspective, he could see no problem with hydrography being an elective.

Mr. Johnson from BC asked if there has been discussion around any subjects outside of the core syllabus being moved into any particular province’s professional examinations.

Mr. Pals indicated that if the provinces indicated that they would be willing to do that, then the syllabus could contain only the eleven core subjects. He added that it would need to be discussed.

Ms. Cornett advised that the educational institutions are included in the discussions right from the beginning so that the transition from those programs, satisfying the criteria with the current syllabus and any changes to the syllabus will be seamless and will not cause any great disturbances in the educational system.

Mr. Pals encouraged all the provincial presidents present to take this information back to their respective Councils and indicate that they will be approached to discuss the syllabus.

Mr. Wallace announced that the Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors has joined CBEPS and felt that very soon, there will be one unified curriculum across the country.

President Wallace indicated that this year, Council has spent a great deal of time on Practice Review Board and Systematic Practice Review issues trying to answer the questions of how far along are we on Phase 3 of SPR, what resources are needed to get through Phase 3 and what might Phase 4 look like? He continued by advising that Council approved the Practice Review Board conducting a poll of the member-
ship, to find out what their thoughts were about Systematic Practice Review and where it should be heading. President Wallace encouraged the membership to provide some feedback and direction to the Practice Review Board.

Mr. Paul Stoliker, Practice Review Board Vice Chairman and Chairman of the Practice Review Board Subcommittee looking into these issues was asked to inform the assembly about the polling results.

Mr. Stoliker addressed the assembly as follows:

The poll was designed by the Practice Review Board Subcommittee in conjunction with Rose Country Advertising & Public Relations. I’d like to thank Brian Stecyk for his guidance and timeliness.

The response from the membership was 80%, which was fantastic. I’d like to thank the membership for participating in the poll.

The first thing the Subcommittee did was to define the following goals:
1. Determine if the membership thinks that SPR provides value to the public.
2. Determine if SPR provides value to the ALSA membership.
3. Determine if the membership supports some kind of SPR in the future.
4. Determine if the membership thinks SPR is educational.
5. Determine what parts of the current SPR process the membership thinks is good or bad, effective or ineffective.
6. Determine if the membership thinks there is an alternative to SPR and, if so, what is it?

The idea was to analyze the poll results and to base it on some demographics.

A summary and highlights of the results are as follows:

*Not counting follow-up reviews, how many SPR reviews have you had?*

- None ................................................................. 19.1%
- One ................................................................. 20.1%
- Two ................................................................. 31.9%
- Three .............................................................. 28.8%
Does the public benefit from SPR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Review</th>
<th>One Review</th>
<th>Two Reviews</th>
<th>Three Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Stoliker pointed out that well over 50% of the membership feels the public derives benefit from SPR.

Is SPR educational?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No reply</th>
<th>Scale of 1 (low)</th>
<th>Scale of 2</th>
<th>Scale of 3</th>
<th>Scale of 4</th>
<th>Scale of 5 (high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results were surprising as it appears that the membership does not think that SPR is as disciplinary as they think it is educational. There was a higher percentage that thought there was somewhat of a disciplinary component in SPR. That is definitely something that the PRB tries not to have. Members who have had more reviews then to feel that the process is more disciplinary than those who have had none.

How would you rate the benefits that you received from your first review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One Review</th>
<th>Two Reviews</th>
<th>Three Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would you rate the benefits that you received from your second review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One Review</th>
<th>Two Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Significant</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you rate the benefits that you received from your third review?

No benefit...............................................................13.9%
Marginal benefit.....................................................53.2%
Significant benefit ..................................................29.1%
Very significant benefit ............................................3.8%

You can see that every group felt that the review was quite beneficial to the land surveyor. For those who have had two reviews, there is a tendency towards the review not being as beneficial. For those who have had three reviews, those respondents felt that it was the least beneficial of all.

What do you feel was the most positive outcome of the SPR reviews that you have been involved in?

Educational/Awareness ..............................................104
Confirmation ..........................................................40
Interaction ............................................................32
Identify Deficiencies ...............................................20
No benefit...............................................................16

Members felt that the process was definitely educational. Many member were glad to have someone confirm that their processes were good; some liked interaction with the Association, especially those that are not in the major centres; some liked the fact that the process identified deficiencies in their practices; and sixteen of the respondents did not feel that the process benefited them at all.

What do you feel were the negative aspects of the SPR ... reviews you were involved in?

Nothing negative......................................................78
Too long/time consuming ...........................................47
Too nit-picky/too detailed ........................................32
Reviewer/reporting/rigid ...........................................28
Disciplinary/stressful ..............................................21
Not enough detail ....................................................10
Do not support..........................................................7
Cost .................................................................5
These points are all good things for the Practice Review Board to consider when discussing the future of Systematic Practice Review.

The SPR process currently costs approximately $485,000 annually (about 35% of the ALSA budget). How would you rate the value you receive for your money on a scale of one to five where one is no value at all and five is very significant value?

No reply .................................................................0.3%
Don’t know ............................................................2.1%
Scale of 1 (low) ......................................................7.3%
Scale of 2 ..............................................................24.3%
Scale of 3 .................................................................33.7%
Scale of 4 ..............................................................24.3%
Scale of 5 (high) .....................................................8.0%

Even though the cost is quite high, generally the members think that it is a worthwhile and valuable process. When the question was asked if the membership would agree to increase fees to support SPR if needed, exactly 50% responded yes and 50% said no. There was no clear direction from the members on this question.

If a Phase 4 Systematic Practice Review process is developed, should it be similar to the current system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Review</th>
<th>One Review</th>
<th>Two Reviews</th>
<th>Three Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Support SPR</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you believe a process other than the current system should be developed what do you envisage a new system to be?

Focus on education ..............................................25
Focus on new surveyors .........................................20
Focus on poor performers .......................................19
Less detailed .......................................................15
Streamline/reduce costs ........................................12
Mandatory continuing education ..............................7
More detailed .......................................................7
Emphasize professionalism ....................................5

Some of these responses are interesting because it has been the Practice Review Board’s philosophy that everybody
should be treated equally in terms of SPR, that is, not to differentiate between new land surveyors and the more experienced land surveyors, or those who have received good or bad reviews. Many members had some different ideas in that some felt that SPR should concentrate on new land surveyors, or land surveyors who have not had a good review. Many members felt that SPR should be less detailed and that costs should be reduced. A few members felt that the program should concentrate on mandatory continuing education. As well, a few members felt that the process should be more detailed and should emphasize professionalism rather than day to day business.

**How many products that are reviewed should be field inspected?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If you answered some, under what circumstances should a product be field inspected?**

- If problems identified in plan review;
- Extensive re-establishments, especially Part 2 monuments;
- Complex survey;
- First review for surveyor;
- History of the surveyor (bad past reviews, poor field inspections, etc.);
- Random.

**Should the Director of Systematic Practice Review be able to approve any reviews without consultation with the PRB?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was asked because they are many good reviews and should the PRB be spending time discussing them and why should the Director be required to spend time preparing a presentation to the PRB for these types of reviews. Over 50% of the membership did not like the idea of the Director having the authority to approve a file on his own. There was a significant number of members who thought it was a good idea.
What should be done in cases where an ALS receives consistently low scores?

- More education and training/mentor ................... 80
- Send to discipline ............................................. 57
- Appearance before PRB ................................... 41
- Follow-up reviews at own expense ....................... 31

Do you believe compulsory continuing education programs would lead to a reduction in the number of problems identified in an SPR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Reviews</th>
<th>One Review</th>
<th>Two Reviews</th>
<th>Three Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was asked because if the membership did not want to continue with SPR then perhaps continuing education would be an alternative.

Do you believe the ALSA should be looking at the subject of compulsory continuing education for land surveying profession?

- No reply ....................................................... 0.3%
- Don’t know .................................................. 3.8%
- No .............................................................. 34.4%
- Yes ............................................................. 61.5%

This question is asking the membership if the Association should again look at a compulsory continuing education program. The majority of the members felt that the Association should look at it again. The survey did not ask whether continuing professional development should replace or complement Systematic Practice Review.

Do you have any concluding comments about or recommendations for the SPR process?
- SPR ok with some modifications;
- Less intense reviews for good past performance;
- More intense reviews for poor past performance;
- SPR is too detailed and time consuming;
- Cost is too high;
- Replace with compulsory continuing education;
- Remove field audit;
- Discontinue SPR.
These comments are listed in the order of the most responses first, with discontinuing SPR having the least responses.

The following is my summary of the poll that I presented to Council:

- The membership tends to agree that SPR has a positive impact on protection of the public.
- The membership tends to believe that SPR is more educational than not.
- The membership tends to believe that there is moderate value received when the cost to run SPR is considered.
- The membership is mostly in favour of Phase 4 being similar to Phase 3.
- The membership is very much in favour of allowing cursory reviews (or no reviews at all) for practitioners with consistently high SPR scores.
- The membership is mostly in favour of requiring SPR responses only to issues of a major nature.
- The membership is highly in favour of considering a compulsory continuing education program.

President Wallace suggested that it would be nice to get some feedback from the membership on how they feel about the survey to give the PRB Subcommittee further direction.

Mr. Amundrud suggested that the Association may want to consider an audit system where one survey firm performs an audit on another survey firm. The report from the audit would then go before the Practice Review Board rather than having a Director of Practice Review.

Mr. Stoliker asked the membership for its thoughts on the loss of anonymity in the case of one survey firm performing an audit on another. He added that everything that goes before the PRB is confidential.

Mr. Marquardt advised that he spent four years on the PRB and one of the problems was that twenty to thirty percent of reviews done require a follow-up review. He estimated that fifty percent, roughly about fifteen percent of total reviews have a lot of wasted time in that practitioners miss or ignore deadline which costs the Association time and money. That ten to fifteen percent could amount to approximately $70,000 to $100,00 in savings. Mr. Marquardt suggested that those particular practitioners, get it right in the first place and observe your deadlines; and the money that you save could be your own.
Mr. Hagen observed that the program could likely operate with only one Alberta Land Surveyor as well as have a continuing education component. He felt this would cut the costs in half as the Director would review a plan and if the plan looks good, there is no need to go further (i.e. no field checks and a short report).

Mr. George commended Paul Stoliker on his presentation as well as the PRB Subcommittee and Brian Stecyk of Rose Country Advertising and Public Relations. He commented that the Association is in a dilemma for Phase 3 and there is some question on how, or if, it is going to be finished. Mr. George went on to say that Mr. Hagen’s idea is good in that it would save some costs, but there does have to be a certain amount of infrastructure. He indicated that it is very important to have a Director of Practice Review to be a leader in this regard. Mr. George added what it would be up to the PRB to decide whether an Assistant to the Director of Practice Review would be required. He advised that the intent of the program is educational.

Mr. George commended the previous directors, Al Nelson, Lyall Pratt and Fred Cheng for their contributions. He indicated that it is a big job and commitment, but the survey has shown that the membership is fairly pleased with SPR. Mr. George added that many excellent ideas have come out of the survey for a Phase 4. He encouraged the membership to provide more feedback to the Subcommittee and the Practice Review Board.

Mr. Wallace commented that Council is wondering why the Association has not had any applicants for the position of Director of Practice Review. He suggested that it may be an illusion that it’s a lousy job or that it is poorly paid. Mr. Wallace dispelled both illusions by indicating that it is a very respected and educational job. He added that the Association is also prepared to pay a competitive salary depending on the applicant.

Former Practice Review Board Public Member Russ Barnes indicated that he served on the PRB for a few years and was extremely disappointed with practitioners who would not reply on time or did not respond in the time that they promised they would. He went on to say that these members are doing this at the expense of the entire membership. Mr. Barnes felt that the reviews at the Board level were too detailed and suggested that, in the future, the Board should
only look at the portions of the review that really matter and perhaps just note the small items. He added that, as a public member, he saw the need to maintain a review of some sort to protect the public. Mr. Barnes indicated that when a practitioner is under review and every product sampled needs adjustment in one way or another, that indicates that chances are that the entire practice needs some work. He went on to say that if the Association is going to have the authority to be a self-governing profession, governance of the whole membership is important.

Mr. Wallace thanked Mr. Stoliker for his presentation and also thanked the PRB Subcommittee for all its hard work.

President Wallace informed the assembly that Information Item #5 was originally Recommendation #5. He added that Council had concerns that the original recommendation may be contrary to legislation. ALSA Solicitor David Jardine presented a legal opinion on the issue. Mr. Wallace indicated that there were some concerns raised and Council decided not to proceed with the debate and vote on the recommendation at this year’s AGM. He went on to say that Council agreed to provide the legal opinion to the membership. Mr. Wallace advised that Council has agreed to work with the Alberta government’s legal department and the Director of Surveys on the issues raised with the hope that the recommendation can be brought forward at a future date.

Standards Committee Chairman Rob Pinkerton was asked to present the information item to the membership.

Mr. Pinkerton advised that the intent was that Part C, Section 3.8 be revised to read as follows:

*Notwithstanding sub-section 3.8.1, if a statutory monument has been placed on a public land disposition survey for a Miscellaneous Lease (MLL), a Recreation Lease (REC), a Surface Material Lease (SML), or a Disposition Reservation (DRS), an Establishment of Monuments plan does not have to be registered at the Land Titles Office.*

Mr. Pinkerton added that Council directed the Standards Committee to investigate after the Director of Surveys questioned the benefit and need to register two plans; one at Land Titles and an identical one at Public Lands. This would grant an exemption to four types of dispositions (miscellaneous leases, recreational leases, surface material leases and disposition reservations) whereby the plan would only need to be recorded with Public Lands and no plan would be registered.
at Land Titles. He continued by pointing out that the rationale behind the original recommendation was that, prior to the issuance of approval documents from Public Lands for all four types of these dispositions, final monumented plans of survey must be filed with Public Lands ensuring that the posts associated with the plan will be recorded in a public record. Exceptions are that permanent sample plot DRSs are applied for and acquired on a sketch and provincial government access road DRSs are also applied for on a sketch and then surveyed.

Mr. Pinkerton advised that the intent of the recommendation was that the plan of survey would be available by IHS for the dispositions and the Committee felt that there would be an unnecessary duplication of resources to file a plan at Land Titles also. He noted that Sections 44.3 and 46.3 of the Surveys Act would still apply whereby if a previously unmonumented Part 2 or Part 3 position was being established or if a position was being re-established, a plan of survey would still need to be filed showing that re-establishment or establishment at Land Titles or the Metis Settlement Land Registry.

President Wallace suggested that the membership discuss the issue on its merit alone to dispel any doubts that the membership may have on its legal validity.

Mr. Hagen felt that if a statutory iron post is planted, a plan at Land Titles should be filed. He suggested that the Association consider designing and creating a disposition monument for sale that is permanent in nature and has a permit stamp on it. Mr. Hagen felt that this would create a new revenue possibility for the Association, the Director of Surveys would have a permanent monument and it would eliminate the need to have a plan filed at Land Titles. He went on to say that this would dispel any confusion from the public’s perspective.

Mr. Jamieson indicated that what is currently used is a twelve inch spike and did not see the need to create a new monument.

Mr. Nome suggested that the Public Lands and Land Titles offices be combined into one department.

Director of Surveys Mike Michaud asked the membership to consider what the benefit was to register disposition plans at Land Titles. He went on to say that there is an extra cost associated with registering a second plan that is passed on to
the taxpayers of Alberta and to clients. Mr. Michaud indicated that the Department did twenty DRS surveys in the Fall of 2007 for which they did two cost estimates; one for registering one plan at Public Lands and one for also registering an additional plan at Land Titles. He indicated that the price amounted to $1,735 extra per plan, which was significant when multiplied by the 1,500 dispositions that need to be done. Mr. Michaud suggested that the membership consider what the benefit is to have the second plan registered at Land Titles. He also suggested that the debate could continue on to Pipeline Installation Plans (PLAs).

Mr. Prevost indicated that in a previous year, the membership was questioning the need to put iron posts at the corners of MLLs, RECs or SMLs. It was commented on at the time that the twelve inch spikes or iron bars that were being used were adequate. He added that the changes went ahead anyway and as a result, those plans have to be registered at Land Titles and it has become an issue because there is a cost involved. Mr. Prevost felt that if the original recommendations of the majority were being followed, this would not be an issue in the first place.

Mr. Prevost went on to say that, years ago the membership was introduced to the DIDS system and some rapid reprogramming of computer and CAD systems had to take place so that the government could use the files to populate their systems, the cost of which was borne by the membership and its clients. Now that their might be some work that the government has to do, the costs are becoming apparent and it has become an issue.

Mr. Dupuis indicated that it was not too long ago that an iron spike was sufficient. He added that the membership’s clients are questioning costs. Mr. Dupuis went on to say that he believed the theory that the oil companies can pick up the costs and the government can’t is not necessarily the right mentality as it is the public that the profession is serving; not special interest groups.

Mr. Green questioned the extra cost of $1,735 per plan and asked for an explanation.

Mr. Allred stated that it appeared to him that the issue is a debate over monumentation versus plans. He reflected on a former position that he held at an oil company many years ago, that he was amazed and disappointed at the number of repositories that had to be visited to get plans registered.
Allred added that the same problem appears to exist today and wondered what the benefit is of registering some of the plans at Land Titles or what is the benefit of having a public lands system. He suggested that there should be one system for registration of all lands (Crown and freehold). Mr. Allred went on to say that perhaps the debate should centre around improving the whole system rather than trying to repair small problems, which was done with monumentation, to create a bigger problem.

Mr. Jeschke expressed concern that as the Crown that does hold title to land, which falls under the Land Titles system, if we only register with one system, then there will have to be two separate registries with two different directions. He went on to say that Land Titles’ jurisdiction is titled territory. In unsurveyed territory that is outside of Land Titles’ jurisdiction, he agreed that it would be enough to register the plans with Public Lands. Mr. Jeschke did not feel that both should be done on titled land as it does not serve the best interest of the public.

President Wallace adjourned the meeting in favor of an open forum session and until the next day, Saturday, April 26th at 9:00 a.m.

President Wallace brought the meeting back to order at 9:00 a.m. by reminding the members that new business motions must be in writing and signed by a mover and a seconder.

Mr. Allred, recently elected MLA for St. Albert, brought greetings from the government of Alberta as follows:

It is my privilege and pleasure to bring you greetings on behalf of Premier Ed Stelmach and my colleagues in the legislative assembly.

Just as an aside, I would like to congratulate you, President Bob, on the decorum and order that you are maintaining in this assembly. You should come and set an example for our assembly. It is certainly much different in the legislature.

As well as bringing greetings from my colleagues in the legislative assembly, I would like to thank the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association as I regard you as my second constituency. I’d like to give a special thanks to all those members of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association who were so generous in contributing to my campaign. That was truly appreciated. An extra special thanks to John Stephens who so willingly offered to assist in our fundraising efforts.
I don’t think I really need to say how highly I regard the membership of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and the Association itself. I’ve always enjoyed working with you and for you, over the years and I hope to continue to do so, albeit in a slightly different capacity. Although you will note, I have a contingency plan as I was successful last night in winning the bid for the T1A.

I’d like to invite each and every one of you to come down to the legislative assembly and I will personally and proudly introduce you to the assembly. That is a regular ritual at 1:30 p.m. at every day of the sitting and I would be very pleased and honoured to be able to introduce any one of you or a group of you.

I’d also invite you individually, and as an association, to submit information on important events to the surveying profession in the coming years so that I may announce to the public, those events in the assembly. As an example, we have a wonderful display and a wonderful program going on with the David Thompson Bicentennial and there will be a number of events relating to that bicentennial in the coming years. I especially want Monroe Kinloch to keep me apprised of important events and dates in the David Thompson Bicentennial celebrations so that they can be announced in the legislature as well and recorded for prosperity in Hansard. This is probably one of our greatest opportunities as a profession to publicize the land surveying profession. I’ve always said our problem is that we don’t have a bad image, we just don’t have an image. We have a great opportunity in this bicentennial year to publicize the greatest surveyor that Canada has ever known.

I’m advised that in the 103 years since the birth of Alberta as a province, there have only been 791 members elected to the Alberta legislature. I find it to be an interesting parallel that, since the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association was incorporated by the passing of the first Land Surveyors Act in 1910, there have only been 798 members commissioned as Alberta Land Surveyors.

