

the negotiator

April 2020



Disposition Renewals from a Land Surveyor's Perspective Understanding Surface Continuations

Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project BC Grasping At Straws?

The Negotiator

VOLUNTEER PUBLISHED, VOLUNTEER COORDINATED, VOLUNTEER CREATED
AND SUPPORTED BY OUR VALUED ADVERTISERS

ADVERTISING SPACE AVAILABLE

DIRECT ACCESS TO A VAST READERSHIP OF OVER 1000 EDUCATED PROFESSIONALS
ACTIVELY ENGAGED AND EMPLOYABLE IN CANADA'S OIL AND GAS SECTOR


OPPORTUNITY TO ENGAGE PROACTIVE AND INFORMED INDIVIDUALS
REGULARLY ACCESSING *THE NEGOTIATOR'S* ELECTRONIC ISSUES

EFFICIENTLY REACH A WIDE AUDIENCE COVERING ALL DISCIPLINES AND
PROFESSIONS WITHIN LAND ASSET MANAGEMENT: LAW, SURFACE, MINERALS,
ACQUISITIONS AND DIVESTMENT, TECHNOLOGY, CONTRACTS

OPPORTUNITY TO REPRESENT YOUR ORGANIZATION IN A WELL-REGARDED, PROFESSIONAL
PUBLICATION THAT IS WELL-READ AND RESPECTED BY INDUSTRY PROFESSIONALS

CONTRIBUTE MEANINGFULLY TO A NOT-FOR-PROFIT VOLUNTEER RUN ORGANIZATION
WITH A DEVELOPED REPUTATION IN CANADA'S OIL AND GAS SECTOR

NOW
WITH
LIVE
WEB LINKS



TO BOOK YOUR ADVERTISING IN *THE NEGOTIATOR*, PLEASE CONTACT:

D'arcy Gregoire 403-509-6439

the negotiator

April 2020
The Magazine of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Landmen



Disposition Renewals From a Land Surveyor's Perspective

2 Peter Lund

Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project Clears Legal Hurdles

8 Paul Chiswell, Robert Martz & Brendan Downey

- 12** Message From the CAPL Board
- 13** 2019 Holiday Charity Event
- 14** 2020 CAPL Conference
- 16** Get Smart

- 17** Roster Updates
- 17** In Memoriam
- 18** The Social Calendar

SENIOR EDITORIAL BOARD

Director of Communications

Amy Kalmbach 403-619-2868

Advertising Editor

D'arcy Gregoire 403-509-6439

Coordinating Editor

Danell Stebing 587-233-7742

Feature Content Editor

Vacant

Regular Content Editor

Martin Leung 403-517-6822

Social Content Editor

Jason Peacock 403-724-5273

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

R. L. ("Reiny") Fercho 587-577-7115

DESIGN AND PRODUCTION

Rachel Hershfield, Folio Creations

SUBMISSIONS

For information regarding submission of articles, please contact a member of our Senior Editorial Board. By providing submissions to the Canadian Association of Petroleum Landmen for publication in *The Negotiator* you are granting permission for the content to be posted or re-posted on the CAPL website and CAPL's affiliated social media.

DISCLAIMER

All articles printed under an author's, association's or corporation's name represent the views of the author; publication or posting neither implies approval of the opinions expressed, nor accuracy of the facts stated.

ADVERTISING

For information, please contact D'arcy Gregoire (403-509-6439). No endorsement or sponsorship by the Canadian Association of Petroleum Landmen is suggested or implied.

The contents of this publication may not be reproduced outside of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Landmen regulated content, either in part or in full, without the consent of the Senior Editorial Board.

Readers may obtain any Director's contact information from the CAPL office.

General reception@landman.ca
Karin Steers ksteers@landman.ca

2019-2020 CAPL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Kristin Rennie

Vice-President

Shaun Williams

Finance

Janice Redmond

Secretary

Kathryn Gagne

Director, Business Development

Jacque Farquhar

Director, Communications

Amy Kalmbach, P. Land

Director, Education

Bill Schlegel, P. Land

Director, Field Acquisition and Management

Wade McLeod

Director, Marketing

Marah Graham

Director, Membership

Amanda White, PSL

Director, Mineral Energy Engagement Team

Tim Galbreath

Director, New Education

Alexis Watson

Director, Professionalism

Kyle Huntley, P. Land

Director, Public Relations

Justin Sullivan

Director, Events

Jeff Rideout

Past President

Noel Millions, PSL



Disposition Renewals From a Land Surveyor's Perspective

written by
PETER LUND, ALS, PENG
McElhanney Ltd.