As near as my research has been able to determine, I’m only the second member of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association to be elected to the Alberta legislature. I follow in the footsteps of Jean Leon Cote who was Alberta Land Surveyor #8 and served in the Alberta legislature from 1909 until 1923 when he became a senator. I am certain that he is the father of the Land Surveyors Act and the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. You will recall meeting his grandson and namesake, his Honor J.L. Cote, Justice of the Alberta Court of Appeal who spoke to our ethics seminar in Jasper two years ago.
I know I have large shoes to fill in following in J.L.’s footsteps. In the true tradition of a land surveyor, I will do my best to retrace the original boundaries set by the Honorable J.L. C^[J near the turn of the century.

Mr. Wallace called upon Executive Director Brian Munday to conduct the elections in the absence of Registrar Dave McWilliam. He asked that currently serving Council members at the head table join the assembly.

Mr. Munday announced that Mr. McWilliam had appointed the following newly commissioned Alberta Land Surveyors to act as scrutineers: J.A. (Jeffrey) Adair, R.T. (Ralph) Bode, J.D. (Jeremy) Howden, R.P. (Ryan) McMahon, M.A. (Michael) Thompson.

The assembly was advised that the Nominating Committee put forward the name of R.O. (Ron) Hall for the position of president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2008-2009.

Mr. Munday asked for any further nominations.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Jaques, seconded by Mr. Pals, that nominations for the position of president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2008-2009 cease.*

**Motion Carried**

The assembly applauded Mr. Hall as the ALSA president for 2008-2009.

Mr. Munday announced that the Nominating Committee put forward the following names for the position of vice-president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2008-2009: D.R. (Don) George; T.W. (Terry) Hudema.

Mr. Munday asked for further nominations from the floor for the position of vice president for 2008-2009.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Rob Scott, seconded by Mr. Rasmussen, that nominations for the position of vice president of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2008-2009 cease.*

**Motion Carried**

Messrs. George and Hudema addressed the membership.
Mr. Munday announced that there were four nominations for the positions of councillor of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2009-2010 as follows: J. (John) Haggerty, J.I. (Jim) Maidment; J.J. (John) Matthyssen; C.R. (Connie) Petersen.

Mr. Munday asked for further nominations from the floor for the position of councillor for 2008-2010.

It was MOVED by Mr. Hagen, seconded by Mr. Marquardt, that nominations for the position of councillor of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for 2008-2010 cease.

Motion Carried

Mr. Munday invited the candidates to address the assembly.

The assembly was advised that only active and honorary life members may vote and called upon scrutineers to collect the ballots.

Mr. Wallace resumed the chair by congratulating Mr. Hall and asked Council to resume their positions at the head table.

Dr. Nasir El-Sheimy from the University of Calgary addressed the assembly as follows:

It is a great honour to be here for the second year in a row in my capacity of the head of the Department to share with you some of our news and also to listen to some of your recommendations and suggestions on how to improve our program in order to serve the Association in a much better way.

You recall from my presentation last year, Stephen Green and Janet MacPhee gave us a generous gift for establishing a $50,000 endowment, another $50,000 for helping our students in the survey camp and $100,000 for renovating our students’ home room. This year we will have the official opening of the 3rd and 4th year home rooms during the summer.

I spent almost the first six months of my position hiring six new faculty members as well as having another one starting in May 2008. The new faculty members are: Jeong Kim, Earth Observation specifically in the area of Geodesy; Xin Wang and Steve Liang in the area of Geospatial Information Systems; Andrew Hunter in the area of Cadastral Land Tenure; Derek Lichti in Medical Imaging and Biometeorology and Mark Petovello in the area of Global Navigation Sys-
tems. We will be hiring a new faculty member in May 2008 in the area of Energy and Environment. The Department will then have twenty members and will be considered one of the largest geomatics programs worldwide.

The Department spent about six months in 2008 in developing a five-year plan for the Department. One of the first initiatives was to de-map the Department’s research areas into four areas to reflect our expertise as follows: Positioning and Navigation, Earth Observation, GIS & Land Tenure and Digital Imaging. We will be sharing the progress reports and a summary of the five-year plan with your Council.

This is the first year the Department will graduate over fifty graduates. It is expected that this number will remain at fifty plus, given the fact that the enrolment quote has been raised from fifty to fifty-five. Many of our graduates this year already have offers in the area of land surveying.

The surveying stream in our Department is currently an extremely popular choice for the students. This is evident from the number of students taking the technical elective courses. For example, thirty-two out of the fifty-two students this year, signed up for the ENGO 579 which is Survey Law and Practice, thirty-one students signed up for the Land Use Planning Course and nineteen students signed up for the High Precision Surveying Course.

Recognizing again, the importance of the land surveying stream in our Department as part of our five-year plan, we have looked at the undergraduate program and, in consultation with some members of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association, came up with two new courses which would be of benefit to our students. ENG 103 Survey Block Week Course will be offered at the end of August/early September every year to incoming third year students. The second course which is called Geodetic and Engineering Survey Course will be offered in the third year. Typically, the undergraduate curriculum has only one course in the second year with most of the other courses in the fourth year. There was no surveying course in between except for the survey camp. With the addition of these courses, we anticipate that students interested in surveying would be taking courses in second, third and fourth years. The High Precision Surveying course would become a genuine technical elective course.

The survey camp is one of the most important components of our program. This year, again, we have a very large group of fifty-two students taking the camp which is normally held in the Kananaskis Valley. One of the important components of the camp, which I would like to thank the members of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for, is the one and half-day technical lecture session for the third year students.
I would like to thank Victor Hut specifically for taking the lead in putting the lectures together and inviting members of land surveying associations to contribute to these lectures.

The graduate program continues to grow. One of the important components of the graduate program is the international lecture series. For this series, which is typically offered in the spring and summer for two weeks, we invite international experts in areas that we do not cover in the Department. I would like to invite members of the land surveying associations, Alberta specifically, to recommend any courses that we can support at the Department.

Recognizing the importance of the cadastral research area in our Department and the fact that it is difficult to obtain funding for research through the normal channels, Alberta Land Surveyors have been very generous in offering funding for the Department. Over the last two years, the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association provided $60,000 for funding and research in the area of land tenure and cadastre. This fund has been tremendously helpful for the Department in recruiting and supporting graduate students who work in the area of organizing issues and physical cadastral systems and mathematical modelling for physical cadastres. The money also supported the development of database structure software that incorporates multimedia data and serves a range of different applications. Dr. Barry is the main beneficiary of this fund and he has been contributing a number of articles to ALS News.

A new chair position has been established in the Department. Recognizing the immeasurable value of research and development in the area of land cadastre and tenure, John Holmlund has provided the Department with a $500,000 gift over the next five years for the establishment of the John Holmlund Chair in Land Tenure and Cadastral Systems. To my knowledge, this is the largest gift ever given to the Department and I am confident that this is the first chair in the world in the area of land tenure and cadastre. The Chair will be extremely significant, not only for the Department, but it is unique in Canada and the world to promote the Department as a centre of excellence and research in the area of land tenure and cadastre. I am pleased to also announce that, in consultation with Mr. Holmlund, Dr. Michael Barry will be taking the position of Chair. Congratulations Mike and we look forward to you and John working together over the next five years to promote, not only the University of Calgary, but Alberta as a centre of excellence in land tenure and cadastral systems.

The second great opportunity that the Department is working on is the establishment of an ingenuity centre...
on integrated resource management. We have been working in cooperation with the University of Alberta, the University of Lethbridge and the Alberta Information Communication and Technology Institute in putting together a proposal for funding from Alberta Ingenuity.

Alberta Ingenuity is a not-for-profit organization which has an $800 million endowment for supporting research in Alberta. The area that we are targeting is integrated resource management. We submitted a letter of intent last January and have been short-listed. The decision of Alberta Ingenuity will be in August. If successful, Alberta Ingenuity will provide approximately $1 to $2.5 million per year for five years with an opportunity to renew for another ten years. Alberta Ingenuity seeks matching funds from industry and government and I am also glad to announce that the Alberta government, through a consortium, has committed to provide approximately $1 million per year. The centre’s research and development vision targets three sectors: forestry and agriculture, energy and environment and water resources. The three technology areas will be earth observation, GIS and allocation of navigational sensors. The overall idea is to be able to observe, monitor, forecast and manage Alberta’s resources. The proposal for the centre will include education and training. For example, we will be proposing professional development courses in a number of areas. We would like input from the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association on areas you would like to see in this training program. Another activity for the centre will be partnership and services where the user community, development companies and the universities are encouraged to work together for a larger initiative beyond the centre activities. The details of the partnership and educational training will be in the proposal and we will be in a position to share that with the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association once it is ready. We are still seeking partnership from the geomatics and land surveying firms within Alberta to assist in the funding in the amount of $1 million. We have put forward a draft of a number of partnership models. We expect to have a number of partners at different levels. The first level is called founders. A founder is expected to contribute to the centre in the order of $150,000 per year for five years. A builder is expected to contribute $100,000 per year for five years and a sponsor is at the level of $15,000 for five years. There is definitely a return in investment for each level. As an example, returns could result in joining a number of development projects or a number of commercialization activities within the centre.

Parallel to this, the Alberta government, through a much larger initiative, Integrated Resource Management, is work-
ing on the development of the Geomatics Product Commercialization Centre (GPCC). This centre will be much larger than the research and development centre and the objective of the GPCC is to take the development and prototypes to the market. At this level, partners with our centre will have the first opportunity to gain from the fund allocated for the GPCC.

We are currently proposing a number of different levels for research and development. The strategic level includes five-year projects. Although there is a five-year timeline, this level would be expected to have an outcome on a yearly basis. There also also two very interesting programs. The first one is called the idea to implementation program which will be initiated by industry. This program is a two-year program with the first year being the concept year and the second being the implementation year. After that any implementation will be taken to the product commercialization centre.

We would be allocating about twenty percent of the centre fund for industry/government-initiated projects. These are projects that will be brought forward by partners of the centre and will also encourage government and industry to work with researchers within the three universities on an idea. There could also be small projects for the development of guidelines in certain areas, development of best practice documents in certain areas, and so on. There is no limit put on the industry and government-initiative project. It can be one month, three months or five years. The proposal is due by May 26th to Alberta Ingenuity. We expect to hear back by the end of August or early September.

We would be more than happy to discuss with your Council what major challenges the centre might address for ALSA and how might the ALSA and its membership wish to participate in the centre.

On behalf of the Department, I would like to thank the ALSA and its members for their continuing support, specifically in our undergraduate and graduate programs. I would also like to thank the ALSA members that contribute to the survey camp and hope they will participate again in future years. I would again like to extend special thanks to John Holmlund for his generous gift to the Department.

Executive Director Brian Munday congratulated newly elected Council members John Haggerty, Jim Maidment and Connie Petersen. He also informed the assembly that Don George was successful in his bid for vice-president.
The assembly offered a round of applause for the successful candidates.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Michael Thompson, seconded by Mr. Adair, that the election ballots be destroyed.*

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Dwayne Westacott, ALS delivered the following greeting from the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology.

I’d like to thank the membership, Council and the Association Staff for giving me the opportunity to speak today. The Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT) has been producing surveying technologists or, the new phrase, geomatics engineering technologists, since 1963.

We feel that the Association and our program maintain an excellent relationship. The Association does many things to enhance our program such as scholarships, provision of staff to help in our courses and supplying students with copies of *ALS News*. The students are delighted when they receive their copy. All of your contributions promote interest in the Association and keep our students abreast of Association activities. Your help does not go without notice. Thank you.

NAIT’s Geomatics Engineering Technology program is nationally accredited via the Canadian Technology Accreditation Board (CTAB). We’ve offered Basis Survey Calculation, Basic Total Station, Introduction to Land Titles, Survey Law, Cadastral Studies and Land Information System courses on weekends and evenings via continuing education. Many students use these courses to help them with the Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors (CBEPS) exams. A number of our students wrote CBEPS exams in an effort to become Alberta Land Surveyors.

Presently, there are four instructors in our program. The enrolment has decreased a bit this year. Twenty-one students began first year and we expect twenty to graduate this spring. This academic year, forty-six scholarships and awards totaling $28,700 were awarded to Geomatics Engineering Technology students and the Association, of course, has provided some of those scholarships and awards. Once again, our program continues to receive a generous, no charge donation of Leica System 12000 Dual System Geodetic Grade Real Time Kinematic Receivers from Spatial Technologies Inc. The no-cost RTK corrections have been provided by Pleiades Data Corp. and by the MMM Geomatics Alberta Limited Edmonton base station.

An hour is set aside each week for our industry meet and greet. It is a great way for industry and students to make con-
tact. If you would like the opportunity to meet our students, simply get in touch with our office and a time will be set for you. Students, staff and industry also get together at what has become an annual golf tournament. We all appreciate the generous donations that have been provided to help the students make this a huge success.

There has been 100% employment for our students for as long as I can remember. The wages continue to be above average and this speaks volumes for our program and our profession.

President Wallace indicated that at last year’s Annual General Meeting, Larry Pals presented some information about TILMA, the Trade Investment and Labour Mobility Agreement. He went on to say that, since then, representatives from the Alberta and British Columbia associations met to work out an agreement. Mr. Wallace added that it was his understanding that the land surveying profession is one of the first professions to come to an agreement under TILMA. He asked for one of the Alberta Land Surveyors that worked on TILMA to make a presentation to the assembly on what the agreement is all about.

Mr. Pals addressed the membership as follows:

On April 28, 2006, the governments of Alberta and British Columbia signed the TILMA. It came into effect on April 1, 2007 and is to be fully implemented by April 1, 2009. It is a comprehensive agreement that will eliminate most barriers to trade, investment or labour mobility between the two provinces.

Currently, more than 60 occupations have been identified as having different standards that limit labour mobility between the two provinces. British Columbia and Alberta are to work with occupational regulators to reconcile these standards by April 1, 2009. An omnibus bill, that will amend provincial legislation as required to make it compliant with TILMA, has been introduced into the legislature in Alberta and has received first reading.

Any professional regulatory organization (PRO) whose practices are inconsistent with the terms of the agreement may maintain their practices if they can demonstrate that the scope of practice or occupational standard difference is necessary to achieve a legitimate objective such as the protection of health or the environment.

Dispute resolution is expected to be quick, accessible and enforceable. TILMA allows a monetary reward of up to $5 million to be issued if it is determined that a party (Govern-
ment of Alberta or Government of British Columbia) has not complied with the dispute resolution panel’s report. Unlike the Agreement on Internal Trade, an individual can launch a dispute directly.

TILMA has been very well received by the general public and other governments across Canada. It has actively been promoted as a model for the next generation of trade agreements. Media coverage and government promotion in BC and Alberta has created high expectations for immediate results.

Land surveyors are listed in Part VI (Transitional Measures) as a profession or occupation in which both the Alberta and British Columbia professional regulatory organizations (ie: ALSA and ABCLS) require additional examinations and practical training. Representatives from both the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association and the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors met over the last year to learn more about each other’s systems of survey and registration processes and how we can meet our obligations under TILMA.

The ALSA and ABCLS have agreed that:

• A land surveyor from the other jurisdiction be required to pass one professional jurisdictional examination covering jurisdiction-specific matters currently contained in the existing professional examinations.

• The jurisdictional examination be no longer than approximately half a day and shall be offered within five business days of the host association receiving an application.

• If a candidate does not receive a pass mark in the written jurisdictional examination, the host association may require the candidate to wait a period of time before attempting the examination again. The waiting period shall not exceed 30 calendar days.

• Articling time, oral qualifying examinations, project reports are not required.

• There is a need to investigate computer-based examinations.

• The TILMA Mutual Recognition Document comes into force January 1, 2009.

Mr. Pals welcomed any questions or comments from the assembly.

Honorary Life Member Jack Webb asked why the Saskatchewan and Manitoba governments did not agree to TILMA even though the associations in those provinces were willing to be part of it.
Mr. Pals felt that it might be a protectionist issue. He added that the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association is more than interested in how TILMA will work.

Dale Rosnes, President of the Saskatchewan Land Surveyors’ Association advised that the members voted unanimously in favour of joining TILMA. He went on to say that since that time, the government of Saskatchewan has announced that they are against the initiative. Mr. Rosnes continued by indicating that one option may be to form an agreement outside of TILMA.

Wilson Phillips, President of the Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors commented that Manitoba is working towards making labor mobility more formal. The government of Manitoba has made the comment, “be careful what you wish for” regarding TILMA when first approached.

Mr. Phillips indicated that the provincial land surveying acts for the four western provinces are very similar in that land surveyors are licensed to perform cadastral surveys only for the betterment of the public. He found it disconcerting that the membership in Alberta speak about how well their Association served them with only one person speaking about serving the public.

Mr. Phillips continued by stating that the bigger issue in TILMA is not labour mobility investment. He added that as far as moving towards signing on to TILMA, he could not speak for the government of Manitoba. Mr. Phillips indicated that, in Manitoba, the move is towards a more open process where if a land surveyor from Alberta wants to come to Manitoba, that would be encouraged. He asked how the TILMA protects the public. Mr. Phillips asked if a BC surveyor wants to become an Alberta Land Surveyor and keeps failing the exam, will that person be allowed to write the exam an unlimited amount of times. In reference to survey review departments, he asked what happens to a member’s license if a discipline case occurs; do they lose their license in only one province or in all? Mr. Phillips also asked what happens with corporate structures. He felt unsure that the members in Alberta were adequately informed respecting the questions asked.

Mr. Pals responded that the TILMA agreement allows a candidate to write the exam as often as requested. He added that with respect to the discipline question, if a practitioner does a poor job in Alberta, that practitioner will be disciplined in Alberta only.
Mr. Neil Bennett, President of the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors, commented that BC is looking forward to the TILMA coming into effect. He acknowledged that there are some issues that BC is still struggling with such as corporate ownership.

BC Registrar Chuck Salmon, indicated that the government of BC felt that the issue of corporate ownership could be dealt with through a legislative amendment if necessary. He added that the reality is that, if a firm from Alberta wants to become a firm in BC, they have to be 100% owned by BC land surveyors. Mr. Salmon went on to say that there are partnership agreements between BC and Alberta land surveying firms.

Mr. Allred announced that Bill 1, The Trade Investment and Labor Mobility Agreement Implementation Statutes Amendment Act. He continued by stating that it does not address any professional associations at this time. Mr. Allred further advised that the implementation date for the total package is April 1, 2009.

Mr. Allred commented that the four western provinces began working towards TILMA in approximately 1977 when the Western Canadian Board of Examiners was formed. He went on to say that he felt there has been even more progress through the CCLS reciprocity policy, accreditation and CBEPS. Mr. Allred felt that there has been a steady move towards the implementation of the TILMA, particularly in the four western provinces.

Mr. Allred indicated that it has been his concern that the profession may be moving towards the lowest common denominator. He further indicated that, in the background documentation for Bill 1, that question is answered, in that it states that Alberta and BC are to work towards sustainable and high standards.

Mr. Wallace commented that during his travels in the past year, BC Past President Joe Johnson and he have been called upon many times to provide their respective province’s perspective of the TILMA. The message that he and Mr. Johnson tried to pass along to other provinces was that they start to consider the agreement. Mr. Wallace added that Alberta and BC have embraced the change as a positive move forward. He conceded that there are still many questions to be answered and a lot of testing that still has to be done.

President Wallace asked President Neil Bennet from the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors and the
TILMA Working Group representatives from Alberta (Bruce Beairsto, Larry Pals, Rob Scott) and British Columbia (Chuck Salmon and Geoff Hobbs) to participate in the signing of the agreement which took place at the front of the meeting room.

Paul Jennings from the Southern Institute of Technology addressed the membership as follows:

Most of you don’t know me. I am the new academic at SAIT for the geomatics program.

Currently, SAIT offers three levels of geomatics training. Our most famous one is the Geomatics Engineering Technology Diploma. That program has recently expanded to meet not only applicants’ demands, but industry’s demands as well, for survey technologists. We currently have the capability of training 120 geomatics technologists. We have an intake of 64 students in the first year. The current class is just under 100 students. There were a number of students who did not show up for the term even though they had paid deposits.

SAIT also has an applied degree program in GIS which is a natural transition from the two-year diploma program. It is a post-diploma degree and open to any student with a diploma in geomatics, geography, business or computer science. It is more of an application of GIS; how can you become better at your profession with an applied degree in GIS. This program is popular and has expanded to two classes of 24 students. The program is also available completely online. The full applied degree is available through distance learning and can be done from anywhere in the world. We also have some survey certificate courses in our continuing education department. There are six or seven credit courses which include an option of field work, survey certificate or a drafting survey certificate. These are popular with field staff who are looking to make a transition into the office from the field or for survey assistants who are looking to upgrade to being a junior party chief.