PUBLIC LAND DISPOSITION RENEWALS

As part one of a four-part series, this article is going to review public land disposition renewals. It will provide insight into different survey plan options available for renewals, how the AER and AEP will assess the application with regards to the survey plan, and provide some suggestions to help reduce costs of renewal projects.




Figure 1

With capital budgets constantly under downward pressure, trying to get funding for renewal projects is a trying exercise.

Some companies have up to 3,500 dispositions that will need to be renewed within the next two years. Therefore, planning and getting them done in the most efficient way possible is very important. This is often done by planning and understanding the options available for each disposition.

In 2013, the Responsible Energy Development Act (REDA) was enacted and the AER established who was responsible for the Public Lands Act (ACT). The Public Lands Act contains the Public Lands Administration Regulation, which requires disposition holders to uphold specific duties.

One of these duties is that the holder must upon expiry: cancel, surrender, or abandon the formal disposition and reclaim the subject land to an equivalent land capability.¹ As per section 20 of the regulation, letting a disposition expire leaves the future of those lands to the discretion of the director in charge of the ACT. The best way to avoid conflict with the AER on this topic is to complete the renewal process within the requested timeframe. This timeframe is after halfway through the disposition's term and prior to one year before the expiry. If the renewal is applied for between one year remaining and the expiry date, a new application must be submitted. The previous disposition will be replaced if the new application is approved. Therefore, it is important to stay current on renewals to ensure no extra cost is incurred by submitting late.

When reviewing a renewal program, there are a few things to consider, and the flow chart, Figure 1, breaks down a simple process that should be considered for each individual disposition.

If you choose to renew the disposition, three items will need to be met for the AER/AEP. The following sections will outline these items and meet the renewal application requirements.

(1) THE DISPOSITION MUST HAVE NO CHANGES?

When considering whether the disposition has changed, there are three things to determine:

1. Has the *purpose* of the land use changed since the disposition was previously approved as defined by the PLAR A1 and A2 Tables?
2. Has the *activity* of the land use changed since the disposition was previously approved as defined by the PLAR A1 and A2 Tables?
3. Has the *physical footprint* of the area of land use changed since the disposition was previously approved?

If the answer to any of these questions is yes, then an application for amendment will need to be completed prior to applying for a renewal. If unsure, further investigation is required. This might include discussing purpose and activity with operations within the company or getting a Land Surveyor to complete a field visit to

Purpose	Activity	Definitions	Disposition Type	Additional Options (TFA)		File Number for Consultation (FNC)	Application Plan Requirements	Final Plan Requirements	Survey Type Monuments
				Approval	Authorization				
Pipeline	Produced Water	A pipeline which only transports produced water from drilling or plant site operations	PLA	Yes	Yes	PA	Sketch	Survey / Hybrid Cadastre	1/4
Pipeline	Waste Water	A pipeline which only transports waste water. This includes sewage, grey water, black water, or other various liquid waste streams.	PLA	Yes	Yes	PA	Sketch	Survey / Hybrid Cadastre	1/4
Pipeline Installation	Cathodic Protection/Anode Bed	An installation intended to reduce corrosion of a pipeline by installation of a sacrificial metal (anode bed). A cathodic protection/anode bed only requires a separate disposition when outside of the pipeline agreement (PLA) area. A pipeline installation (PIL) is used when above ground structures are required, while a PLA is used when only belowground linear protection infrastructure is installed.	PIL	No	No	PA	Sketch	Survey / Hybrid Cadastre	2/4

Figure 2

determine the boundaries of survey on file compared to the area of use. Although statutory declarations are no longer required for application purposes, many companies still like to get them completed to show due diligence and have a copy on file for future reference or if requested by the AER/AEP during the application review process.

(2) THE DISPOSITION MUST HAVE A PLAN ON FILE WITH THE AER/AEP THAT MEETS THE FINAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS AS SET OUT IN PLAR TABLE A1 AND A2² When reviewing the PLAR tables, there are four plan types: Sketch, LIDAR, Conventional Survey, and Hybrid. All four types can be used can be used for renewals, but the tables will need to be reviewed to determine what type is allowed for the disposition of interest.

2020 CAPL SQUASH TOURNAMENT

Date
Friday, April 24

Time
1:00pm - 4:00pm (Squash)
5:00pm - 7:00pm (Bowling & Dinner)

Location
Glenora Club

Registration is now available online via the CAPL website

For more information or for sponsorship opportunities please contact:
Shaun Cooper at scooper@torcoil.com

www.landman.ca

No prior Squash experience required!

CANCELLED
SEE WEBSITE FOR DETAILS

Figure 2 is from PLAR A2 and, as an example, shows that for a proposed water pipeline, the disposition would be a PLA. It shows, at minimum, a sketch plan being required for application and either a conventional survey (type 2 monument) or Hybrid Survey plan being accepted for the final plan/renewal.

When renewing a disposition, the the submitted plan type must meet the final plan requirement type found in the PLAR tables. If the previous plan meets this requirement then it can be re-used.

If the option to use different types of plans for a renewal is available, it is important to make sure the best option is used. Each style has it own benefit, and knowing the difference can help reduce costs. In the PIL example, if the option to use a hybrid plan is available but a full conventional survey is completed, then the survey costs *could* greatly increase due to the extra field time that *may* be required. The terms *could* and *may* are used because the use of the conventional survey plan could also decrease the cost of the survey if used in a congested area with lots of statutory iron posts where a hybrid plan is likely not the best option. There are many different variables to consider when picking what plan will work best for each job.

Discuss with your Land Surveyor if it is unclear as to why a specific plan was used over another.

When reviewing the following plan types, note whether the plan type has physical monumentation placed during the survey. As indicated in the legends of the PLAR tables, physical survey monumentation will either be a 30cm iron spike/bar (type 2) or a statutory iron post (type 1). The pros or cons of physical monumentation of the sites is a personal preference. Many have the opinion that monumentation is good, as it can help show interest in land while the disposition is in the application process. Others believe monumentation is outdated due to the accuracies of Global Navigational Satellite Systems (GNSS).

Sketch Plan

When no physical monuments are placed, corners/boundaries are defined by roughly calculated positions.

Pros

- Low cost
- Fast project turnaround
- Can easily be amended

The advertisement features a background image of a rolling green landscape under a clear sky. At the top center is the Synergy Land & Environmental logo, which consists of a stylized 'S' inside a circle followed by the text 'SYNERGY LAND & ENVIRONMENTAL'. Below the logo are four circular icons: a construction worker in a green hard hat, a person in a field with a surveying instrument, a person in a field with a surveying instrument, and a green circuit board. The word 'VISION' is written in large, white, outlined letters, with '2020' in solid white to its right. Below this, the text reads: 'With an eye on future opportunities, Synergy Land & Environmental Ltd. is ready to merge today with tomorrow!'. Further down, it says: 'Through the integration of our Live Data Capture systems with our Environmental and Archaeological assessments, we are able to deliver the solutions you require faster than ever.' Below that, it states: 'Planning, designing, and implementing while crews are still in the field. No remobilization, no wasted time.' At the bottom, it says: 'Solutions for your tomorrow, today!' and provides the website 'www.synergylandenv.ca | 1-877-961-5263 | Community Engaged'.

Cons

- Not available for all final plans, so will often require another plan type for the final plan requirement
- No elevations, unless specifically requested by client

LIDAR Plan

No physical monuments placed and corners/boundaries are defined by calculated positions.

Pros

- Fast project turnaround
- Complete site elevations to help with site design

Cons

- Requires 1m LiDAR data that is expensive for single site use (more cost effective for a group of sites)
- Often will require another plan to meet final plan requirements

Conventional Survey Plan

Type 1 and 2 physical monuments are placed, corners/boundaries are defined by the placed monuments.