With SAIT’s recent expansion, faculty has increased to seven full-time faculty in the geomatics program. There is one Alberta Land Surveyor on staff, one professional engineer, one holding a masters degree in science and one PhD, graduate from the University of Calgary. Of the seven full-time faculty, four are SAIT alumni. The instructor not only teaches to the geomatics program but also to many other faculties at SAIT Polytechnic whether it be land surveying or GIS classes, remote sensing courses, civil engineering, architectural technology, environmental technology, engineer-
ing design and drafting and our Bachelor of Applied GIS. This has allowed SAIT to collect experts in certain fields.

Also, with the expansion, some very large capital investments have been made in equipment in order to handle all of the students. Currently, SAIT has eight Leica High Precision Total Stations which are exclusively used by the Geomatics Program so we can teach the control survey, one-second accuracy skills needed by our students. We also have thirteen Leica construction-grade total stations which we use for most of our related subject courses such as our introduction field work courses. The operation is a bit easier, but the students get the theory behind using total stations and doing angular measurements without having to jeopardize our high-end Total One Series instruments.

GPS is also very popular, so SAIT has finally upgraded its GPS capabilities with some substantial donations from both Spatial Technologies and Butler Survey Supplies. SAIT currently has two permanent reference stations on the roof at campus, broadcasting real-time corrections both through UHF radio and through GSM capabilities as well. SAIT also has eight RTK Rovers and by the end of the month should have twelve new Leica Smart Series Smart Rovers. The increasing amount of equipment is allowing SAIT to decrease the number of students in our field classes with the goal to have GPS students working in groups of two instead of three. The field classes are capped at 24 students.

SAIT also has 28 Single Frequency Static Receivers. As part of the control surveys accreditation, students are taught network design and surveying. This allows us to send the students across central Calgary to find ASCMs and do large-scale control network surveys.

In my new position, one of the things on the immediate horizon is redeveloping the curriculum. The graduates this months will be the last ones to go through the old curriculum. The current first-year students are going through the new curriculum. The two main features were to advance when technology gets introduced to the students. Digital drafting, Autocad and Introductory GPS RTK have been moved into the first semester.

It was recently announced that SAIT will be receiving funding to renovate the survey area as some of the classrooms date back to 1967. Our survey crib is going to be expanded to accommodate all of our new GPS equipment and new total stations. We are also looking to hire an equipment technologist and perhaps upgrade the position to include a technical support as well.

With respect to CBEPS accreditation, SAIT has two options in the diploma program: mapping or surveying. Both
courses are accredited and receive exemption from four of the CBEPS examinations. SAIT is reapplying under its new curriculum to hopefully get more CBEPS credits or at least to renew the four that it currently has.

SAIT has been working closely with ASSMT in marketing surveying and mapping technology as a career choice for high school students. We have been setting up joint booths with ASSMT at trade shows in Lethbridge, Red Deer and Calgary in an effort to promote the industry from a technologist’s points of view.

SAIT is very big on e-learning. We currently have 20% of the courses in the diploma program through e-learning as well as our complete GIS Degree. SAIT is also looking to add some of its more surveying-specific courses as e-learning options.

I’m here to invite you to get involved with SAIT. We are also interested in re-engaging some of our alumni and hosting some events this summer. You should expect to get an invitation to an alumni event on campus where we will have participation by industry, new and current students and recent graduates. The program at SAIT has been around since 1912 in one form or another. It hasn’t been continuously in operation as it closed and became a military training school for a while, but in some shape or form, surveying has been taught at SAIT since 1912.

We have had the pleasure this year of many of your colleagues assisting from the instructional side. Just as you are having trouble hiring employees, we are have a difficult time hiring instructors. Raymac Surveys and Focus have helped us out this year by allowing some of their ALS members to do substitute instructing for some of our courses. The students really appreciated having that connection. If anyone is interested in being an instructor or conducting a seminar on new technology, you would be welcome at SAIT.

Recruiting has become a large issue with the students. As of last year we had to start limiting the recruiting sessions because it was becoming too much of a burden. If you are looking to recruit students, we have set up some scheduling. Recruiting events are restricted to two per week during the semester because it was getting to be too onerous for the students to show up three or four times a week for events. SAIT still has a once a year industry night organized by the Students’ Geomatics Club which you are all openly invited to attend. It is very popular to have the individual sessions as well from many of the larger firms.

SAIT doubled the size of its program but the number of scholarships have not been increased. If any of you have any interests or ideas as far as a legacy goes for SAIT for pro-
moting your firm, we would be happy to accommodate you. We do currently give out six to eight scholarships per year in the program of which ALSA is one of the major donors.

I invite you to contact me if you have any questions, any concerns about the program, or ideas on how we can do better. We do have an industry advisory committee if anyone is interested in getting involved.

Mr. Allred referred to the degree program in GIS and that there were a number of streams a student could enter into it from; one being business administration. He referenced an article in the *Professional Surveyor* titled “GIS - The Greater Extent - Redefining Who We are” which commented on some of the different streams into GIS among which is land surveying and GPS. Mr. Allred expected that a student coming from a business administration stream might be delinquent in those areas. He asked what the program has to ensure that those students get the right type of core knowledge.

Mr. Jenning responded that the program is set up more as a GIS user degree which is meant to attract candidates from forestry, the environment and business who are already using geography or geographics or geospatial data in their day-to-day work to augment those capabilities. He suggested that the mapping diploma stream teaches students how to build GIS; the GIS degree teaches students how to use GIS.

Mr. Allred continued by stating that the key focus of the article he referred to was the misuse of GIS information by people that do not understand the fundamentals.

Mr. Jennings responded that students would get introduced to coordinate systems and projections to avoid some of those common problems that occur in the GIS world. He added that because it is an applied degree, it is only eight months of full-time school with a one-year practicum.

Mr. Partridge commented that this is a prime opportunity for members to participate in the process. He indicated that he was fortunate to do that with Mr. Jennings in the past year with support from Focus. Mr. Partridge urged members to consider contacting Mr. Jennings to find out how they can assist with the process.

Mr. Jennings added that any assistance would be welcome and that it does not have to be a huge commitment; even assisting or substitute teaching for one or two classes would be great to give some industry feedback to the students.
President Wallace pointed out to that earlier in the business meeting, Director of Surveys Mike Michaud alluded to the fact that Council had endorsed monumentation. He went on to say that that was not the case and that Council has passed the monumentation issue on to the Standards Committee for more work.

It was MOVED by Mr. Pinkerton, seconded by Mr. George, that a new Part D, Section 1.6 be created in the Manual of Standard Practice as follows:

**Digital Submissions to LTO and Public Lands**

1.6 For surveys using satellite positioning or surveys tied to survey control markers, the practitioner must do one OR both of the following when submitting digital CAD files to LTO or Public Lands:

1. Submit a CAD file, based on observations from satellite positioning or observations to survey control, which is in one of the accepted mapping planes (3TM, UTM, or 10TM).

2. Submit an ASCII (text) file containing the grid coordinates of all the found and re-established monuments and survey control markers measured in the survey. The aforementioned grid coordinates will be based on observations from satellite positioning or observations to survey control and will be in one of the accepted mapping planes (3TM, UTM, or 10TM).

---

**Motion Tabled**

Mr. Pinkerton advised that Council directed the Standards Committee to look into the issue of digital submissions to Land Titles and Public Lands after the Director of Surveys brought it forward as a new business item at a Council meeting. He went on to explain that the recommendation only affects surveys that are performed with satellite positioning techniques or where the survey has tied into survey control markers. The recommendation does not affect existing requirements for survey integration. Mr. Pinkerton further advised that the recommendation requires that surveyors submit either a CAD file in one of the accepted provincial mapping planes (3TM, UTM, 10TM) or to submit an ASCII file containing the found and re-established monuments/coordinates associated with the survey.

Mr. Pinkerton went on to advise that the intent of the recommendation is to improve the level of mapping accuracy in Alberta. He also advised that both the City of Edmonton and Martin, Newby were contacted and their reactions were fa-
favourable. Mr. Pinkerton indicated that costs associated with
digital submission was brought up at the regional meetings.
He added that the Standards Committee debated the issue
extensively and realized that there will be costs and time
associated with the implementation of digital submissions,
however, it was felt that it was well warranted.

Mr. Hagen felt that digital submissions would add much time
and effort and extra cost to clients and the public. He was
under the impression that the $100 for digital mapping was
so that that information would be inserted into a database.
Mr. Hagen felt it was an example of government trying to
download the costs to the land surveyors and their clients.

Mr. Green felt it was a good idea but wondered whether the
recommendation needed more work as there seemed to be
some things missing, such as RTK.

Dr. Barry indicated that since 1937 in South Africa, any ru-
ral survey is tied to geodetic control. Beginning in the 1990s,
everything had to be tied to coordinates. Dr. Barry indicated
that it does add cost initially, but eventually, when the evi-
dence of coordinates of other monuments have been fixed
to control points and you have the control point coordinate
at a particular time, that can be used as evidence in a survey
without having to explore it. He added that it provides the
integrated survey and evidence and is a major advantage in
terms of the precision of the survey. Dr. Barry felt that it was
an incremental process and the technology now makes it a
lot easier.

Dr. Radovanovic indicated that he did not disagree with the
concept of the proposal but did not feel that the recommen-
dation was ready. He indicated that it does not specify that
currently, CAD files are submitted to Public Lands and CAD
files that may not necessarily be rotated are submitted to
Land Titles. Dr. Radovanovic asked that if the recommenda-
tion passes, would a different CAD file be required for sub-
mission? He pointed out that there is the option to not send a
CAD file at all but to send an ASCII file.

Mr. Amundrud pointed out that, for a number of years, the
profession has been integrating surveys to survey control
monuments. For the smaller municipal firms, staff is geared
toward working with ground coordinates. He added that he
was concerned about some of the problems those firms might
face in trying to implement the system. As GPS becomes
more prevalent, the change will end up happening but, Mr. Amundrud felt it was too soon right now.

Mr. Shuffletoski did not see how the recommendation was an issue for the Manual of Standard Practice and felt that it would fit better into the Land Titles Manual as it does not change the plan but how Land Titles receives the plan. Mr. Shuffletoski went on to say that he agreed that grid coordinates are important and can be used as survey evidence. He felt there were some issues as to what happens when the ASCII file of coordinates is sent to Land Titles and whether the file is available to other practitioners or whether Land Titles use it for their purposes and then destroys the coordinate list. Mr. Shuffletoski added that plans today are not representing the field work that is performed and just show the inverses of the coordinates obtained with GPS so why not put those coordinates on the plan and publish those as the plan.

Mr. Pinkerton indicated that the Standards Committee discussed the issue surrounding the transmission of the coordinate file and it is intended that it would go to SRD or to Land Titles and be stripped out. It would go directly to the mapping branch and not be available to the public.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Michaud, seconded by Mr. W.A. Martin, that Recommendation #6 be tabled.*

**Motion Carried**

The meeting was adjourned in favour of an unrecorded open forum session.

Upon resuming the meeting Mr. Wallace asked the assembly to join him in applauding all committee members who have put in a great deal of time and effort during the past year.

Mr. Wallace also thanked the Committee chairs and presented a small gift of thanks for their efforts over the past year as follows:

- Jerry Rasmuson—Boundary Panel
- John Wallace and Stephen Green—CAPP Liaisons
- Larry Pals—Canadian Board of Examiners for Professional Surveyors
- Stephen Green—DOS Review Committee
- Jeff Blatz—Future of the Association Committee
- Les Frederick—Historical & Biographical Committee
- Len Olson—Legislation Ad Hoc Committee
- Al Jamieson—Oil & Gas Ad Hoc
Blaine Benson—Practice Review Board
Courtney Tripp—Professional Development Committee
Lesley Ewoniak—Public Relations Committee
Rob Scott—Registration Committee
Barry Fleece—Safety Committee
Rob Pinkerton—Standards Committee

Mr. Wallace continued by presenting a small gift of appreciation to retiring Council members Bruce Beairsto, Tim Harding, Terry Hudema and Dirk VandenBrink.

The following returning Council members were also presented with a small gift of appreciation: Russ Barnes (public member), Bruce Gudim, Ron Hall, Rob Radovanovic and Brian Ross.

Incoming President Ron Hall was asked to take the Oath of Office as follows:

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

This function I will perform without affection, partiality, or prejudice to any member of this Association; or any member of the public. The importance of the rights of the public and minorities; and the protection of these rights; will always be considered paramount in all matters brought before me.

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

The retiring Council members were asked to step down and the newly elected Council members took their place.

All members of Council were asked to take the following Oath of Office:

I 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's Address

President Hall presented Mr. Wallace with the past president’s pin and plaque.

Mr. Wallace presented President Hall with the gavel.

President Ron Hall addressed the assembly as follows:

I am honoured to accept the responsibility of being your president. I do indeed, consider it a privilege and an honour. When one looks down the list of past presidents, it becomes very obvious that the standard has been set very high and I will give it my all to live up to the standard set by those that went before me and continue to represent your best interests and to represent this Association to the high level it has been represented in the past.

On this note, I would like to congratulate Bob on a year well done. At times, over the year, I know it was pretty stressful for Bob and there were occasions when the solutions and actions required did not seem that straightforward. I can assure you that Bob had the best interests of this Association and the public at large front and centre with all his dealings. He represented this Association in an honest and ethical way at all times. Thanks Bob.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the outgoing councillors Bruce Beairsto, Tim Harding and Terry Hudema who have given a lot of themselves on Council over the past year on your behalf. Congratulations to Dirk for being a free man until I find a committee for him (which I think I’ve already got sorted out). I would also like to congratulate the incoming councillors John Haggerty, Jim Maidment and Connie Petersen and Vice President Don George. I am looking forward to working with all of you along with the existing councillors over the next year. I know we will have many challenges but I have every confidence that we will all work together to represent the best interests of our Association and its members. Also, a special thanks to Terry Hudema and John Matthyssen who were willing to give back to this Association. It is greatly appreciated.

Congratulations to those members who have received their twenty-five year pins and especially those who received their fifty year pins. It is because of you and your contributions that we have such a great association and such a great profession.

To our new members (nineteen of them as I recall) who just received their certificates—congratulations and welcome to the Association. Also, welcome to the articled students here today. To both of these groups, please take notice of those members who just received their twenty-five and fifty year pins. Please congratulate them and thank them.
They all had a strong impact and influence on who we are today. You, in turn, are our future and do not take that lightly. It is a strong responsibility an obligation. We are not a membership of several thousand; we are several hundred. These few hundred have a significant impact on our society. With this comes responsibility. Please take that responsibility seriously. After what I have seen over the last couple of days, I am confident you will take that seriously and our future is in good hands.

On the whole, our profession on a national level is not quite so fortunate. Like Past President Bob, I believe we have an obligation to our peers across the country to provide leadership as we all work together for the good of our profession. We have seen the framework proposal from CCLS on a national surveyors’ initiative and I know Past President Bob and Dave McWilliam will represent us well at the national level as that framework evolves.

Our learned colleague from BC commented earlier that our profession is changing. I strongly believe this as well. I see this as an opportunity, not a challenge.

Along with the national body initiative, there are a number of other initiatives facing us that Council will have the obligation of reviewing over the next year. The Director of Practice Review and Systematic Practice Review (SPR) in general—where are we going with this? Where can we go? What does the membership want? I think we heard that fairly clearly yesterday. We saw a presentation on a survey that was done. I’d like to thank Paul Stoliker and the subgroup for that work. They did an excellent job on a very difficult task. I think the challenge now is to lay out a plan for the future. I heard clearly yesterday that the membership does indeed support practice review. It may need some tweaking and changes but I think we have been instructed to move ahead. That is what we will endeavour to do.

Related to this are ongoing discussions with the Director of Surveys and our Minister for funding for SPR and for working with government to better meet our statutory obligations or perhaps assisting in the Director’s duties. Over the past many years, we have been fortunate to have a very vibrant economy in Alberta which has allowed us to fund many things that we wanted to do. Will this vibrancy continue or are we entering a different stage? What changes may we have to make, if any? What services can we continue to offer?

Like many of you, I do not think we are on any kind of a critical point. We have had a couple of slow years but I don’t think there is any need to panic. However, I do think it is
only prudent to challenge the sustainability of our current model to ensure that we have sustainability for the future.

Speaking of sustainability, we had a couple of very significant events over the last couple of days—the MOU with ASSMT. The MOU is a first good start and now we have the challenge of determining how to best and effectively live up to our commitments under this MOU. We have signed the agreement with TILMA. I think there is still a lot of work to do with TILMA creating huge opportunities for membership on both sides of the Rockies. We will see where it goes from there with our brethren to the east.

These are just a few of the current issues that Council will be working on on your behalf and attempt to resolve over the next year. Please make your opinions on these issues and others known. We are here to represent you and we need to know what you want.

Over and above these issues, Council will continue to provide support and oversight to the Association administration who, I can tell you, perform an excellent service on your behalf. Council will also continue to improve upon existing systems and processes as directed by you or as brought to our attention.

One thing in particular that I would like to see improved over the next year and we will work diligently with Council in so doing, is the communication between Council and committees, especially the committee chairs. There were instances over the last year where we had mole hills turn into mountains over very simple lack of communication between Council and committees and extra efforts were exerted for no real reason. Communication through minutes alone is not sufficient. We need a better way. Committees perform a huge service on behalf of the members and they are the life-blood of our membership and our Association. Misaligned efforts, no matter how well intended, can be a waste of time and only go to creating hard feelings. This is easily avoidable and should not happen. President Bob made changes in the last year and I would like to continue on improving this. Therefore, I would like to ask Council and all the committee chairs to think about this over the next while and come to the Steering Committee with some recommendations for improvement.

It is interesting how the more things change, the more they also seem to stay the same. After reviewing the last several years of presidents’ addresses, it is interesting to see how, although the issues change or at least acquire new names, there always seems to be a list way too long of things that need to be addressed and initiatives that need to
be executed. Yet, each year, we seem to be fortunate to find enough volunteers willing to work hard to solve these issues. When you think of the many volunteers we have each and every year, ready and willing to give of themselves to keep our Association the best it can be, we are indeed extremely fortunate. To all those committee volunteers, thank you and please, everyone, consider volunteering for a committee. It is really how we get things done.

Lastly, I would like to say thank you to the excellent people that I work with. Without your support, I would not be able to take on this honour as your president. I am a very lucky man to be surrounded by people who have supported me all along and continue to support me both at home and at work.

Once again, thank you for the privilege of being your president for the upcoming 100th year.

President Hall announced the new business portion of the business meeting. He advised that new business recommendations must be in writing and signed by the mover and seconder. Mr. Hall continued by advising that 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 and it does not necessarily mean that the new business motion will be implemented by Council as new information may come forward.

It was MOVED by Mr. Maltais, seconded by Mr. Jeschke, that the ALSA contract with an experienced professional technical writer and editor who is familiar with the Alberta land surveying profession to edit, reformat, update, and maintain the Manual of Standard Practice.

Motion Carried

Mr. Maltais spoke to the motion by advising that, years ago the good practice resolutions eventually became a document called the Manual of Good Practice. He went on to say that approximately twenty years ago, a major rewrite/edit of the document was undertaken. At that time, the name was changed to the Manual of Standard Practice and it has grown in a hodge-podge manner as every year, passed recommendations are added to it. Mr. Maltais felt it was time that the entire document be edited. In addition, he felt that updates and changes need to be managed in a more diligent manner. Mr. Maltais indicated that some of the problems are:
Mr. Maltais felt that the document is very important to the members, has grown over the years and is really the bible of land surveying as less and less appears in the Act and more and more appears in the Manual.

Mr. Maltais went on to indicate that there will be a cost involved. He indicated that he had a professional editor look at the document who has provided an estimate of $12,000 to $20,000. Mr. Maltais indicated that the motion includes having the same editor manage updates to the Manual on a yearly basis.

Mr. Maltais added that one thing that came to his attention in Mr. Jardine’s letter, was that a statutory iron post is not defined in the Surveys Act. He pointed out that it was not defined in the Manual of Standard Practice either. There is a comment that appears to define a statutory iron post but it is not identified as such. Similarly there is a description of something that appears to be a standard post (some members call it a brass tablet or a brass cap) which is again not identified as such in the manual. Mr. Maltais felt that there were numerous problems with the Manual that could be cleaned up through the edit that he is recommending.

Mr. Pinkerton spoke in favour of the motion as he felt that the Manual has grown substantially. He commented that the Manual was written by land surveyors, not technical writers.
It was MOVED by Mr. Tripp, seconded by Mr. Fretwell, that is recommended that the Council of the ALSA include in the terms of reference (2008-2009) of the Professional Development Committee the development of a mandatory continuing education regime for presentation at the 100th AGM.