Pros

- If constructed properly, does not require new plan for renewal

Cons

- Higher cost
- Project turnaround can be slower

Hybrid Plan

No physical monuments placed and corners/boundaries are defined by accurately calculated positions.

Pros

- Fast project turnaround
- Can greatly reduce the overall cost of the project

Cons

- Cannot be used to submit for a well license with a D56 application
- Need to consider the other type of plans in the area; often does not work well if crossing many other type 1 or 4 monumented dispositions

Each plan type also has its own requirements, determined by statutes that Land Surveyors are ethically bound to follow, as well as AER plan requirements.

(3) THE SITE COVERED BY THE DISPOSITION MUST HAVE BEEN ENTERED (I.E., SITE ENTRY NOTIFICATION HAS OCCURRED)²

If this item is not met, then under Section 18(1) of the Public Land Regulation, the holder of the disposition has multiple options for the disposition to still be renewed, but they will need to get acceptance from the Director responsible for the ACT.⁴

AMENDMENTS

If either or both situations (1) and (2) previously described cannot be met, an amendment will be required prior to submitting for a renewal. Most often, the survey plan that will accompany the amendment application will be the same type acceptable for the final plan requirement. In specific situations, there are two other plan types that can be used for amendments: itemized plans and compiled plans.

An itemized plan can be used to add or remove land from a disposition without having to survey the entire disposition. This option can only be used for linear dispositions longer than 6.5 km. The itemized plan is used to accompany the original plan and, therefore, multiple active plans will exist for a single disposition.

A compiled plan can be used in three specific situations and is a combination of multiple existing plans to create one new plan.

The three uses are:

- An amendment to an existing disposition for the purpose of partial reclamation of that disposition⁵
- An amendment to an existing disposition, where an associated disposition is being reclaimed⁵
- The purpose of partial assignment of an existing disposition from the disposition holder to another person eligible to hold a disposition⁵

PLANNING A RENEWAL PROGRAM

There are many options that can be undertaken to help get a renewal project completed in a timely manner and with a reasonable budget. Grouping dispositions in similar areas, picking the correct plan type, and pre-planning are effective means to be most cost effective.

Another idea is that a renewal project can start during the application stage, as some final plan requirement types can be used for both application and renewal. This greatly depends on the knowledge of how the area will be developed, and this could possibly change. For example, if you know an MSL is going to be constructed and are confident the site will be constructed within the disposition boundaries, then completing a conventional survey (type 2 monument) or hybrid survey would

be an option. This will reduce or eliminate the need for an as-built plan. One issue of doing this is that if an amendment is required, it can only be done with one of the final plan types instead of the less stringent sketch plan.

REGISTRATION

Once the survey plan is completed, the amendment and renewal applications are submitted using the AER's OneStop website. The application will then go through a review process that is completed by both human and digital analysis.⁶

Often, during the review process, small plan deficiencies are found, and the plan will be returned with a time period to be re-submitted with minimal consequence for the error. The review will then be completed along with the rest of the application. If approved, it will be shared on the AER/EAP's Publication of Decision website. ♦

NOTES

1. http://www.qp.alberta.ca/1266.cfm?page=2011_I87.cfm&leg_type=Regs&isbncn=9780779813483
2. <https://www.aer.ca/regulating-development/project-application/application-process/formal-disposition-renewal-and-amendment-renewal>

3. <https://open.alberta.ca/publications/public-lands-administration-regulation-plate-a2-alberta-energy-regulator-aer> (November 2018)
4. http://www.qp.alberta.ca/1266.cfm?page=2011_I87.cfm&leg_type=Regs&isbncn=9780779813483
5. <https://open.alberta.ca/dataset/b6c45c4f-4dad-4b16-a52d-634ebdefd880/resource/0267d2d5-01ad-48fa-af22-b03e26dc6c91/download/director-surveys-compiled-plan-standards-2019-07.pdf>
6. See <https://www.aer.ca/regulating-development/project-application/application-process/formal-disposition-renewal-and-amendment-renewal> for more details on the review process and the possibility of appeal.

The information and recommendations mentioned in this article are as of current enactments. Please ensure current enactments are followed in order to remain compliant.

Keep an eye for the September 2020 Negotiator for part two that will look at survey evidence. The different types and issues sometimes found when looking at it.