Motion Carried

Mr. Tripp spoke to the recommendation as he felt that there was quite a bit of support for mandatory continuing education and the timing is right as there are discussions going on about the redesign of the next phase of SPR. Mr. Tripp felt that the motion is designed to send a strong signal to Council and the Practice Review Board that the membership is willing to consider some sort of mandatory continuing education regime as the evolution of SPR moves forward. It would also send a strong signal to the public that the profession is in fact front and centre in the protection of their rights. As well, it would send a strong signal to other professions that the ALSA is deserving of the mandate it has been given.

Mr. Hagen commented that he was in favour of the motion but felt that it would be difficult to get something ready for a recommendation at the next AGM.

Mr. Fretwell advised that the intent was not to come up with a program by the next AGM but rather to move discussion along and ensure that it is on the agenda of the Professional Development Committee for the 2008-2009 year.

Mr. Fretwell felt that the motion speaks very highly of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association to ensure that the public is protected. He added that many other professional associations in North America already have such a program.

Mr. Holmlund commented that the issue of mandatory continuing education has come up at least twice and been defeated by the membership. He added that if the assembly supports the motion, any program that is developed has to be unique, in concert with SPR and needs to make sense. Mr. Holmlund did not feel that any real protection to the public will result if the Association develops a mandatory continuing education program just because other professions and associations offer it. He continued by stating that if the Committee comes up with something that actually does protect the public, he would support it.

Dr. Radovanovic spoke in favour of the motion and agreed with Mr. Holmlund that the Professional Development Com-
mittee has a good opportunity to do something significant with respect to mandatory continuing education.

Past President Wallace indicated that he has been in favour of some sort of continuing education for some time. He suggested that the Professional Development Committee present its ideas to regional meetings to gain input from the membership. Mr. Wallace continued by stating that perhaps that way a system could be developed that is truly Alberta-based and works for everyone.

Mr. Pals agreed with the philosophy of mandatory continuing education but felt that directing the motion to the Professional Development Committee may be premature. He felt that, in light of what may have to happen with SPR, the Association may have no choice but to develop continuing mandatory education.

President Hall commented that Council deals with recommendations from the Annual General Meeting in the best way it can on behalf of the membership. Council has the ability to direct the new business motion appropriately based on the feedback received from the membership.

Mr. Green suggested that the issue of a non-practicing category should be considered in discussions on the mandatory continuing education issue.

Mr. Kent Campbell, President of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors, indicated that the AOLS has been looking at mandatory continuing education for approximately five years. The AOLS still does not have a good feeling from its membership on the issue so implementation will not take place until next year. He went on to say that the AOLS has been dealing with some of the same concerns such as what do you do about members who are only professors and members that are not active? Other issues such as management of the program were also considered. Presently the AOLS has 800 members and a staff of five and to keep track of the members in the program is also onerous. Mr. Kent went on to say that the AOLS is putting the onus on the membership to keep track of what they do. These records could be part of evidence in the complaints or discipline process.

Mr. Campbell indicated that if the ALSA indeed goes ahead with developing a mandatory continuing education program, the AOLS would be pleased to provide the ALSA with some ideas and, as well, the AOLS is open to new ideas.
Mr. Wilson Phillips, President of the Association of Manitoba Land Surveyors, advised that the AMLS has had a voluntary professional development points system in place for approximately five years. This system will become mandatory in the very near future. Mr. Phillips added that after a presentation in Ontario that he attended, he suggested to the AMLS that it should be following the AOLS ideas because it has been well thought out. He went on to ask that if every association across Canada has to have a mandatory continuing education program, why is it not web-based? Why is it not run by CCLS? CCLS is supposed to be serving all of the associations across Canada. This would be a quick win for CCLS.

Ms. Marie Robidoux, President of the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors, advised that the ACLS program is voluntary. ACLS has a web-based program which is very easy to maintain and makes sense because ACLS has members all across Canada. She added that the ACLS is beginning to support web-based continuing education and hopes to have some courses available in the next year. Ms. Robidoux indicated that she belongs to another professional association in which mandatory continuing education is the norm. She commented that she fails to understand why mandatory continuing education is such a big issue because as professionals, there is a need to continually improve on techniques and business sense.

Mr. Neil Bennett, President of the Association of British Columbia Land Surveyors, commented that, at present, BC has a voluntary system and hopes that it will move towards a mandatory system in the future. He added that several issues that have come up at the ALSA meeting are exactly the same as what is being discussed in BC.

*It was MOVED by Mr. Fretwell, seconded by Mr. Tripp, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA in its negotiations with the government on the iron post levy ensures that there are adequate funds budgeted to maintain the calibration baselines.*

*Motion Carried*

Mr. Fretwell advised that the genesis for the recommendation is that Council, in its negotiations with the government, ensure that the Director of Surveys’ department has enough money to maintain the baselines in Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge and Grande Prairie. He added that, for a number of years the Calgary baseline has a “use at your own risk”
status. Four of the eight monuments are suspect at being in motion, yet, under the Surveys Act, land surveyors are required, by law, to calibrate equipment to the baseline established by the government. The Director of Surveys’ reason for not maintaining the baseline is budgetary.

It was MOVED by Mr. Miller, seconded by Dr. Radovanovic, that it is recommended that the Council of the ALSA create a category for non-practicing or “inactive” membership with separate annual dues.

Motion Carried

Mr. Miller indicated that he is personally applying for retired status in the Association because there is no other option for him as a stay-at-home dad and would like Council to consider creating a category for non-practicing or inactive membership with separate annual dues.

Ms. Marie Robidoux made the following remarks on behalf of all the visiting presidents:

I would like to thank the ALSA for an informative meeting and making us realize that we all face the same challenges across the Country.

I’d like to indicate to the ALSA that now Past-President Bob Wallace has been very active in all the meetings he attended. He has been very respectful of other’s opinions and has been very strong in his. He has contributed to the many presidents’ forums that he attended and was always mindful of the ALSA first.

Bob has also attended all social events. As the representative of the visiting presidents, I can assure you that we all have appreciated his contributions. I would like to thank Bob and Kathy for the extraordinary hospitality that was extended to us these last few days and I will leave you with these few words. After a very lengthy discussion, we, the visiting presidents, have made a decision. Out of respect for Bob’s family, we will not tell any stories.

Thank you.

President Ron Hall declared the 99th Annual General Meeting of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association closed at 4:01 p.m.
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REVIEW ENGAGEMENT REPORT

To the Members of
Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association

We have reviewed the statement of financial position of Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association as at April 30, 2007 and the statements of operations, changes in net assets and cash flows for the year then ended. Our review was made in accordance with Canadian generally accepted standards for review engagements and accordingly consisted primarily of enquiry, analytical procedures and discussion related to information supplied to us by the Association.

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

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

Edmonton, Alberta
July 9, 2007
Chartered Accountants
# STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION

(Unaudited)

**ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 30</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## ASSETS

### CURRENT ASSETS

- Cash and short-term investments--Note 3 $2,448,630 $1,921,107
- Accounts receivable 281,404 461,888
- Prepaid expenses--Note 4 40,212 47,215

**Total Current Assets** 2,770,246 2,430,210

### INVESTMENT IN RPR INDEX REVOLVING FUND--Note 5

- 0 599

### EQUIPMENT--Note 6

- 55,961 58,877

**Total Assets** 2,826,207 2,489,686

## LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

### CURRENT LIABILITIES

- Accounts payable and accrued liabilities $294,894 $23,500
- Goods and Services Tax payable 20,544 24,930
- Deferred contributions--Note 7 305,053 294,671

**Total Current Liabilities** 620,491 343,101

### DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENTS--Note 8

- 32,447 36,975

### DUE TO RPR INDEX REVOLVING FUND--Note 5

- 1,976 0

### NET ASSETS

- Invested in equipment 55,961 58,877
- Internally restricted 2,115,332 2,050,733

**Total Net Assets** 2,171,293 2,109,610

**Total Assets** 2,826,207 2,489,686

## LEASE COMMITMENTS--Note 9

(Approved by the Council)
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STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS
(Unaudited)
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION
Year Ended April 30, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2007</th>
<th>Budget 2007</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNRESTRICTED---General Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue--Schedule 1</td>
<td>$2,633,613</td>
<td>$2,550,721</td>
<td>$82,892</td>
<td>$2,901,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and levies</td>
<td>320,060</td>
<td>268,500</td>
<td>51,560</td>
<td>310,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublease</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>21,551</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>15,251</td>
<td>17,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on disposal of investments</td>
<td>10,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,384</td>
<td>3,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on disposal of equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,986,003</td>
<td>2,826,021</td>
<td>159,982</td>
<td>3,243,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council and Committees--Schedule 2</td>
<td>173,892</td>
<td>222,500</td>
<td>48,608</td>
<td>163,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic practice review--Schedule 3</td>
<td>378,849</td>
<td>388,953</td>
<td>10,104</td>
<td>360,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses--Schedule 4</td>
<td>555,377</td>
<td>571,161</td>
<td>15,784</td>
<td>482,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses--Schedule 5</td>
<td>1,701,741</td>
<td>1,630,428</td>
<td>(71,313)</td>
<td>1,803,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of equipment</td>
<td>4,451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4,451)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,814,310</td>
<td>2,813,042</td>
<td>(1,268)</td>
<td>2,810,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE (EXPENSES)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary recoveries</td>
<td>11,037</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary expenses</td>
<td>(26,704)</td>
<td>(26,142)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(20,051)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>(24,888)</td>
<td>(24,228)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Surveying in Alberta Publication Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book sales</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>37,266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book publishing expense</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(10,051)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Council of Land Surveyors Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>22,265</td>
<td>22,685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>(21,424)</td>
<td>(21,322)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Survey Textbook Fund</td>
<td>(36,352)</td>
<td>(22,903)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Centennial Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,273)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral Research Fund</td>
<td>(30,036)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>(1,368)</td>
<td>(861)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(107,285)</td>
<td>(67,880)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE OVER EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$64,408</td>
<td>$364,905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Statement of Changes in Net Assets
(Unaudited)

**Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association**

Year Ended April 30, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Description</th>
<th>Balance at Beginning of Year</th>
<th>Revenue (Under) Expenses</th>
<th>Net Additions to Equipment</th>
<th>Balance at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted - General Fund</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$198,402</td>
<td>$(23,793)</td>
<td>$(174,609)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invested in Equipment</strong></td>
<td>58,877</td>
<td>(26,709)</td>
<td>23,793</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internally Restricted - Note 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>1,512,448</td>
<td>(1,368)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Revolving Fund</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(15,667)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Public Relations Development Fund</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(24,888)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transfer and Education Fund</td>
<td>29,949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors’ Reserve Fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Surveying in Alberta</td>
<td>87,209</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(88,394)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Council of Land Surveyors Fund</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM Stabilization Fund</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Allowance Fund</td>
<td>5,357</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral Research Fund</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>(30,036)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100th Anniversary Project Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,050,733</td>
<td>(107,285)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Increase</strong></td>
<td>$2,109,610</td>
<td>$64,408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(2,725)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS
(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

Year Ended April 30
2007          2006

CASH PROVIDED BY (USED IN)

Operating activities:
Revenue over expenses                        $ 64,408   $ 364,905
Charges not affecting cash:
   Amortization                              22,258     19,352
   Amortization of deferred lease inducement   (4,528)    (3,772)
   Loss on disposal of equipment              4,451      0
   Gain on disposal of equipment              0         (3,469)
Net changes in non-cash working capital items--Note 11    464,877  (128,759)

Investing activities:
Proceeds on disposal of equipment            0         6,500
Purchase of equipment                        (23,793)  (15,941)
Investment in RPR Revolving Index Fund        (150)     (1,154)
                                                  (23,943)  (10,595)

Financing activity:
Lease inducement                             0         6,791

CASH INCREASE

527,523                                          244,453

Cash and short-term investments at beginning of year
1,921,107                                          1,676,654

CASH AND SHORT-TERM INVESTMENTS AT END OF YEAR

$2,448,630                                          $1,921,107
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

April 30, 2007

NOTE 1--PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION

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

NOTE 2--SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

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

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

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

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.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

April 30, 2007

NOTE 3--CASH AND SHORT-TERM INVESTMENTS

Cash and short-term investments include $2,115,332 (2006--$2,050,732) which have been designated for specific programs that are described in Note 10.

NOTE 4--PREPAID EXPENSES

Prepaid expenses are comprised of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent deposit</td>
<td>$18,812</td>
<td>$18,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>8,667</td>
<td>20,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td>5,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s travel</td>
<td>5,293</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,212</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,215</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 5--INVESTMENT IN/DUE TO RPR INDEX REVOLVING FUND

The investment in RPR Index Revolving Fund represents the Association’s net equity in the fund. At the end of the current year, the fund was in a deficit balance.

NOTE 6--EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Accumulated Amortization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment</td>
<td>$47,883</td>
<td>$34,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>26,205</td>
<td>14,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>31,646</td>
<td>19,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer software</td>
<td>7,128</td>
<td>7,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112,862</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,577</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Equipment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>3,101</td>
<td>1,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey equipment</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>4,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive equipment</td>
<td>40,826</td>
<td>29,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>16,676</td>
<td>12,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,918</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,242</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$179,780** | **$123,819** | **$55,961** | **$58,877**
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

April 30, 2007

NOTE 7–DEFERRED CONTRIBUTIONS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at beginning of year</td>
<td>$294,671</td>
<td>$255,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions received during the year</td>
<td>305,053</td>
<td>294,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts recognized as revenue</td>
<td>(294,671)</td>
<td>(255,222)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BALANCE AT END OF YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$305,053</td>
<td>$294,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 8–DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENTS

The Association moved to new office space in June of 2004. In the new location, the Association received one year rent free as a lease inducement. The Association amortizes the tenant deferred lease inducement on the straight-line basis over the term of the lease which expires on June 30, 2014. The current year’s amortization of $4,527 (2006–$3,773) was credited to rent expense.

NOTE 9–LEASE COMMITMENTS

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

The Association leases a photocopier under an operating lease agreement which expires on September 30, 2009.

The Association leases a vehicle under an operating lease agreement which expires on April 30, 2008.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 / 2008</td>
<td>$ 53,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 / 2009</td>
<td>48,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 / 2010</td>
<td>48,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 / 2011</td>
<td>46,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 / 2012</td>
<td>46,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$242,402
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

April 30, 2007

NOTE 10--INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS

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

Discipline Revolving Fund
This fund is used for expenses relating to discipline hearings, discipline related education seminars and administrative matters pertaining to the Discipline Committee. At the start of each 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. Council sets the fund at $10,000.

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.

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.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION
April 30, 2007

NOTE 10--INTERNALLY RESTRICTED FUNDS (continued)

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

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

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

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

100th Anniversary Project Fund
This fund was established to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Alberta Land Surveyors Association in
2009.

NOTE 11--CASH FLOW INFORMATION

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>$180,484</td>
<td>$(152,850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>7,003</td>
<td>(13,097)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>271,394</td>
<td>(12,729)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax payable</td>
<td>(4,386)</td>
<td>10,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions</td>
<td>10,382</td>
<td>39,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$464,877</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(128,759)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION

April 30, 2007

NOTE 12–SCHEDULES

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

NOTE 13–FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

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

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

(UNAUDITED)

**ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION**

**Year Ended April 30, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2007</th>
<th>Budget 2007</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts</td>
<td>$1,638,210</td>
<td>$1,679,636</td>
<td>$ (41,426)</td>
<td>$1,845,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts</td>
<td>630,886</td>
<td>553,434</td>
<td>77,452</td>
<td>700,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>150,912</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>(18,088)</td>
<td>157,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>73,563</td>
<td>41,951</td>
<td>31,612</td>
<td>62,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>50,570</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>47,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>33,249</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>13,249</td>
<td>41,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>20,941</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>18,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>19,883</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>10,283</td>
<td>12,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>(1,178)</td>
<td>7,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>6,754</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>8,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                      | $2,633,613  | $2,550,721  | $ 82,892        | $2,901,502  |
COUNCIL AND COMMITTEES

(Unaudited)

ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS' ASSOCIATION

Year Ended April 30, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2007</th>
<th>Budget 2007</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration and examination</td>
<td>$40,351</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$(2,351)</td>
<td>$32,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>33,147</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>36,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>32,189</td>
<td>52,700</td>
<td>20,511</td>
<td>33,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's travel</td>
<td>16,742</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>9,258</td>
<td>26,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Review Board</td>
<td>12,221</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>(2,221)</td>
<td>6,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Tour within Alberta</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>(555)</td>
<td>1,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and biographical</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>4,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>2,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention and social</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>2,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Panel</td>
<td>3,267</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>6,733</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>(567)</td>
<td>2,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>4,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomatics Engineering Liaison</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,897</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Council of Land Surveyors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards: Dispositions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$173,892 $222,500 $48,608 $163,566
SYSTEMATIC PRACTICE REVIEW  
(Undaunted)  
ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION  
Year Ended April 30, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2007</th>
<th>Budget 2007</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>$321,811</td>
<td>$329,363</td>
<td>$7,552</td>
<td>$310,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>18,690</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>(690)</td>
<td>15,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and transportation</td>
<td>12,977</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>(477)</td>
<td>13,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>7,704</td>
<td>7,715</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and plans</td>
<td>6,270</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>7,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5,967</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>(167)</td>
<td>1,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(229)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and dues</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>2,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field supplies</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rentals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$378,849  $388,953  $10,104  $360,849
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2007</th>
<th>Budget 2007</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, benefits and contract staff</td>
<td>$306,662</td>
<td>$303,955</td>
<td>$(2,707)</td>
<td>$259,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building operations</td>
<td>104,399</td>
<td>111,793</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>100,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies and photocopying</td>
<td>31,886</td>
<td>25,851</td>
<td>$(6,035)</td>
<td>27,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and courier</td>
<td>15,244</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>18,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>14,554</td>
<td>14,262</td>
<td>(292)</td>
<td>12,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and donations</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>13,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>13,375</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>(2,375)</td>
<td>6,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and stationery</td>
<td>8,890</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>9,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, Internet and database</td>
<td>6,777</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(777)</td>
<td>6,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and maintenance</td>
<td>6,647</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>1,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6,634</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBEPS levy</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>4,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>4,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training and library</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence and travel</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>(484)</td>
<td>2,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships and subscriptions</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>5,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>(6,448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical file management</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad debts</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$555,377 $571,161 $ 15,784 $482,275
### OPERATING EXPENSES

(UNAUDITED)

**ALBERTA LAND SURVEYORS’ ASSOCIATION**

**Year Ended April 30, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actual 2007</th>
<th>Budget 2007</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Actual 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron posts</td>
<td>$906,409</td>
<td>$933,131</td>
<td>$26,722</td>
<td>$1,003,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker posts</td>
<td>449,911</td>
<td>398,472</td>
<td>(51,439)</td>
<td>485,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
<td>183,060</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>(14,060)</td>
<td>175,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALS News</td>
<td>49,644</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>(9,644)</td>
<td>41,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>30,495</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(10,495)</td>
<td>29,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges and management fees</td>
<td>25,954</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(5,954)</td>
<td>18,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf tournament</td>
<td>21,358</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>(2,858)</td>
<td>17,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meetings</td>
<td>17,041</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>(4,041)</td>
<td>12,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>14,817</td>
<td>15,325</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>14,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and manuals</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>(241)</td>
<td>3,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates and stamps</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>1,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $1,701,741 $1,630,428 $(71,313) $1,803,529
History will likely record 2007-2008 as a year of tremendous upheaval within the office of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

After years of stable employment within the ALSA office, 2007-2008 saw a great deal of turnover. Council had approved hiring another full-time staff person in 2007-2008 to be dedicated specifically to the Systematic Practice Review program and the Practice Review Board. Heather Gildart took over the SPR/PRB duties from Josie Kumar who remained with the Association but would be responsible for other Association committees. Heather worked for the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association for three months before retiring to New Brunswick with her husband.

With the evident decline in post sales, I decided to advertise for both a full-time and a part-time SPR/PRB administrative assistant. The best candidate out of that round of interviews was Crystal Vossos who agreed to come to work for the ALSA on a three day a week basis. Crystal decided that the position was not for her and resigned after one month.