Spring is here!

The roads are getting messy up in the bush, but it doesn't stop our Indigenous Consultation team. They are out there every day doing meaningful engagement ensuring projects run smoothly for our clients.

Call Melanie Lusk, our IC Coordinator, at 780-428-2212 to discuss your next project.



The Real Deal!

www.scottland.ca

CALGARY EDMONTON GRANDE PRAIRIE LLOYDMINSTER REGINA FORT ST. JOHN

Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project Clears Legal Hurdles

written by

PAUL CHISWELL, ROBERT MARTZ & BRENDAN DOWNEY

BD&P



Originally proposed in late 2013, the Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project (the TMX or the Project) has faced numerous legal and regulatory challenges and delays. However, two important judgments delivered in early 2020 appear to have settled much of the uncertainty surrounding the future of the Project.

While the ultimate result was expected, the speed with which the Court announced its decision was extraordinary. The comments and questions from certain Supreme Court Justices during the hearing, particularly those of Justices Rowe and Brown, made it clear that federal jurisdiction over interprovincial undertakings remains an unimpeachable core federal power and provinces cannot interfere in their operation.

On January 16, 2020, the Supreme Court of Canada deliberated for only thirty minutes before dismissing British Columbia's unconstitutional attempt to legislate the flow of heavy oil through the TMX. British Columbia's appeal was the culmination of its government's efforts to fulfill its May 2017 election promise to "use every tool in the toolbox" to stop the Project.

In April 2018, the Government of British Columbia submitted three reference questions to the Court of Appeal of British Columbia (the Reference). The Reference asked whether British Columbia had jurisdiction to amend its *Environmental Management Act* to impose a permitting requirement on the transportation of "heavy oil" within British Columbia (the Proposed Amendments). The Proposed Amendments defined "heavy oil" to only capture blends of oil produced in Alberta and Saskatchewan and, due to the

infrastructure currently in place, would only apply to the TMX and additional crude-by-rail operations.

The British Columbia Court of Appeal unanimously rejected the Proposed Amendments in May 2019, finding that the Province did not have the jurisdiction to enact them as they impermissibly intruded on the federal government's constitutional jurisdiction over interprovincial works and undertakings, which include interprovincial pipelines and railroads. British Columbia appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada.

On January 16, 2020, the Supreme Court of Canada, citing only the reasons of the British Columbia Court of Appeal, unanimously dismissed British Columbia's appeal. While the ultimate result was expected, the speed with which the Court announced its decision was extraordinary. The comments and questions from certain Supreme Court



WWW.PROGRESSLAND.COM
1.866.454.4717

303 – 13220 St. Albert Trail, Edmonton, Alberta T5L 4W1

Justices during the hearing, particularly those of Justices Rowe and Brown, made it clear that federal jurisdiction over interprovincial undertakings remains an unimpeachable core federal power and provinces cannot interfere in their operation.

As the Supreme Court of Canada will not be issuing further reasons for its decision, it is difficult to predict with any certainty its precedential effect; however, certain themes emerge from the questions and statements of the Justices at the hearing, including:

- **Colourability lives:** The Attorney General of Canada, as the respondent in the reference question and on the appeal, did not argue that British Columbia had intentionally drafted the Proposed Amendments to conceal their true purpose. And, typically, the Supreme Court will be reticent to second-guess the intentions of a province in the circumstances of a reference. But at least two members of the Court appeared willing to consider departing from its usual deference, with Justices Rowe and Brown making statements and asking questions suggesting that British Columbia drafted the Proposed Amendments in a colourable or intentional way to conceal an attempt to improperly regulate or target the TMX. Not only did the federal Attorney General not argue for this conclusion, but it was also further than the British Columbia Court of Appeal went in its decision. This, combined with Justice Stratas' recent comments at the Federal Court of Appeal regarding costs awards for abusive applications in the TMX case, suggests that the courts are becoming more alive to improper court challenges regarding the TMX and, potentially, other large infrastructure projects. In the future, Canadian courts may be more willing to halt such tactics at a preliminary stage.
- **The protection of the environment is not a constitutional principle:** The intervener, EcoJustice Canada

As the Supreme Court of Canada will not be issuing further reasons for its decision, it is difficult to predict with any certainty its precedential effect; however, certain themes emerge from the questions and statements of the Justices at the hearing...