While these changes were taking place within the SPR/PRB clerical position, a number of other changes were happening. Recent NAIT grad Adam Pluim replaced Jeremy Dawson as the Association’s technologist and John Ironstone began work as the Assistant to the Director of Practice Review for a six-month period. On November 1, 2007, Don George returned from his leave of absence while John Ironstone took his own leave of absence.

About a week after Don George returned, Fred Cheng resigned as Director of Practice Review. Don George has done a wonderful job of filling in as Acting Director of Practice Review, fulfilling the responsibilities as best he can as Director of Practice Review and Assistant to the Director of Practice Review.

As I write this, the Association continues to look for a new Director of Practice Review.

Kerry Barrett has been hired as Administrative Assistant to the Systematic Practice Review program and the Practice Review Board with responsibilities for other Association committees.

I want to express my deepest thanks to Dawn Phelan and Sharon Armstrong for filling in when the Association was between SPR clerical staff and training them when they had been hired.
In addition to those changes within the Systematic Practice Review program, there were a number of other staffing changes as well. Lynnette Cederland left the Association in September 2007 and Josie Kumar left the Association in January 2008. Tara Lacerte was hired in October 2007 to provide front-desk support for the Association and has since taken on a number of other responsibilities.

In any organization where there has been so much upheaval, the office is not going to be as productive. I certainly noticed that was the case. However, I am absolutely confident that the current staff has the right mix of experience and abilities and the right desire to serve the Association and get us moving forward for the future.

Staffing issues obviously consumed a large part of my time in 2007-2008. However, when I take a step back and look at the larger picture I see a number of initiatives that have the potential to fundamentally transform the Association.

The ALSA had a number of meetings with its BC counterparts to hammer out an agreement under the Trade Investment Labour Mobility Agreement. Land surveying is one of the first professions to develop an agreement under TILMA and the agreement will be signed at the ALSA AGM this year. TILMA is the next step in the evolution of the registration process and a significant step forward from the Labour Mobility Agreement signed by all land surveying jurisdictions in 2001. I believe there will be a push for more TILMA-style agreements with other surveying associations.

At the January Council meeting, the Canadian Council of Land Surveyors presented a vision for the future of the surveying profession in Canada. The ideas presented in this paper are a significant change in the way the self-governing survey associations govern themselves and it will be interesting to see how these ideas play out.

Within Alberta, the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association is set to sign a memorandum of understanding with the Alberta Society of Surveying and Mapping Technologies. The memorandum of understanding is a general document that looks at different ways the ALSA and ASSMT can move forward to start working more closely together. This may be perhaps the most significant coming together of the two organizations since the incorporation of ASSMT in 1970.

Many members will recall the presentation by Justice Coté at the 2006 AGM. In reviewing the transcript of his speech, it is interesting to see how much has changed with respect to self-governing professions since then. In late 2007, the federal government’s Competition Bureau published a report on self-governing professions in Canada and called it one of the
least competitive sectors in Canada. In reviewing the report, I believe the ALSA stacks up well against the concerns of the Competitions Bureau. However, one of the areas that the ALSA will likely have to look at in the future is the structure of corporations under the Professional Practice Regulation.

What else changed for the land surveying profession and the ALSA office in the last twelve months? The first two decisions of the new ALSA Boundary Panel were reached and, now that there is some history, there was a great deal of discussion at the Council level about what may need to be changed. As the Government of Alberta is considering increasing the surcharge on iron posts and marker posts to allow the Association to take over the investigation of boundary uncertainties from government, it appears that this aspect of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association will grow. At the other end of the scale, the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association held its first Trig-Alta math challenge with 455 students and 29 schools participating. It was a great opportunity to increase the awareness of land surveying as a career to many high school students.

When I step back and look at all the changes over the last 12 months, I see many things that have had an impact on the ALSA office itself and many things which will likely have an impact on the ALSA office in the future. I look forward to continuing to work for the Association and being a part of the changes yet to come.

_Brian E. Munday_  
Executive Director
Registrar’s Report

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Started Year With</th>
<th>Added During Year</th>
<th>Subtracted During Year</th>
<th>Remaining At Year End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2007, the average number of years of experience of an active Alberta Land Surveyor was 16.7 years. Alberta Land Surveyors who received their commission in 2007 had articled for an average of 43.3 months.

Member Locations During 2007 (Calendar Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Articled &amp; Affiliate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande Prairie</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industry Information
(Surveyor’s Corporations & Partnerships)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Head Offices</th>
<th>Branch Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male/Female Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Received</th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-Present*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1999</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1994</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1989</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current

Articled 95 14
Affiliate 18 1

*up to February 26, 2008
Committee Reports

ASSMT

I am completing my second and last term as council liaison with ASSMT. I have thoroughly enjoyed my time sitting in on the ASSMT Council monthly meetings. The following highlights of their yearly activities are do in no small way to input from the current ASSMT president, Clint Johnston and I’d like to thank him for his help.

ASSMT has monthly meetings. These meetings are held either in Red Deer or Calgary and are often attended by Council members via conference call. As mentioned above, the current president of ASSMT is Clint Johnson. The vice-president is Rob Cream and the executive director is Wayne Latam. The current membership of the ASSMT stands at 331 regular, associate and student members.

Following are highlights from the ASSMT for the year 2007-2008.

- The first joint ALSA/ASSMT Council meeting was held.
- The ALSA/ASSMT councils have accepted a MOU for endorsement by the respective organizations.
- A member of ASSMT was appointed and participated in the ALSA FOTAC (Future of the Association Committee).
- ASSMT hired Cathy Bleay as the new Executive Assistant.
- Ken Berg has resigned from the Panel of Examiners for the ASSMT membership. Ken has been involved for well over 20 years and has been key to ASSMT. A replacement is currently being sought.
- Hugh Furber, CST has resigned as registrar after being involved with the Society for over 30 years in many capacities. Chris Martin, CST replaces Hugh as registrar.
- Annual membership dues increased to $100.00 for regular members.
- Similar to the ALS News, ASSMT publishes a newsletter called The LINK. Under the direction of Rob Cream, CST, Editor and Publisher, there have been regular distributions of the newsletter.
- Members continue to do the ASSMT presentations to geomatics students at various colleges. These include Olds, Lethbridge, NAIT and SAIT.
- Bursaries are provided to the geomatics departments at Olds College, SAIT and NAIT and Lethbridge College. These bursaries were increased to $500 per college this year.
• ASSMT representation continues on various ALSA committees.
• ASSMT continues to maintain a close relationship with the Alberta Geomatics Group via a MOU signed in 2005.
• Future Initiatives:
  • Continuation of a yearly joint ALSA/ASSMT Council meeting.
  • Future involvement with the ALSA to develop a formalized role for technicians and technologists.
  • Re-introduction of the registered survey technologist (or similar) designation.
  • Maintain a presence as liaisons on the ALSA committees and ensure our membership stays informed.
  • Increase awareness of the importance of certification with industry and employers.

ASSMT’s AGM is scheduled for May 9th and 10th, 2008 in Wetaskiwin. It is always a lot of fun and my wife and I will surely be attending.

Again, it was a pleasure sitting as a liaison on ASSMT Council this year. I hope them all the best with their 2008-2009 initiatives.

T. (Tim) Harding, ALS
ASSMT Liaison

BOUNDARY PANEL
The purpose of the Boundary Panel is to determine if a boundary uncertainty is best resolved through a mediation process involving its members or to recommend the use of Section 9 of the Surveys Act.

Since its inception, four cases have been referred to the Panel. The Panel has held hearings on three of the referrals with two of these being resolved by the parties agreeing to revisions and plan corrections. The third hearing did not result in any agreement and has been returned to Council for further action. The fourth referral upon review was classified as a title description problem and as such was not within the terms of reference for a boundary panel hearing.

The ALSA Council is considering wholesale changes to the Panel's terms of reference based on the cases before it to date.

J.E. (Jerry) Rasmuson, ALS
Chairman

Panel Members
Chairman:
Jerry Rasmuson
Members:
Jim Berry
Bruce Drake
Bob Haagsma
Terry Hudema
Bill Hunter
Mark Kocher
Irwin Maltais
David Marquardt
John Matthyssen
Ross Metcalfe
Roger Ross
John Van Berkel

CAPP
The Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association continues to be represented on two committees of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. We have representation on the Resource Access Committee and the Geomatics Committee.
This provides an excellent opportunity for us to ensure we have the opportunity to dialogue with key stakeholders affecting the land surveying profession. During the 2007 calendar year, there were fewer issues than in the past which required input from a land surveyor’s perspective. Issues such as possible SRD requirement for full monumentation on dispositions, Canadian Height Modernization initiative, preparation of preliminary wellsite plans using LIDAR technology, the progress on CCCM’s conversion from NAD27 to NAD83 and implementation of digital AOA applications continued to be discussed and the status monitored. The issue of the value of registered plans within Alberta was discussed. The Geomatics Committee is planning to lobby ERCB and SRD for improvements on what was being delivered for mapping purposes.

Other issues discussed but not necessarily of direct interest to land surveyors included development of the provincial land use framework, Alberta Environment’s Cumulative Effects initiative, updates on the Land Agents Licensing Advisory Committee and functionality of the Surface Rights and Land Compensation Boards including difficulties presently being experienced. Drafts of British Columbia’s standardizing of surface lease and pipeline agreements were also reviewed and response provided.

The input from the land surveying profession appears to be appreciated and valued.

J.D. (John Wallace, ALS  
S.C. (Stephen) Green, ALS

CONVENTION & SOCIAL
The Convention & Social Group is chaired by the executive director with the president and vice-president and their respective spouses working to plan the AGM. Michelle Woywitka provides administrative support – which means she does most of the work.

The Convention & Social Group worked on the following tasks this year:
1. Organized the 43rd annual ALSA golf tournament. 140 golfers participated and we could not have asked for better weather. Due to the generosity of the participants, the J.H. Holloway Scholarship Foundation raised $1,800 through the sale of mulligans and draw tickets. A special thank you to George Smith for his continued support in helping organize the tournament. Congratulations to the winning team: Darin Falk, Damian Gillis, Rob Owens and Troy Sewter.

Group Members  
Chairman:  
Brian Munday  
Members:  
Bob Wallace  
Kathy Wallace  
Ron Hall  
Shirley Hall  
George Smith  
(golf tournament only)  
Exhibitor Liaison:  
Rick Kurash
2. The 99th annual general meeting will be held at the Chateau Lake Louise from April 24-26, 2008. This is the second year at this venue and we look forward to going back. The Association is endeavouring to maintain control over the costs of the AGM but our costs do continue to rise and we must pass those costs on to the attendees. The Convention & Social Group did consider a kids program at this year’s AGM given the growing number of young kids we have seen at the AGM in recent years; however, the cost was going to be just too much.

3. The centennial AGM is almost upon us. It seems like it wasn’t that long ago that we were thinking how far away it is and now it is just one year away. The centennial AGM will be in Banff at the Banff Springs Hotel. The Convention & Social Group is planning some high-profile speakers and events to make the 2009 AGM a memorable occasion.

B.E. (Brian) Munday
Executive Director

CANADIAN BOARD OF EXAMINERS
FOR PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS

National Board
A true national board of examiners is closer. The AOLS has already taken steps to join CBEPS. There are a few details to be resolved. A meeting with representatives from AOLS will be set up in the near future. We have had preliminary discussions with PEI as well as Nova Scotia.

Certificates of Completion
• There are currently 138 active candidates in the candidate database as of October 2007.
• CBEPS has issued a total of 72 certificates of completion to candidates since January 1, 2007.
• The breakdown of certificates by province is as follows: Alberta – 31; British Columbia – 22; Manitoba – 8; Saskatchewan – 4; Ontario – 1; Nova Scotia – 4; Yukon – 1; New Brunswick – 1.
• Twelve of these certificates were issued automatically to graduates of the University of Calgary Geomatics Engineering Program.
• Four certificates were issued automatically to graduates of the University of New Brunswick Geomatics Engineering Program.

CBEPS Participants
Chairman:
Murray Marian, SLSA
Registrar:
Jean-Claude Tétreault
Secretary:
Kevin Jones
ABCLS
Neil Bennett
Jack Larson
ACLS
Marie Robidoux
Patrick Ringwood
ALSA
Bruce Gudim
Larry Pals
AMLS
Gary Fraser
Jim Watling
SLSA
Ed Desnoyers
Murray Maria
UNB
James Secord
U of C
Andrew Hunter
BCIT
Don Thomson
Red River College
Bob Watson
Examination Registration

Statistics for October 2007 Sitting

Note: Numbers shown in brackets are totals from the March 2007 exam sitting. Numbers shown to the right of the brackets are for the October 2007 sitting.

Grand Total:
• (175) 165 candidates wrote a total of (298) 274 exams.

Breakdown by Board:
• (20) 21 ACLS Candidates registered to write (29) 30 exams in Schedule III.
• (152) 139 CBEPS Candidates registered to write (265) 237 exams in Schedules I and II.
• (3) 5 APBELS Candidates registered to write (4) 7 exams in Schedules I and II.
• Overall pass rate for Schedules I and II exams = 71.30%

2008 CBEPS Examination Dates
• Spring: March 10 to 14, 2008
• Fall: October 20 to 24, 2008

International Evaluation Services
The Board has utilized the International Qualifications Assessment Service for foreign applicants who wish to be evaluated as candidates. This eliminates the need for course-by-course review by the Evaluation Committee for assessment of content, and confirms if the applicant’s degree is in fact comparable to a Canadian degree. The Board will continue to utilize our own educational resources for evaluation before proceeding with this service if possible.

The next AGM for CBEPS is scheduled for Friday, March 28th, 2008.

L.M. (Larry) Pals, ALS
B.W. (Bruce) Gudim, ALS

DOS REVIEW

The genus for this Committee was derived from a Director of Surveys Think Tank meeting held on February 13th 2007. The Committee was to review the findings of the Think Tank session and make a recommendation to Council on the future of the Director of Surveys Office. We held one conference call meeting and two face-to-face meetings in Red Deer. Our recommendation to Council was for the ALSA to meet our Deputy Minister for Sustainable Resource Development, Brad Pickering, and review a proposed strategy and organizational chart for a new position to be called the “Director of Geomatics.” Council accepted the recommendation and representatives from Council and the Committee met with the Deputy Minister who had suggested that the
surcharge for iron posts and marker posts be increased to allow the Association to investigate cases of boundary uncertainties. Council is presently dealing with that issue.

S.C. (Stephen) Green, ALS
Chairman

DISCIPLINE
Between March 7, 2007 and the date of this report being written, February 6, 2008, there were six complaints lodged with the Alberta Land Surveyors' Association.

Two of the six complaints have proceeded to a hearing. One decision has been published in ALS News and a written decision is forthcoming in the other case.

Hearings have been scheduled in two cases but have not taken place yet.

One complaint was resolved with the cooperation of the practitioner and the complainant. One complaint has been received by the Association and it is currently in the hands of the Registrar to see if it can be mediated.

D.H. (Dirk) VandenBrink, ALS
Chairman

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

In the past, the Executive Committee was able to hold most of its meetings by conference call. However, in 2007/2008, there were a number of issues that required more discussion and debate necessitating more face-to-face meetings this year. As most of the most of the Executive Committee members are in Calgary, the meetings were held in Calgary to save some money. On two occasions the Executive Committee met in the morning and the Convention & Social Group met in the afternoon.

What were the issues at the Executive Committee that required more discussion and debate? The first two decisions of the new ALSA Boundary Panel were reached and Council and the Executive Committee had to figure out how to deal with the Boundary Panel’s decisions, particularly if the boundary in question remained unresolved.
Early on in the Association year, it became apparent that iron post and marker post sales were down and the Executive Committee looked at the 2002 Association Finances Ad Hoc Committee report to consider what could be done. The Executive Committee became concerned about the Association’s investment returns and brought in an independent investment advisor to help the Association analyze what its goals and objectives are so that a comprehensive plan could be developed. The Executive Committee deals with any staffing issues brought forward by the Executive Director and the resignation of Fred Cheng as Director of Practice Review led to a number of conversations around the Executive Committee table, particularly as the Practice Review Board began discussing what Phase 4 may look like.

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

R.M. (Robert) Wallace, ALS President

FUTURE OF THE ASSOCIATION AD HOC

Terms of Reference:

• Work with ASSMT to formalize the role of technologists within the land surveying industry
• Establish an external review of procedures by which public concerns are dealt with within the Association
• Investigate industry association vs. professional association activities within the ALSA (Clarification: the perception of self-servitude should not exist and the ALSA should remain pure in its mandate)
• Liaise with CCLS and other provincial associations in regards to their “future” committee

The past year was a busy one for the Future of the Association Ad Hoc Committee (FOTAC). After the presentation at last year’s AGM by the 2006-2007 Chair, Rob Radovanovic, the membership seemed interested in the proposed topics of study put forward by the Committee.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was developed by the Committee with representatives from ASSMT and presented and endorsed by Council. The MOU outlines the commitment of both associations to develop a cooperative relationship. It provides a framework whereby committees from both organizations can begin formalizing procedures and working details of such an agreement.

After researching the practices of other professional associations in dealing with public concerns and complaints, we found that, for the most part, the ALSA is in line with professional standards. The one thing that the ALSA appeared
to lack was a more user-friendly website for the members of the public to understand the process for making a complaint to the Association. Our recommendation was that a complaints specific tab be added to the ALSA website. Council has approved the recommendation and a complaints tab will be added to the Association’s home page.

After reviewing the industry association vs. professional association topic we found that there is no perceived desire amongst surveyors for an industry advocate in Alberta, and that there is no critical mass for a voluntary industry advocate in Alberta. We feel it would be better served by a local chapter of a national organization. Based on this, we decided that it did not merit more of the Committee’s time and energy.

At the completion of the year, the members of FOTAC felt that all of the terms of reference had been dealt with and the Committee had served its purpose. The Committee made a recommendation to Council that the Committee be disbanded and Council approved it.

The Committee was able to reach these conclusions thanks to its volunteer members, the Council Liaison and the help of the ALSA support staff. As the Chair of the Committee I would like to thank all of those individuals that helped out.

J.W. (Jeff) Blatz, ALS
Chairman

GEOMATICS ENGINEERING LIAISON COMMITTEE
GELC meets to discuss and coordinate issues that effect the western survey associations and the University of Calgary. This includes coordinating professional surveyors as presenters for the annual Survey Camp in August in Kananaskis Country.

Acknowledgement to ALSA
Acknowledgement was given to the ALSA for their financial contributions to funding cadastral research at the U of C.

Operations Overview
The faculty is planning on bringing in four new faculty members. Three of the new positions were specified. Two new faculty members will join the Department in January of 2008. Recruitment of one new faculty member, in the area of Energy and the Environment, will begin in April 2008. This will bring the number of faculty members to 22. Undergraduate student numbers are fairly constant. An indication of the number entering the survey stream is the number enrolled in...
ENGO 579, Survey Law and Practice. Currently 32 students are enrolled in ENGO 579.

Course Changes
The Department has added a practical surveying block week course before the students begin their third year. They have also made ENGO 443, Geodetic and Engineering Surveys, a compulsory third-year fall course in the Survey Stream. This is part of an effort to put more practical surveying exercises into current courses.

Training of Students
Again this year, the University expressed concerns about employers who take on internship students not fulfilling their responsibilities to educate the students.

Many of the students did not develop good survey skills or developed poor survey practices. Basic knowledge and skills in keeping proper field notes, calibrating instruments, conventional and RTK procedures, evidence evaluation and survey calculations are just some of the areas students are known to be deficient in when returning from work terms. Discussion continued as to whether students should be learning these skills at university or through mentoring in the workplace. Employers are asked to commit to better mentoring and to develop the professional skills of their internship students.

Issues
The Department is having difficulty attracting the brightest and best first-year students into Geomatics Engineering. The biggest contributing factor to this is the recent boom in the oil industry. Most students are choosing Mechanical, Chemical and Civil Engineering because they view these departments to be closer linked to the oil industry. As a result both Electrical and Geomatics engineering are seeing less interest. During the tech boom in the late ‘90s and early ‘00s, Electrical and Geomatic were the most desirable departments. Now fewer top students are listing Geomatics as their first or second choice. This directly affects the quality of students that the program is able to graduate to industry. The Department is working on improving their marketing to first-year students. The Department has asked the associations to continue to market the profession as a whole. This is the best way we can help the Department in this concern. The Department is encouraged by ALSA’s marketing to high school students and is encouraging us to continue to do this. They are finding many of the students are entering first-year with a department already in mind.
Opportunities
Alberta Ingenuity has issued a Call for Letters of Intent for the establishment for several new Alberta Ingenuity Centres of Excellence. Geomatics has an opportunity in the area of Integrated Resource Management (IRM). A number of people (Elizabeth Cannon, Dean, Schulich School of Engineering, David Parker, Colt Geomatics and John Holmlund, Focus Geomatics) have been working on a committee to develop something in the area of geomatics in Alberta, focusing on three areas: sensor systems, earth observation with remote sensing and GIS.

For the Centres of Excellence proposal, the department will be collaborating with other educational institutions (University of Alberta and University of Lethbridge). A requirement of the funding is that the centre must be pan-Alberta. The long-term plan is to provide funding for research projects, funding to assist teams of researchers to work with industry on projects, provide some consulting to companies in Alberta and training beyond what is presently offered (such as evening courses to the geomatics community).

Survey Camp
The U of C’s Survey Camp is a very positive part of the Geomatics Engineering program that has time and again been well received by the students, associations and faculty. The associations have been providing speakers to make educational presentations at Survey Camp over past years and continue to receive excellent evaluations by the students. Students appreciate the glimpse into aspects of real world projects, experiences and technical innovations that make this such a desirable career to go into.

Even though these presentations were again stronger this year over the last, the department reminds us to strive to continually present new material. Not the same as that presented at Career Day or a repeat of exercises completed by the same students in a previous year. The students do recognize and appreciate the sharing of relevant projects, situations and new uses of technology. In being lucky enough to be accommodated by such good presentations year after year, it is a goal that each new crop of graduates strives to become better assets to all associations.

If any member is interested in making a presentation at this year’s Survey Camp, please contact Victor Hut at (403) 735-9356, or by email at victor@midwestsurveys.com by June 15th, 2008.

R. (Robert) Radovanovic, P.Eng, ALS, CLS
The Committee met six times during the past year; three meetings being conference calls and the remainder being face-to-face in the ALSA boardroom. The main focus of this year’s Committee is the upcoming ALSA 100th anniversary and how best to commemorate this occasion. Last year’s Committee came up with a design for a monument to be tentatively placed in a location in Edmonton and Calgary. However, when the estimated costs were provided, it was just too expensive and the idea was abandoned. Several other ideas were considered ranging from publications to paintings. At the present time, Council has asked the Association’s public relations consultant, Rose Country Communications, to help the Association develop an overall plan for the centennial and identify which project or projects would have the greatest effect.

The Collections Sub-Committee has met almost every week or two and has almost completed the cataloguing and photographing of the various artifacts in the ALSA collection. They had almost completed this task until Charlie Weir donated another 35 - 40 articles! Much appreciation goes to Charlie for his substantial donation. The Sub-Committee is also considering being trained in the conservation and preservation of the more delicate artifacts such as photographs, survey plans and scrolls.

The Committee is in the process of developing a commemorative exhibit for the ALSA 2009 AGM with a provision to convert the exhibit into a traveling exhibit to be displayed through small museums throughout Alberta. The object of this exhibit will be to educate and entertain the general public. It will also dovetail with the school curriculum, with the objective of being a resource for visiting school classes. Many thanks to Gord Olsson for his commitment to this task.

The Committee is also in the initial stages of organizing a heritage survey at the 2009 AGM in Banff similar to the Calgary centennial survey in 1994.

The Committee members are continuing the process of contacting past and present members of the Association in an attempt to update the biographical information database. If you are contacted, please make an attempt to complete the biographical form. This information is being used to update the ALSA www.landsurveyinghistory.ab.ca website. A big thank you to Brian Munday for his work in bringing this website to life.

The Committee is in preliminary discussions with the Town of Devon to celebrate the arrival of the David Thompson brigade on May 13, 2008. It is anticipated that a survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members</th>
<th>Historical &amp; Biographical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman: Les Frederick</td>
<td>The Committee met six times during the past year; three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman: Rick Beaumont</td>
<td>meetings being conference calls and the remainder being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Chairman: Allan Main</td>
<td>face-to-face in the ALSA boardroom. The main focus of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Liaison: Tim Harding</td>
<td>year’s Committee is the upcoming ALSA 100th anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members: Jim Harland</td>
<td>and how best to commemorate this occasion. Last year’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Nixon</td>
<td>Committee came up with a design for a monument to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gord Olsson</td>
<td>tentatively placed in a location in Edmonton and Calgary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Smith</td>
<td>However, when the estimated costs were provided, it was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Waye</td>
<td>just too expensive and the idea was abandoned. Several</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Weir</td>
<td>other ideas were considered ranging from publications to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paintings. At the present time, Council has asked the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association’s public relations consultant, Rose Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications, to help the Association develop an over-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all plan for the centennial and identify which project or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>projects would have the greatest effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>The Collections Sub-Committee has met almost every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Members: Lou Breton</td>
<td>week or two and has almost completed the cataloguing and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Kinloch</td>
<td>photographing of the various artifacts in the ALSA collec-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gord Olsson</td>
<td>tion. They had almost completed this task until Charlie Weir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lew Rodney</td>
<td>donated another 35 - 40 articles! Much appreciation goes to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Weir</td>
<td>Charlie for his substantial donation. The Sub-Committee is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also considering being trained in the conservation and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preservation of the more delicate artifacts such as pho-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tographs, survey plans and scrolls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee is in the process of developing a commemo-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rative exhibit for the ALSA 2009 AGM with a provision to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>convert the exhibit into a traveling exhibit to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>displayed through small museums throughout Alberta. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object of this exhibit will be to educate and entertain the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general public. It will also dovetail with the school cur-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>riculum, with the objective of being a resource for visit-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ing school classes. Many thanks to Gord Olsson for his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commitment to this task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee is also in the initial stages of organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a heritage survey at the 2009 AGM in Banff similar to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee members are continuing the process of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contacting past and present members of the Association in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an attempt to update the biographical information database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you are contacted, please make an attempt to complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the biographical form. This information is being used to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>update the ALSA <a href="http://www.landsurveyinghistory.ab.ca">www.landsurveyinghistory.ab.ca</a> website. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>big thank you to Brian Munday for his work in bringing this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>website to life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee is in preliminary discussions with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Devon to celebrate the arrival of the David Thomp-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>son brigade on May 13, 2008. It is anticipated that a survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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demonstration to approximately 300 grade seven students will be performed.

The terms of reference and a draft budget for 2008-2009 were prepared and passed on to Council for approval.

Much thanks for all the hard work during the last year to all the Committee and Sub-Committee members.

*L.J. (Les) Frederick, ALS
Chairman

LEGISLATION AD HOC
During the year 2007–2008, the Committee was busy reviewing a number of items which required a response to Council.

On June 5, 2007, we met at the Red Deer Lodge. We reviewed the Surface Rights Act and reported to Council with respect to “right of entry” as it pertains to the Surface Rights Act.

Further, we also went on to examine the Municipal Government Act and Subdivision Regulations in association with the Surveys Act and Land Titles Act. The Committee had extensive discussions and worked over the year to prepare a letter to Council for submission to the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding the practical day-to-day operations of the Act and discrepancies, which the Committee identified to Council in respect to the various interpretations and breaches, which were occurring at local planning authorities. Recommendations were provided to Council for provision to the Minister respecting the establishment of regional planning authorities and conducting periodic reviews of local planning authorities respecting compliance with the Act.

The Committee is presently reviewing the membership’s compliance with Section 47 of the Surveys Act with the intent of reporting to Council prior to the annual meeting in April of this year.

*L. R. (Len) Olson, ALS
Chairman

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

For President:
R.O. (Ron) Hall—Calgary
For Vice-President:
D.R. (Don) George—Edmonton
T.W. (Terry) Hudema—Calgary

Committee Members
Chairman:
Len Olsson
Council Liaison:
Terry Hudema
Members:
Terry Chiddy
Darrin Connatty
John Lohnes
David Marquardt
Lee Morden
Andrew Roop
Garry Schirrmacher
John Van Berkel
David Young

Committee Members
Chairman:
Dirk VandenBrink
Members:
Stephen Green
Al Nelson
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For Council:
J. (John) Haggerty—Grande Prairie
J.I. (Jim) Maidment—Calgary
J.J. (John) Matthyssen—Calgary
C.R. (Connie) Petersen—Medicine Hat

Additional nominations may be made by two Alberta Land Surveyors, with the consent of the nominees in each case, up to and including at the Annual General Meeting being held between the dates of April 24th to 26th, 2008 at the Fairmont Chateau Lake Louise.

The following offices are to be filled:
- President: one year term
- Vice President: one year term
- 3 members of Council: 2 year terms

D.H. (Dirk) VandenBrink, ALS
Chairman

OIL & GAS AD HOC COMMITTEE
In 2007-2008, the Oil & Gas Ad Hoc Committee was charged with the following task from Council:
The Farmers’ Advocate had raised concerns with the Association about surveyors entering onto lands without notification and causing damage. The Farmers’ Advocate would like the Association to consider putting together a “survey notification and access to private land” document.

A meeting was scheduled for February 1, 2008 and representatives from Alberta Professions & Occupations were to attend, being the Registrar & Associate Registrar of Land Agents. Discussions ensued with representatives from the land agents profession and a general agreement was reached that this issue would be better addressed through that group and with ALSA representation. The representatives from government cancelled out of our scheduled February 1st, meeting and we subsequently cancelled the meeting.
The issue was addressed by the Association responding to the Farmers’ Advocate via a letter explaining the ALSA discussions, and that we felt the issue would be best addressed through the Land Agents Advisory Committee.

D.A. (Allan) Jamieson, ALS
Chairman

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD
The Board thanked outgoing members Dwight Wiberg, Bernie Jess, and Brent Murray. Joining the Board for the 2007-2008 term were Jessica Barich, Jacques Dupuis, David Higgins, Brian Huber, Frank Meashaw, and Bill Mintz. Our public member, Russell Barnes, departed after more than
four years of service to the PRB. Mr. Barnes took on the Public Member role with Council. The Board welcomed Rudy Palovcik as the PRB’s new Public Member. Mr. Palovcik’s first meeting was January 9, 2008.

SPR staff changes continued in 2007-2008. Fred Cheng departed as Director of Practice Review. The Assistant to the Director of Practice Review, Don George, took on the role of Acting Director. Mr. George will continue in this capacity until his one-year contract comes to an end April 30. John Ironstone will be returning May 1 as Assistant to the Director of Practice Review for a second six-month period. Kerry Barrett recently joined the ALSA staff and provides administrative support to the SPR and the PRB.

A new development for the PRB in the last year was the appointment of a Council Liaison. This was done to enhance communications between Council and the PRB. Ron Hall served as Council Liaison for a portion of the year and was then replaced by Robert Radovanovic.

At the last Steering Committee meeting in May 2007, discussion on the PRB focused on the progress of Phase 3. At that time, it was reported that Phase 3 would not be completed within the five-year time frame based on progress to date. As a result, Council passed a motion directing the PRB to review the SPR process and make recommendations for any changes to Council. Council also passed a motion adding three additional members to the PRB. This was done to ensure the day-to-day activities of the PRB were not delayed while the review process takes place.

At the PRB’s first meeting, it was decided that a sub-committee be formed to review the SPR process as requested by Council. Paul Stoliker chaired the sub-committee, which met seven times over the term. Their work resulted in a recommendation to Council for a telephone poll. Approval was received and the poll was initiated by Rose Country Communications. The purpose of the poll was to gather input from the membership about the objectives and process of Phase 4. A preliminary report on the results of the poll is expected at the AGM in Lake Louise.

In October, Council referred a Boundary Panel case to the PRB. The Board is reviewing options on how to proceed. This will become a new item under the terms of reference for the Board in 2008-2009.

The Board met a total of eight times this term including the last meeting on March 12, 2008. At present, 100 Phase 3 files have been opened by the Director of Practice Review representing 61% of all Phase 3 files. The Board has considered and closed 57 files representing 35% completion.

**Board Members**

**Chairman:**
Blaine Benson

**Vice Chairman:**
Paul Stoliker

**Council Liaison:**
Rob Radovanovic

**Public Members:**
Russell Barnes
Rudy Palovcik

**Members:**
Jessica Barich
Jeff Boutilier
Jacques Dupuis
David Higgins
Brian Huber
Bruce Jones
Ed Lyster
Frank Meashaw
Bill Mintz
Doug Neufeld
Mark Prevost
Thirteen follow-up reviews have been identified in Phase 3 to date. Six of them have been considered and closed. No formal hearings were held this term.

The weighted average for all reviews thus far in Phase Three is 81.3%. This is 0.7% lower than the percentage reported in 2007 and is lower than the final Phase two average of 84%. The lower score continues to be a concern for the Board as scores were expected to improve from Phase 2 to Phase 3.

The most significant challenges for the upcoming year revolve around staffing. The Director of Practice Review position has been vacant since early November 2007 and at time of writing remains vacant. The Assistant to the Director of Practice Review position will be vacant October 31, 2008 when Mr. Ironstone’s contract ends. Concerns about the length of time to complete Phase 3 will be exacerbated if these two key positions are not filled.

B. (Blaine) Benson, ALS
Chairman

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
The Professional Development Committee met seven times and has presented five seminars to date:

- Getting it Right - Jun 2007, Edmonton
- Exam Preparation Seminar - Sep 2007, Red Deer
- Field Notes Seminar - Nov 2007, Edmonton
- Train the Trainer - Nov 2007, Edmonton
- Land Titles Act - Jan 2008, Edmonton

A Safety Seminar was also arranged but cancelled due to lack of interest.

By the end of April of this year an additional five seminars will be offered:

- Getting it Right - March 6 & 7, Medicine Hat
- Getting it Right - March 13 & 14, Calgary
- Exam Preparation Seminar - March 15, Red Deer
- Risk Management - April, AGM
- Corner Site Investigation - April, AGM

Regional meetings were held in Calgary, Edmonton, Grande Prairie and Medicine Hat.

The Committee discussed the use of an external consultant to aide in defining and accomplishing its goals and will make a recommendation to Council.

C.J. (Courtney) Tripp, ALS, CLS
Chairman
PUBLIC RELATIONS
This year the Public Relations Committee had another packed year of activities. We held four face-to-face meetings and one conference call. The Committee members were more than willing to take on projects and contribute in any way that they could. Thank you to the Committee members for making it a successful year. Here is a review of what we accomplished this year:

1. Math Contest
This was the first year for the Trig Alta Math Challenge for grade 11 students in Alberta. The exam was set by retired high school math teachers and the questions were reviewed by the Public Relations Committee in November. The exam contained four long answer questions and ten multiple choice. The enrollment seemed to be high with 750 applicants. However, there were only 455 students that ended up writing the exam. The Committee felt that the exam provided some benefit in promoting the profession to high school students and since there is nothing to compare the number of writers to, it is hard to tell if the participation in the exam was good or not.

Suggestions for next year are to change the time of year in which the exam is written to May, have grade 10 students instead of grade 11 students write it since trigonometry is in the grade 10 curriculum and remove degrees/minutes/seconds conversions from the exam as it is not taught at this level.

Overall the Committee feels that the math contest was a success and we look forward to enhancing the process and having even more success next year.

2. ALSA Scholarships
Last year, the scholarships were revamped including increasing the values and adding new ones. This year, the PR Committee was asked to look into putting more emphasis on the Alberta institutions rather than out-of-province schools. The Committee decided to reallocate funds from out of province scholarships to Alberta scholarships, due to budget cuts. A proposal will be put forward to Council.

Upon doing some research it was found that there were a large number of students transferring from Mount Royal College into the Geomatics Program at the U of C. It is thought that this may be a transfer scholarship possibility.

3. Student Events
The 2007-2008 school year was packed with activity for the PR Committee. An increasingly popular event is the first-year BBQ at the University of Calgary. This event is held to promote geomatics to students in Engineering that have
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not yet chosen their discipline. The venue on campus was changed this year due to construction. However, it seemed to work even better than past years.

The U of C Beef and Bun night was successful. However, there was not as many land surveyors there as we would have like. More has to be done by the committee to get more of the membership out to the event.

The U of C Career Day was on the following day, which brought much traffic and interest to the ALSA booth. We were very successful in attracting a lot of attention to the booth.

We have also supported the University of New Bruns-
wick’s, “Geocache for Cash” event that their Geomatics Undergraduate Engineering Students Society is putting on in March. We will be sending water bottles with the ALSA logos on them for the participating students.

The official launch of the careers in geomatics website was completed and can be found at www.careersingeomatics.ab.ca

4. Video
The idea of producing a large scale video to promote the profession has been adapted to a more reasonable short video alternative. However the idea was put on the back burner for budget reasons.

5. Brochures/ Displays
The, “Easement and Rights of Way” brochure was reprinted without any major revisions.

The, “While You Were Out” cards for crews to leave at homes were reprinted.

The trade show display was updated, printed and is currently being used.

The next brochure to be added to the terms of reference is to be on, “Fence Building,” similar to the one from British Columbia entitled, “Good Fences Make Good Neighbors.”

6. Advertisement Ideas
The idea of advertising on public transportation such as buses and LRT systems was researched. It was determined that the bus route could not be selected by the advertiser and it was not possible to advertise only on the school route buses. By not being able to select the routes that would get the most exposure to students who could possibly join the profession, it was decided that it was not feasible to spend budget funding in this fashion.

7. Trade Shows
The ALSA PR Committee participated in the AMSC and the AAMD&C trade shows. The volunteers for the AMSC event
did not feel it was overly beneficial for the ALSA to have a booth at the event. The PR Committee will continue to attend the event next year and assess its value at that time.

8. ALS News Articles
The following committee members submitted articles for the ALS News:
  - Johnathan Phillips – June 2007
  - Jarl Nome – September 2007
  - Bruce Drake – November 2007
  - Jennifer Setiawan – February 2008

L.L. (Lesley) Ewoniak, ALS Chairman

REGISTRATION
2007-2008 marked another year of a large number of articled students and affiliate members in the registration and examining system. Our Committee increased its membership to 28 members. The Committee was kept very busy with the large workload, to which the members were very dedicated. This was an important factor in ensuring this volume of work was handled effectively.

The Registration Committee is currently responsible for assessing and examining 108 articled students and 19 affiliate members. Of those articled students, 77 are located in Southern Alberta, 27 are located in the Edmonton and surrounding region, and 4 are in Grande Prairie. The Committee continued making annual interviews, exams, and qualifying exams available in Grande Prairie due to the demand and past success.

During the year, the Committee took care of several of its terms of reference. In addition to the primary duties of approving and examining candidates, the Committee also:
- Reviewed the annual interview process and interview forms along with approvals of affidavits of service with respect to relevant field and office time.
- Developed new questions for the practical surveying exam for the examiners to draw on.
- Investigated conducting computer-based exams.
- Monitored ongoing discussions on TILMA and its potential effect on our registration process.

The Examining Sub-Group once again put together two sets of three written examinations. The entire Committee reviews and approves these exams before the exam sittings in the spring and fall. The Committee also reviews the pass rates on an ongoing basis, and has frequent discussions to ensure the exams are relevant and fair, while also ensuring appropriate standards of performance are being met. This regular discussion is crucial to the Committee’s role and the
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diverse points of view expressed by Committee members helps to make sure the issues are well thought out.

As of the date of this report, a total of fifteen candidates have passed the final qualifying examination and received their commission as an Alberta Land Surveyor.

The Committee has developed a combined statute law, surveying profession and practical surveying exam that will be applied to TILMA once the agreement between BC and Alberta has been signed.

The Association needs to send a “thank you” to all of the members of the Registration Committee. Their willingness to put in so much effort benefits our Association and the candidates coming in to it. With the high volume of work, the Committee requires the continuation of members willing to volunteer to spread the work around. Work on the Committee is very rewarding and has the benefit of exposing you to different areas of surveying that you may not come across in day to day work. I would encourage you to talk to Registration Committee members about their experience on the Committee.

R.W. M. (Robert) Scott, ALS
Chairman

SAFETY
I volunteered for the Safety Committee in April 2007, the next thing I knew I was nominated as vice-chair. As I was gathering my thoughts together as to what this Committee was really about, I was declared the Chair for the remainder of the term due to the resignation of the Council approved Chair. Then Brian Munday informed me that I had one week to prepare this report.

First of all, I would like to thank Carrie Desjarlais for her time as Chair of the Committee. I believe this Committee has far reaching effects on each and every member of the ALSA and every employee within our organizations.

Our terms of reference for the 2007-08 year were:
• Liaise with the Professional Development Committee regarding the delivery of a safety seminar to ALSA members.