Society, was on the receiving end of difficult questions when it advanced its position—a position it has advanced in many previous hearings—that protecting the environment is an organizing principle that informs the constitutional division of powers. This

appeared to have no traction with the Court, with Justice Rowe being particularly skeptical. While both federal and provincial governments have the jurisdiction to legislate environmental protections, the argument that it constitutes a superseding constitutional principle seemed to garner little support.

- **A recognition of the Court's role in timing:** The dismissal of this reference from the bench was extraordinary. However, it accorded with some comments from members of the Court, which were to the effect that the mere existence of such challenges posed regulatory risk sufficient to kill the TMX and similar projects. The willingness of the Court to address this risk by dismissing the reference from the bench may be a message that lower courts can and should move quickly to resolve these matters.

Soon after, on February 4, 2020, the Federal Court of Appeal gave the Project another boost when it dismissed an application for the judicial review of Cabinet's decision to approve the Project (the JR Application) brought by the Coldwater Indian Band, Squamish Nation, Tsleil-Waututh Nation, and Ts'elxwéyeqw (collectively, the Applicants). While the JR Application originally involved six First Nation applications, two discontinued their applications after reaching agreements with Trans Mountain.

The Applicants sought to re-litigate the adequacy of the consultation process; however, the Court recognized that the issue before it was more limited. When the Federal Court of Appeal quashed the original approval of the Project in August 2018, it acknowledged that despite the deficiencies it identified in the Government of Canada's consultations,

much of the consultation process was done properly. As such, when it directed the Federal Government to renew its consultations with affected Indigenous groups, the purpose was only to remedy the

discrete deficiencies that the Court had identified, which largely concerned its efforts to engage in meaningful dialogue. With this in mind, the fundamental issue for the Court was whether Cabinet could reasonably conclude that the second round of consultations addressed the flaws the Federal Court of Appeal had identified.

Ultimately, the Court found that the Cabinet's decision was entitled to deference and that, based on the evidentiary record, its assessment of the consultation was reasonable. Referring to the Supreme Court of Canada's recent decision in *Canada v Vavilov*, the Court made it clear that its task in reviewing the approval was not to substitute its own preferred decision with Cabinet's and, based on this, determine whether it was reasonable for Cabinet to conclude differently. Instead, the only question for the Court on a judicial review of this nature is whether the rationale for the decision reasonably supports the outcome. Judicial review is not an opportunity for applicants to take a second kick at the executive decision-making can.

While it was not strictly necessary for the Court to delve deeply into this issue, the depth of the Court's comments on reconciliation and what it means for the duty to consult provide helpful guidance moving forward. In our view, these comments represent an attempt to establish clearer parameters around the complex issue of consultation.

The Court also took the opportunity to comment on the duty to consult and its role in the ongoing project of reconciliation. While it was not strictly necessary for the Court to delve deeply into this issue, the depth of the Court's

comments on reconciliation and what it means for the duty to consult provide helpful guidance moving forward. In our view, these comments represent an attempt to establish clearer parameters around the complex issue of consultation. In particular, the Court found that:

- **The project of reconciliation is not a one way street:** In terms of repairing the Nation-to-Nation relationship, reconciliation can only be advanced where both parties commit to the process. It does not require perfection, but reasonable and good faith efforts to meaningfully engage. This means that the consultation process cannot be for show, nor can it be tactically leveraged into an attempt to delay or kill a project.
- **Reconciliation, consultation, and the public interest:** Reconciliation is about transforming the historical relationship between First Nations and the Crown. It is an ongoing process that is achieved, in part, through consultation and accommodation. However, the fact that consultation does not result in agreement or the



Action
LAND & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES LTD.

Our abilities run deeper and broader than you think.

info@actionland.ca 1.866.528.2558 actionland.ca
Medicine Hat • Calgary • Edmonton • Kindersley • Regina • Saskatoon

full accommodation of all concerns raised does not mean that the process was neither meaningful nor adequate. The goal is to reach agreement, but that is not always possible. Where the consulting parties are unable to agree despite meaningful engagement, a

decision-maker can weigh the Indigenous group's concerns against competing social interests. Courts must bear this in mind when considering major projects.