Committee Members
Chairman:
Barry Fleece
Chairman:
Carrie Desjarlais
Past Chairman:
Alex Hittel
Council Liaison:
Brian Ross
Members:
Jeff Adair
David Amantea
Jennifer Beaulieu
Bob Conacher
Laura Curle
Darrell Florence
Victor Hut
Roger Luard
Ross Metcalfe
Greg Murphy
Grant Pelletier
Justin Plante
Mike Prokopetz
Bob Stirling
Dwayne Westacott
• Review the Association’s Buried Facilities position paper by taking into account comments from Alberta One-Call. As the year progressed, we discussed each item and gathered information that we felt would be a concern for every employee, project manager, land surveyor and director for each and every survey corporation. As I review the minutes over the past year, I find topics such as chain saw safety, federal transportation legislation, Bill C-45, injury management and driving as our biggest concerns in getting staff home safely. There are many other topics that have the same effect by creating an unexpected incident that creates turmoil for family, friends, peers and company associates. These will continue to be reviewed on an ongoing basis.

As Mr. Hittel wrote last year, “Have we made a difference?” I believe this Committee does make a difference. We bring topics forward. Then we research and discuss each topic. If it is relevant to surveying we place it on the ALSA’s safety web page. By educating members of the smallest details of safety and the effects of the lack of safety in an organization that can lead to a devastating and lasting effect on each and every employee in the organization.

In the past year, we had a number of topics that created lots of discussion at our meetings including:
• Chainsaw safety certification as developed by Enform.
• Bill C-45 which places the responsibility of safety adherence from party chiefs to directors within a corporation.
• Federal transportation legislation which defines interprovincial travel, hours of work and vehicle capacities.
• Driving distractions which are an ongoing topic from cell phone use, text messaging and any other activity which takes one away from driving concentration.

These items will continue to be monitored by the Committee over the next year as we believe these are the biggest issues in accident prevention. There will be other concerns that will come forward and we will review each matter as to whether it affects the membership.

Lastly, I would like to thank all the members of the Safety Committee for their input, commitment and dedication. I would also like to thank Brian Munday and the staff for their support in keeping us on track.

B.G. (Barry) Fleece, ALS Chairman
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**STANDARDS**

For the 2007-2008 term the Standards Committee consisted of 23 members. The Committee was divided into subgroups to deal with the action items received from Council.

1. Review MSP in regards to GPS surveys and, in particular, Part C, Section 1.2, 2.4 and 4.4 to reflect current technology and practices.
   
   A recommendation was forwarded to Council for consideration at the AGM.

2. Review if the use of various remote surveying techniques could be used to establish a natural boundary.
   
   The Committee met and discussed this topic but no recommendation has yet been formulated. Action item continued to the 2008-2009 term.

3. Investigate issues surrounding the transmission of drawing files to the public and make recommendations to Council.
   
   A recommendation was forwarded to Council that Council consider directing the Professional Development committee to put on a seminar for the membership to inform them of the issues surrounding the transmission of drawing files to the public.

4. Review posting requirements for phased condominium plans done under Section 47 of the Surveys Act.
   
   A recommendation was forwarded to Council that this item be removed from the agenda as there is no need to make any revisions to the Manual of Standard Practice and/or the legislation.

5. Determine whether total coordinates are required on wellsitie plans in unsurveyed territory and make recommendations to Council.
   
   The Committee met and discussed this topic but no recommendation has yet been formulated. Action item continued to the 2008-2009 term.

6. Research the possibility that when the Director of Surveys is requested to grant an extension to the posting requirements under a Section 47 plan that, prior to granting that extension the surveyor who registered the original plan must ensure that steps have been taken to ensure that the original internal control network is still valid and exists or that steps have been taken to establish any new monuments required.
   
   The Committee met and discussed this topic but no recommendation has yet been formulated. Action item continued to the 2008-2009 term.

7. Investigate the need to register a plan at both Land Titles and Public Lands for any disposition, including a PLA,
that is monumented using a statutory iron post and report back to Council.

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

8. Review the wellsite certification in regards to if there should be a time limit on the “to” and “from” dates on the certification and report back to Council.

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

9. Consider developing a common standardized CAD file for submission to Land Titles and Public Lands and report back to Council.

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

10. Discussion of adding a minimum text size for Land Titles Plans with Alberta Land Titles.

*A recommendation was forwarded to Council, that a letter be sent to Land Titles requesting them to amend the Land Titles Procedure Manual to include a minimum text size.*

11. Investigate creating standards for LIDAR surveys on private land for wellsites.

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

R.A. (Robert) Pinkerton, ALS, CLS
Chairman
Council 2008-2009 from left to right: (back row) John Haggerty, Russell Barnes, Brian Ross, Bruce Gudim; (front row) Rob Radovanovic, Don George, Connie Petersen, Ron Hall, Bob Wallace, Jim Maidment
RATIONAL DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to Section 52(1) of the Association Bylaws

1. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?

The intent of the recommendation is to increase the maximum fees allowed to be charged by the Association. This does not mean that the fees will be increased to these amounts but that Council can increase the fees to these amounts if it is deemed appropriate. The maximum allowable fees were last increased more than ten years ago. The Association now charges the maximum allowable fee in each of the membership categories except associate membership (where the fee is $100 per year instead of $200 per year).

It is recommended that the Association charge a fee for branch offices. Branch offices, like head offices, require the approval of Council and are subject to their own systematic practice review.

The bylaw change, if approved, will not affect the 2008-2009 membership fee renewals.

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

Post sales have declined and the surcharge on iron posts and marker posts is fixed by agreement.

At the same time, expenses have continued to increase. The Association has been able to cut some expenses in the 2008-2009 budget. There is one less staff person and some non-statutory committees have been cut back.

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

Council and the Executive Committee have been keeping a close watch on the Association’s finances since the 2007 AGM when the decline in post sales became noticeable. Council reviewed the 2002 report of the Association Finances Ad Hoc Committee and their recommendations to deal with a situation in which there were no post sales.

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

Increasing the Alberta Land Surveyor dues from $700 per year to $1,200 per year would increase the Association revenues by approximately $180,000 per year. Increasing corporate dues from $500 per year to $1,200 per year would increase the Association revenues by approximately $63,000 per year.
### TRANSFER FROM STABILIZATION FUND

(2008-2009 Budget)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Current Fee</th>
<th>Proposed Maximum Fee</th>
<th>Incremental Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased Active Member Dues</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Retired Member Dues</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Affiliate Member Dues</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Surveyor’s Corporation Dues</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Articled Pupil Dues</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Branch Office Dues</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Filing of Articles</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Filing Transfer of Articles</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$302,950

Other self-governing survey associations in Canada charge the following active member fees (not including other levies or other membership categories.

- British Columbia: $1,100
- Alberta: $600
- Saskatchewan: $1,550
- Manitoba: $1,415
- Ontario: $1,000
- Quebec: $360
- New Brunswick: $990
- Nova Scotia: $1,100
- PEI: $460
- Newfoundland: $1,300
- ACLS: $700

5. *How is the recommendation in the public interest?*

Potential additional membership dues would allow the Association to continue to offer the services that the membership and the public expect.

6. *Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted?*

No.
RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the creation of a new Part D, Section 5.11 in the Manual of Standard Practice

1. What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
   **ALSA:** Financial costs are minimal and involve ALSA staff administrative time for amendment of the Manual of Standard Practice. There are no ongoing financial commitments required of the ALSA.
   **Client:** The client may have some additional costs from some practitioners for additional field work to comply with the requirements of the certification.
   **Standards Committee:** Subgroup will need to work with the Director of Surveys to assist the Director of Surveys in publishing plan amendment requirements.

2. What is the genesis for the recommendation?
   **July 26, 2007 Mr. Michaud, the Director of Surveys suggested** to Council of the ALSA that there is a need to review the wellsite certification that was revised at the 2007 AGM. The Director of Surveys questioned if there should be a limit on the time span between the two dates shown on the certification.

3. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
   The Director of Surveys was contacted. The Director of Surveys supports the amendment. The intent is that this motion will be enforced for field surveys completed after June 1, 2008 by the Director of Surveys.

4. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   Create meaningful to and from dates for Amendment Plan Certifications, and establish a standard of practice for amendment disposition plan.
   Practitioners should note that prior versions of the amendment are readily searchable and available from Public Lands.
   If the membership passes this recommendation at the 2008 AGM the Association, in specific the Standards Committee, would assist the Director of Surveys in publishing plan amendment requirements on the Alberta Sustainable Resource Development website. Additionally, the Association would advise the ERCB of the change to the wellsite certification.
5. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?

This motion is to have plans created that will have a meaningful chronology, and will depict the true amendment survey.

This motion will provide clarity for the many practitioners as to the expectations of Alberta Sustainable Resource Development.

Alberta Sustainable Resource Development find that Amendment surveys never seem to be complete, as some practitioners just extend the “to” date to encompass additional field survey work. With the current practice there is uncertainty as to what evidence was really dealt with at the time of the extended “to” date. With some plan amendment practices the following questions remain unanswered:
1) When is the survey complete?
2) When does an amendment require a new survey?
3) At amendment, what boundaries need to be found, re-established and re-monumented?
4) What should the amendment plan show, found monuments, placed monuments?

Amendment plans are being filed at Public Lands with other combinations of to and from dates in the certification. Codifying requirements for disposition amendment plans and certification dates will standardize the practice, and provide subsequent practitioners with interpretable plans.

6. How is the recommendation in the public interest?

Alberta Land Surveyors are interpreting Amendment Disposition Plans requirements a number of ways. The public is better served with consistent and clear disposition amendment plan requirements and products.

RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to a revision of Part D, Section 5.9 and the creation of a new Part D, Section 5.9.10 in the Manual of Standard Practice.

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

Financial costs are minimal and consist of ALSA staff administrative time to amend the Manual of Standard Practice. There are no ongoing financial commitments required of the ALSA. Additional financial costs may be required of the practitioner due to the requirement for additional field work and for the acquisition of remotely sensed data to be used in preparing the associated plans.
2. *What is the genesis for the recommendation?*
   Council directed the Standards Committee to investigate issues surrounding the use of LIDAR on private lands and make recommendations to Council after being advised that the ERCB had concerns about how a LIDAR survey is performed on private land. It was indicated to Council that ERCB would like to see standards in place in regards to LIDAR surveys on private land and that they would like to know if a wellsite was prepared using LIDAR.

3. *Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?*
   The Director of Surveys was consulted and raised no objection to the recommendation.

4. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   To add standards for wellsites prepared using remotely sensed data on private land to the Manual of Standard Practice.
   If the membership passes this recommendation at the 2008 AGM the Association would liaise with the ERCB to determine the appropriate timelines for submission of monumented survey plans.

5. *What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?*
   Currently there are no standards in the Manual of Standard Practice for wellsites surveys prepared using remotely sensed data on private land. This recommendation provides standards for surveys prepared using remotely sensed data on private land.

6. *How is the recommendation in the public interest?*
   It will provide clarity to the public and to approving authorities indicating that a survey was performed using remotely sensed data and creates standards for the membership to use when preparing these plans on private land.
RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to Part C, Section 2 and Part C, Section 4.4 of the Manual of Standard Practice.

1. What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?
   The only cost to the association is the cost of updating the MSP. There are no ongoing costs or financial commitments to the association.

2. What is the genesis for the recommendation?
   The action item came from Council in 2007 as it was not satisfied with the recommendation from the 2006 – 2007 standards committee.

3. Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?
   Feedback on the proposed changes was provided by the Director of Surveys Office (Geoff Banham) and others knowledgeable on the subject (Joe Paskaio, Allan Pham, Scott Partridge). Overall there response was positive on the changes and most of their comments have been integrated into the recommendations.
   As an aside, a group of University of Calgary students have undertaken further investigation/testing of RTK redundancy as their major project.

4. What is the overall intent of the recommendation?
   The overall intent of the recommendation is to add to the Manual of Standard Practice some items that specifically address issues relating to the use of GPS. This addition will provide a framework allowing SPR to evaluate practitioners in their use of GPS.

5. What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?
   There is currently nothing in the MSP that addresses some of the concerns unique to GPS. Currently the relevant sections of the MSP, are focused more at static GPS and have not kept up with the current changes in the technology. The proposed addition to the MSP reflects the changes in technology and addresses the issue of redundancy in static and RTK surveys.

6. How is the recommendation in the public interest?
   This addition to the manual specifically points out some sources of error that are unique to the use of GPS and should
help to prevent a practitioner from neglecting to carry out proper procedures to check for these errors.

**EXPANDED INFORMATION**

**Background**
In March 2007 the recommendation from the Standards Committee that was sent to Council was:

**Revise Part C Section 2.4 to read:**
The position of every monument included in a GPS survey either found or placed shall be verified with sufficient redundant observations to ensure that errors are kept within tolerance and that “on the fly” initialization for kinematic surveys is valid. The sources of error in a GPS survey may include, but are not limited to, site multipath, atmospheric conditions, base station and rover set-up.

**Add Part C Section 4.4 to read:**
Environmental / Topographic conditions which may contribute to multipath.

Council referred the matter back to the Committee for further work. There was a concern raised by Council that the Manual of Standard Practice is to contain standards, whereas the recommendation presented was more of a suggestion as to what surveyors could do.

**Research**
Here are some current standards across Canada:

**Alberta: MSP 2007**
- Part C Section 1.2
  — For new surveys consisting of the surveyor’s own work, the minimum accuracy standard,
  — when expressed as a misclosure shall be 1:7500 or 0.02 metres or,
  — when the method of least squares is employed, both the observational residuals and the semi-major axis from the 2-dimensional relative confidence regions, shall be as determined in section 1.1 using a value of (b) equal to 130 ppm.
- Part C Section 2.4
  — The position of every monument included in a GPS survey either found or placed shall be verified with sufficient redundant observations. This applies to both static and kinematic surveys.
- Part C Section 4.4
  — In addition, for surveys done partially or completely using remote positioning techniques, the field records shall include the following:
.1 observation procedures, raw data and logistics;
.2 reduction procedures of the observed data, including software versions;
.3 processed remote positioning data from which cadastral survey measurements are derived.

**British Columbia: General Survey Instruction Rules**

- Part 2 Section 18
  1) Surveys may be conducted using conventional, GPS, or other methods, providing the survey accuracy standards are met.

**Newfoundland: Manual of Practice 2007**

- Section 4
  4.4 In GPS surveys:
    4.4.1 Interconnecting baselines forming a closed traverse shall be used.
    4.4.2 Four or more common satellites with acceptable geometric configuration (no less than ten degrees above the horizon) shall be used.
    4.4.3 H.I. is to be measured carefully and recorded in a field book as a check for post processing.
    4.4.4 Field notes should document data collection parameters.
    4.4.5 Property corners established by a radial method shall be checked by:
      4.4.5.1 Radial tie from another known station.
      4.4.5.2 Independent measurement by conventional survey methods
      4.4.5.3 Comparison with a previous survey.
      4.4.5.4 Point re-occupation.

**Reference Papers**

- Blick, Graeme. Office of the Surveyor General. OSC Technical Report 11: GPS Guidelines for Cadastral Sur-
Information Item #5

RATIONALE DOCUMENT pertaining to Part C, Section 3.8 of the Manual of Standard Practice.

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

There are minimal administrative costs to the Association for amending section 3.8 of the Manual of Standard Practice. But, should section 3.8 of the Manual of Standard Practice remain in its present form, there are significant extra costs to public land dispositions applicants (registration fees, mapping fees, drafting costs) for registering a second plan at the Land Titles Office. For DRS surveys, the Alberta tax payer will save an estimated $2 million dollars by just eliminating the duo registration requirement for DRS type surveys. Similar cost savings will be realized by other disposition type applicants.
2. **What is the genesis for the recommendation?**
   The Director of Surveys questioned the benefit and need to register two plans, one at Public Lands Office and one at Land Titles Office.

3. **Was anyone outside of the Association membership consulted? What was their reaction?**
   The Director of Surveys was consulted and he fully supports this recommendation. It was noted through discussions with the Director that a final plan of survey is required to be submitted to Public Lands prior to issuance of the approval documents.
   
   Some discussions have taken place with CAPP with respect to their need for pipeline dispositions (PLA) to be also registered at the Land Titles Office, but more discussions are required before PLA can be added to the Manual of Standard Practice’s 3.8.2 exclusionary clause.

4. **What is the overall intent of the recommendation?**
   The intent of this recommendation is to eliminate, on public land, the extra cost for registering a second plan at the Land Titles Office.

5. **What problem is trying to be solved? How does the recommendation solve the problem?**
   This recommendation eliminates, for surveys on Public Land, the costs for registering a second plan at the Land Titles Office.

6. **How is the recommendation in the public interest?**
   This recommendation reduces the public’s costs for obtaining four categories of surface leases on Public Land.

**RATIONALE DOCUMENT for the motion pertaining to the creation of a new Part D, Section 1.6 in the Manual of Standard Practice.**

1. **What are the financial costs of the recommendation? Are there any ongoing financial commitments required?**
   The only cost to the association will be the administrative costs to make the necessary changes to the MSP and to liaise with the necessary bodies to make sure that all documentation which needs to be updated is updated.
   
   There are no ongoing financial commitments for the Association.
2. **What is the genesis for the recommendation?**

The genesis of the recommendation arose from new business put forward by the director of Surveys, Mike Michaud. The new business was: Consider developing a common standardized CAD file for submission to Land Titles and Public Lands and report back to Council.

After further discussion on the topic at both the committee and sub-group level, it was apparent that the main objective of this item is to take advantage of GPS surveys and surveys tied to control to improve the quality of mapping in Alberta.

Since companies already have processes in place for submitting projects to LTO and Public Lands, there would be no advantage to practitioners, the public or LTO and Public Lands to standardizing the actual forms and digital files (ie. Layers and levels).

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

Bill Martin of Martin Newby Consulting and Brian Sobchysyn of the City of Edmonton were consulted and were members of the sub-group.

Their reactions were very favourable. Both Brian and Bill believe this will improve the level of mapping accuracy in Alberta.

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

The overall intent of the recommendation is to improve the level of mapping precision and accuracy in Alberta.

If the membership passes this recommendation at the 2008 AGM the Association would liaise with the Land Titles Office, Public Lands and AltaLIS to make any necessary changes to supporting documentation to facilitate the proposed changes to the MSP.

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

CAD files which are currently submitted to LTO and Public Lands through the LTO DiPS and Public Lands DDiPS systems may be in any map projection or may be skewed, scaled and rotated to no system. This results in improperly scaled and rotated CAD files which must be adjusted once again to fit the existing mapping (which may not be accurate).

With the advent of GPS surveys, practitioners have the ability to submit a CAD file or an ASCII file which is properly scaled and rotated to a map projection.
It may also be relatively straightforward to properly geo-reference this survey to the provincial mapping framework through the use of long-range GPS solutions to the base station of the RTK survey. With the additional options for geo-referencing on the LTO DiPS and Public Lands DDiPS forms, these surveys will start to vastly improve the quality of mapping in Alberta.

The recommendation will allow Spatial Data Warehouse and AltaLIS to use the additional information to better fit the survey into the mapping fabric and even improve the existing mapping fabric.

6. How is the recommendation in the public interest?

The recommendation is in the public’s best interest because it will lead to a better mapping base.

This will result in cost savings for cities, municipalities, practitioners and any other body which uses the mapping base. This cost savings could be passed on to the public or result in their tax dollars going to other projects.

The recommendation will allow dispositions on Public Lands to be more accurately positioned.
New Members 2007-2008

J.A. (Jeffrey) Adair
R.T. (Ralph) Bode
A.W. (Andrew) Christian
J.A. (Jeffery) Fehr
M.W. (Matthew) Forsyth
R.T. (Ryan) Gordon
J.D. (Jeremy) Howden
K. (Kristopher) Jewett
J. (Jiun Han) Keong
B.D. (Byron) Laurie
L.A. (Lesley) Laurie
R.P. (Ryan) McMahon
R.E. (Rich) Nixon
W.T. (William) Powley
J. (Javier) Siu
C.A.S. (Cathy) Sprott
M.A. (Michael) Thompson

Note: New members A.J.F. (Adam) Thompson and P.J. (Paul) Hatch were not in attendance.
Executive Director Brian Munday addressed the luncheon as follows:

This year, we are fortunate to have 19 new Alberta Land Surveyors.

Twelve are University of Calgary graduates; four are University of New Brunswick graduates, one is a University of Toronto graduate, and two challenged the Western Board/Canadian Board examinations.

There was only one member this year who came through under the terms of the labour mobility agreement signed in 2001 but I’m sure it won’t be long until we start recognizing members under the Alberta-BC Trade Investment & Labour Mobility Agreement (TILMA).

President Bob Wallace addressed the new members as follows:

I wish to welcome our new members to our prestigious Association. At this juncture of your career you probably have more questions than answers, but I congratulate you on your achievement. This will be one of the greatest accomplishments of your life. The countless hours you dedicated to schooling, articles and exams have paid off now. There were times that you probably questioned—why am I doing this or will it ever end. Well, today you can stand proud. Your teachers, professors, principal and your family can be proud also.

I can remember a few years ago (27 or so) when I received my commission and I was little intimidated to say the least. I felt the Association was made up of a bunch of stodgy old guys. I was brimming with ideas but I thought there was no way the old guard would listen to me. I suggested, “have you ever considered doing it this way?” “No this is the way we’ve always done it and if it ain’t broke, why fix it.”

How times have changed, we are the stodgy old guys now. But I think the demographics of our Association has been evolving recently. People who have received their commission in recent years comprise a large percentage of our population. What is making this thing work now is fresh and innovative ideas. With so many younger people contributing to our committees, it allows us to think outside the box which I think makes the ALSA unique compared to many other associations across North America.

In order to survive, the ALSA must continue to maintain and improve those duties that we have been given by legislation and to explore new fields of practice. I think we have the best understanding of everything related to geospatial representation.
Your new ideas, your energy and your time are vital to the future and the progression of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association.

There are a few things I ask you to remember as you start your journey as an Alberta Land Surveyor.

First, be respectful. I think our association is unique in the way our members treat each other. Many issues are resolved by simple dialogue between land surveyors. I would suggest you continue your mentorship. Pick an individual that best represents your moral values, then have that person help guide you through your survey and business life.

Second—volunteer. I credit my career as an Alberta Land Surveyor to the countless hours my predecessors put in to establish and maintain our survey profession in Alberta. You can make a difference! Committee work is rewarding not only for the task at hand, but it allows you to interact with fellow land surveyors which allows you to establish relationships that will continue to help you through your career.

Your learning does not stop here. You must continue to learn both technically and personally. You are familiar with the Code of Ethics now. Pull it out every once in while and you will be amazed at what different parts of it jump out at you.

Finally, as much as you have been wrapped up in obtaining your commission, don’t forget your family. Your sacrifices have been their sacrifices. The person you are is a direct result of the support you receive at home.

Please join me in congratulating our new 2007-2008 Alberta Land Surveyors.

Executive Director Brian Munday addressed the luncheon as follows:

Twenty-five years ago, a considerable amount of time at that AGM dealt with the aftermath of the new Land Surveyors Act. That year also saw the first public member on Council and on the newly established Practice Review Board. Council, at that time, directed the PRB to concentrate on the assessment of existing, and the development of new, educational standards and experience necessary to maintain pace with rapid technological changes. By-laws were rewritten that year to recognize the establishment of surveyors’ corporations. The Association also had to deal with new discipline procedures.

The economic slow-down, in 1983, meant not only a decrease in the attendance at the annual general meeting that year but also competitive bidding on survey projects and reducing fees to obtain work. A motion to adopt a minimum tariff of fees, which had been defeated the previous year, was passed that year.

You can see the effect that the economy did have on the number of new ALSs that year. Twenty-five years ago, just seven Alberta Land Surveyors received their commission and today, five are still active.

*Note: Messrs. Finner, MacAulay and Westersund were not in attendance at the awards lunch.*
50 Year Pin Recipients

Mr. Munday informed the luncheon that Fifty years ago, eleven Alberta Land Surveyors received their commission and three are still members of the Association.

Note: Allan Martin accepted for Dalton Martin, ALS. Ed Scovill, ALS (Ret.) accepted for Ken Pawson, ALS (Hon. Life). Lou Breton was not in attendance at the AGM.
Appendix “I”

Presentation of Honorary Membership to Dr. Alec McEwen
by David McArthur, ALS

Members of Council, fellow colleagues and students, esteemed guests, Mrs. McEwen. It is my great pleasure and privilege to honour Dr. Alec McEwen today as a most deserving recipient of honourary membership in the Alberta Land Surveyors Association.

“A Canadian Surveyor in Borneo.” If you were an Ontario Land Surveyor in 1957, this article in your Annual Report would certainly have caught your attention as unique, to say the least. But Borneo was only the beginning of the many adventures of Dr. Alec McEwen.

In the intervening fifty years, this Canada Lands Surveyor qualified as a certified land surveyor in East Africa, a member of the Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors, and as a Chartered Geographer.

He also managed to obtain three law degrees, including a Ph.d in Law from the University of London, in 1979; thus, Dr. McEwen masterfully merged a law and surveying career with a travel itinerary to die for.

It would seem that, even as a young surveyor, Dr. McEwen preferred warmer climates. In 1954, he swapped his responsibilities as the Director of Town Planning in the northern Ontario town of Sault Ste. Marie, for similar duties at the opposite end of the world with the Government of North Borneo.

After a couple of years, he returned to Canada as chief surveyor with the Toronto Transit Commission, selecting routes for the Toronto subway system. (He hasn’t advised me whether he’s working on our own LRT, but I’m sure his help would be more than welcome.)

In 1958, warm climes called him again. This time, he went to Seychelles to provide United Nations technical assistance. (I don’t know where Seychelles is, but I’m assuming it’s warm.)

If you think about it, Alec had a heck of a career even before the Beatles got together.

Since the 1960s, Dr. McEwen interspaced his role as a private practitioner in Canada with many more international stints.
He provided advice to many countries on establishing new procedures and new systems of land tenure; the development of land information systems; as well as the laws governing land. He was employed by the governments of Tunisia, Algeria, Nigeria, Zanzibar, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Bahamas, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago. I’m definitely seeing a pattern here.

But wait—Alec also worked for more northern government—Finland, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Mongolia, and Russia, where in 1998, he provided consulting services for the newly-established land registration system in the Russian province of Novgorod following the fall of the communist government.

Alec has been in international hotbeds at history-making junctures throughout his incredible career. In addition to consulting extensively for the World Bank, he has made recommendations concerning many international boundaries.

From 1976 to 1990, he served as Commissioner for the Canada/US International Boundary Commission, where his duties included responsibility for surveying and mapping the land and water boundaries. I believe he recommended that putting a fence between the two countries was not the way to go.

Dr. McEwen did not neglect our provincial governments. In the 1970s, he spent four years as Director of Lands and Surveys in the Government of Newfoundland. Considering Alec began his articles in 1949, I believe he was a surveyor before Newfoundland was a province!

It seems that Dr. McEwen’s teaching career may have started in Tanzania—why not?—where he was sent in 1964 by CIDA to teach and develop curriculum for a residential surveying technical school.

The University of Calgary was lucky enough to count Dr. McEwen among its staff from 1991 to 1996. I wouldn’t be surprised if the Dean of Law was ticked off that Alec decided to teach in the Department of Geomatics Engineering, where he was a much admired Professor of Cadastral Studies. He now enjoys the title of Professor Emeritus of Geomatics Engineering—whatever that means.

Yeah, but what has Alec done lately? I mean, he hasn’t written a book since 1988, his last of three. The latest book he wrote in, was The Canadian Encyclopaedia, in 2000, in which he wrote on the “Labrador Boundary Dispute”—too bad I missed that chapter.

Throughout his career, Dr. McEwen has contributed over 100 published articles to the body of surveying law and practice in Canada and around the world. His latest may have
been a history in Survey Review entitled “Surveying in Canada 1931-2006” but then I only have his resume up to 2006.

Knowing Alec as I do, I’m sure he has kept busy. I believe his latest stint was in Kabul, where he undertook land tenure research in five Afghanistan provinces for the water, opium and livestock project, funded by the European Union.

Lately, Alec has continued working as a freelance consultant in land administration, land title registration and geomatics. He is also the editor of “Geomatics and the Law” in Geomatica.

Luckily for us, Dr. McEwen agreed to be the editor of our association’s book, “The Law and Practice of Surveying in Alberta.” It was a great pleasure working alongside Alec on the first textbook dedicated to surveying in Alberta.

Throughout, Alec never lost his enthusiasm or his sense of humour. Our Association owes a great deal to this erudite, knowledgeable and honourable man. Dr. McEwen’s efforts and dedication in publishing, lecturing, and spreading his vast knowledge and wisdom throughout developed and developing countries is truly a remarkable achievement, and I am honored to present Alec with the title of Honorary Member of the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association. Thank you.

Dr. McEwen addressed the luncheon as follows:

It’s always most gratifying to be recognized, especially when the recognition comes from one’s professional colleagues and associates. This is a very proud occasion for me. I am deeply honored and extremely pleased to join the Alberta Land Surveyors’ Association as an honorary member.

Thank you all very much.
President Bob, honoured guests, ladies and gentlemen.

It is a real pleasure to be here today to present the Professional Recognition Award. This award is presented for outstanding contribution or service to the profession of surveying. Persons who have obtained high levels of office, who have obtained national or international recognition, who have developed new systems or methods, or have otherwise contributed to the profession of surveying.

Today’s recipient has shown a great passion for the profession of land surveying. His service to the Alberta Land Surveyors Association is unmatched by most of his colleagues. He has served on Council for three terms (1984-86, 1993-95 and 1995-97). He served as vice president, president and past president (1999-2002) and then served as Secretary/Treasurer and CCLS Director (2004-07). He has also served on numerous committees over the years going right back to when he was an articled student in the early 70s.

Larry Pals articled under L.R. Newby ALS and received his Alberta Land Surveyor’s commission in 1976. Throughout his career, Larry has worked enthusiastically for the betterment of our profession.

Larry was born on July 5th, 1951 in Castor, Alberta. He grew up six miles south of Castor on a large mixed farm that was homesteaded by his Dutch grandparents. As the oldest son of seven children, Larry was instrumental in the success of his parents’ dairy operation. In fact, when he left the farm to attend SAIT, they had to invest in milking machines. As a youngster, Larry enjoyed 4H and also became a Queen Scout.

It was at SAIT in the fall of 1969 that I first met Larry. When we weren’t at H block (the Highlander Hotel) bending our elbows we could actually be found doing homework in the study hall. After graduating from SAIT, Larry worked for the Department of Highways doing surveys in south central Alberta and in the summer of ’72, he met Judy at a dance in Halkirk. They were married in ’74.

Over the next few years, Larry and Judy were blessed with three sons, Travis, Ryan and Colin. Larry, being a dedicated father and great community supporter, got involved in all as-
pects of the boys’ lives. He was a Beaver and Cub leader for ten years with the 202 LaPerle Scouting Group. He coached or managed his boys’ hockey teams for many years, served as the District Director and was President of the Knights of Columbus Hockey Association from 1995 to 1999. When his boys got into roller hockey, of course, so did Larry. He was coach, team manager and a Director of Edmonton Inline Hockey from 1996 to 2003.

Larry and his family loved the outdoors. About ten years ago, they cleared a lot and built a cabin at Pigeon Lake. Larry loves the water and enjoys pulling water skiers and grandkids in tubes behind his boat.

Larry has been very active in the Edmonton political scene. Back in the 80s he was the PC Constituency President for Les Young, MLA. Since that time Larry has stayed active with the PC party and works hard to ensure his candidate gets elected to the Legislature. Judy told me that Larry’s philosophy is, “as we are all affected by politics and political decisions, it is best to get involved and help out in the process.”

In 1983, Larry and his partner Peter Jackson formed Pals Surveys & Associates Ltd. They did their first survey in Millet using a 1971 Honda Civic that smoked more than Larry. Pals Surveys, 25 years later, is a well-respected company with 150 employees. They were recently recognized by the Canadian Home Builders Association, Edmonton Region, as the General Member of the Year—congratulations Larry. This is one of many SAM awards they have received over the years.

In speaking briefly with Pete Jackson about Larry, he had this to say, “being the kind of guy Larry is there are not many humorous stories to tell. What stands out is his commitment to the Association and being adamant about conducting all his surveys according to the Manual of Good Practice with no exceptions.”

I would like to thank Larry for his dedication and time he has committed to our Association and to his community. It is through efforts such as this that we enjoy a better place to work, live and raise our families. And lastly I want to thank Judy for sharing Larry’s time with us and allowing us all to benefit from his work and his wisdom. Thank you Judy.
It is my privilege today to make the presentation for the ALSA Outstanding Service Award. The description for this award is for outstanding service or contribution to society. It goes on to say that this service does not necessarily have to relate to the profession of surveying but it really implies exemplary service or contribution in any manner for the benefit of society.

In my humble opinion, today’s nominee qualifies equally for recognition within the survey profession as well as externally for his service to society. The Outstanding Service Award was established by Council in 1977 and has only been awarded 11 times since its inception. This tells me that Council is very serious in its consideration of nominations for the award, and rightfully so. Our nominee this year will join a distinguished group of recipients that include: Bob Baker, Tom Holt, Bob McCutcheon, Buck Olsen, Ken Pawson, Jerry Rasmusson, Ted Rippon, Marlin Sexaur, George Walker, and Wally Youngs. He’s gonna fit right in.

It’s difficult to keep dancing around the identity of the recipient so I’m going to cut right to the chase. Our nominee for the Outstanding Service Award is Alberta Land Surveyor #610, David Norman Marquardt. David is an original Albertan, he was born in Edmonton, but has had the opportunity to spend some of his time in various parts of Canada and the world, being born into a military family. He graduated from high school in North Bay, Ontario before returning to Alberta and the U of A where he studied Physical Education. David subsequently contemplated a career change (to our benefit) as he went on to graduate from SAIT’s Survey Technology Program in 1983. He pursued his qualification to article through the Western Canadian Board of Examiners continuing on to article with Don George, Terry Hudema, and Jim Stuart. David received his commission as an Alberta Land Surveyor on April 19, 1994.

As David has contributed greatly to our Association as well as Society in general, I will speak briefly to both.

Upon receiving his commission, David immediately became involved in Association affairs. His contributions, so far are:
Professional Development Committee 1993-1994
Convention and Social Committee 1995-1996
Practice Review Board 1999-2002
Statutory Boundary Tribunal 2001-2002
Section 9 Ad Hoc Committee 2002-2003
Council 2004-2006
Standards Committee 2004-2006

He currently volunteers for the Boundary Panel and the Legislation Ad Hoc Committee.

In addition, David has been a frequent contributor to ALS News with articles such as: The Digital Camera, Bush or Prairie, A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Office, It Was Just a Site Survey, A Surveyor’s Prayer.

The propensity to submit material for publication is reflective of Dave’s strong mentoring qualities. He is always one the first to volunteer for participation in “mock orals” to prepare articling students for their qualifying exams. But, perhaps the ultimate “goodwill” initiative that he has undertaken relative to the Association is his effort to re-name the trophy for the annual North-South hockey game to “The Brassard Cup” in memory of Jules Brassard. A well-placed effort, to be sure.

Aside from Association work, I can pass along a few of the things that David has contributed in an effort to benefit society.

David and his family attend a church in Okotoks that was in need of structural repair. David volunteered his survey expertise as a contribution to the project. As a result of that work David was asked to sit on the church vestry, which he gladly did for a term of five years. David has also participated in presentations to the church men’s group and in the delivery of sermons at the church. David and his wife Dana, in addition to their three children, have expanded their family with the adoption of two daughters from Haitian orphanages. Enquiries into adopting a third child from Haiti have thus far been unsuccessful primarily due to political conditions in that country. David has participated in, and provided his survey expertise to two missions to assist orphanage development in Trinidad in 2004 and in Haiti in 2007. Both these projects have been documented in his ALS News articles. This past February, David traveled to Rwanda to assist with the development of a reconciliation centre in Kigali.

More locally, there was a time when Dave’s son was younger, that he volunteered in the Jr. Forest Wardens youth organization. Personally, I think his involvement may have been shortened by the fact he couldn’t prevent his own son from stabbing himself in the forehead with his pocket knife.
Other volunteer efforts Dave became involved with were: the Blue Brona Christian Camp in the Kananaskis area, to help them define some boundaries, the Turner Valley base of “Youth with a Mission” to help with some boundary questions, the Millarville Community Church to help with the move of a church to a new site, and serving as Master of Ceremonies for numerous fund raising dinners to support church causes in Chile, Belize and Mexico.

Along with his family, David has welcomed nine exchange students into his home from countries such as Japan, Italy, Brazil and Mexico. The terms have lasted in excess of ten months.

David has contributed his time and effort to the adoption charity, God’s Littlest Angels, an organization to which Dana serves on the Board of Directors.

It is obvious that Dave has the full support of his family in his convictions and efforts to contribute to society. One of the most significant things a person can do to better society is to pass on his beliefs and knowledge through leadership and teaching.

We can easily recognize Dave’s contributions to our company and the Association by his willingness to mentor those around him, but his leadership efforts may be most exemplified by the fact that he included his daughter Ashley on his past mission to Rwanda.

David was deeply moved by his time in Rwanda, and in a recent conversation revealed that he will be returning there for another project in the very near future. Anyone who is even vaguely familiar with the recent history of Rwanda will understand the internal fortitude it must take for a foreigner to stand on their soil.

When he returns, I’m sure he’ll be looking forward to trying to connect again with an acquaintance he made on his last trip—a 35 year old student, who goes by the name of Peter, who affectionately took to calling David “Dad.” It seems when he’s not busy adopting someone, they try to adopt him!

In closing I would like to quote from one of David’s own articles—words that so clearly illustrate his attitude to those around him and the world we live in.

_A Surveyor’s Prayer_

*When my surveying days are done,*
*I pray that my boots show the wear and tear of the many miles I have traveled,*
*Yet my footsteps show how softly I have trod.*

David, I don’t think that 366 surveyors could have said it any better.
Mr. Marquardt addressed the luncheon as follows:

I am absolutely blown away. This is a total surprise. I love what I do as a surveyor.

Years ago, when I was just an articling student, I read an article by Ken Pawson about his various travels in Antarctica and New Guinea and I thought, wouldn’t it be just great if I could ever have the chance to do something like that.

I have so many people to thank. The first is the lady off to my right here (Dana) who has been an absolutely incredible driving force in our marriage and our life. Thank you to all the people who have affected me in some way, shape or form as a land surveyor: Don George, Terry Hudema, Jim Halliday and many others.

As land surveyors, we are some of the best in the world. I have found that out in my travels in talking with other engineers and land surveyors and I encourage you, all you new students, to keep up your involvement with this organization, but to also look outside this organization because it’s a big world out there. Your talents and your expertise could be used just about anywhere. If I can do it, you can do it too.

Thank you very much Jim. You guys were pretty sneaky about this. Thank you and God bless.
List of Exhibitors and Sponsors

EXHIBITORS
Abacus Datagraphics Ltd.
Airborne Imaging Inc.
AltaLIS Ltd.
Bench Mark Equipment & Supplies Inc.
Butler Survey Supplies Ltd.
Cansel Survey Equipment Inc.
Corrpro Canada Inc.
EECOL Electric Corp.
First Order Measurement Solutions Inc.
Hilti Canada
IHS Energy (Canada) Ltd.
Land Measurement Systems Inc.
MicroSurvey Software Inc.
Oce Canada Ltd.
Phoenix Imaging
Russell Metals Inc.
SECO Manufacturing Co. Inc.
Spatial Technologies Inc.
Western Diazo

SPONSORS
Platinum—$1,000+
All-Can Engineering & Surveys (1976) Ltd.
Can-Am Geomatics Corp.
Challenger Geomatics Ltd.
Driving Force Vehicle Rentals, Sales & Leasing
Focus Surveys Limited Partnership
IHS Energy (Canada) Ltd.
Land Measurement Systems Inc.
Midwest Surveys Inc.
Russel Metals Inc.
Stewart, Weir & Co. Ltd.
Trimble Navigation Ltd.

Gold—$500+
Abacus Datagraphics Ltd.
Airborne Imaging Inc.
Caltech Surveys Ltd.
Eastern Drafting Services Inc.
Fairmont Chateau Lake Louise
First Capital Leasing Ltd.
Menzies Printers Ltd.
Millennium Geomatics Ltd.
Mission Geospatial Ltd.
Pals Surveys and Associates Ltd.
Precision Geomatics Inc.
Shores Belzil Jardine LLP
Snell & Oslund Surveys (1979) Ltd.

Silver—250+
Peterson Walker LLP

Bronze—100+
Creative Concepts
D.W. Data Services
LPP Services Ltd.
Rose Country Communications & Public Relations
Vision Geomatics Ltd.