- **Consultation is not a veto:** Echoing recent comments from the Supreme Court, the Court reiterated this point seven times in its reasons. In particular, it is not open to an Indigenous group to impugn the consultation process by arguing that the only acceptable outcome would have been to abandon a particular project. Consultation is a procedural right that requires meaningful and good faith engagement from both sides.

The decisions in these two cases are certainly welcome by Alberta oil producers who have continued to battle legal and regulatory uncertainty as they seek access to new

The Federal Court of Appeal's decision in the JR Application is more substantive and likely to be of greater impact, thoughtfully considering the role of consultation in the project approval process and establishing clear parameters to guide future consultations.

export markets. Looking forward, it is difficult to predict whether and to what extent the saga of the TMX will influence major project development. The Supreme Court of Canada's decision to dismiss British Columbia's appeal of the Reference confirms that individual provinces cannot seek to

interfere with or impair the operation of federally regulated undertakings. Perhaps more important, however, is the suggestion disclosed in the Supreme Court's decision from the bench and the comments of Justices Brown and Rowe that courts should not allow themselves to be used as tools to create legal and regulatory uncertainty to indirectly force the abandonment of major infrastructure projects. The Federal Court of Appeal's decision in the JR Application is more substantive and likely to be of greater impact, thoughtfully considering the role of consultation in the project approval process and establishing clear parameters to guide future consultations. ♦

The authors, Paul Chiswell, Robert Martz, and Brendan Downey, are lawyers at Burnet, Duckworth & Palmer LLP. They represented the Explorers and Producers Association of Canada in its intervention in the Reference at the Supreme Court of Canada.

Message From the CAPL Board

CLICK ON THE HYPERLINK BELOW TO READ THE ARTICLE FROM THE CAPL BOARD




FIELD ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT (FAM)

Wade McLeod

https://landman.ca/negotiator/bod_messages/list

2019 Holiday Charity Event



Canadian Cancer Society
Société canadienne du cancer



CAPL thanks the sponsors, supporters and attendees for making this our most successful holiday charity event to date. This was THE party of the season with over 315 attendees. The event raised over \$11,000 for Breast Cancer and was festive in all respects.

Booking out the entirety of Ceili's, one of the most sought after downtown venues during peak holiday season, and bringing in the best rock band in the world is not an easy feat. So a huge thank you to the sponsors: Millennium Land Ltd., McElhanney, Baytex Energy Corp., Serafina Energy Ltd., TORC Oil & Gas Ltd., and BLG. CAPL is always grateful for the support and participation of our sponsors.

It seems like all of us are too often touched by cancer and I think that it makes an event better when you are doing something good along the way. We hope to continue to contribute to the communities where we live and work in more ways than one.

This was my first time organizing an event with a significant charitable component. I felt compelled to do something to bring awareness and raise funds in support of Breast Cancer. It seems like all of us are too often touched by cancer and I think that it makes an event better when you are doing something good along the way. We hope to continue to contribute to the communities where we live and work in more ways than one.

Mark your calendars – we have booked Ceili's Downtown again for December 10, 2020.

Special thank you and acknowledgment to the following people for their help, involvement, time, and money! ♦

Jeff Rideout, P.Land, Director, Events



Jennifer Gardner
Aaron Rodatz
Jasmine Lothian
Chris Bartole
Craig Tyler
Chris Palacz
Andrea Einarson
Lynn Nellis
Matt Blanchfield
Callie McCallum

Janice Redmond
Adam Stewart
W. Brett Wilson
Colin Page
Greg Cox (and crew)
Scott Rideout
Marah Graham
Mike Jamieson

2020 CAPL Conference



WHERE THE ROAD LEADS
EDMONTON, ALBERTA

“WHERE THE ROAD LEADS”

Our conference journey begins on Saturday, September 12th and our first stop is Commonwealth Stadium for the CFL Labor Day Classic rematch. Be prepared to enjoy the company of 250 of your closest friends and colleagues in the End Zone. We will take part in exclusive pre-game time experiences: Toes on the Turf – which will include being on the field for close-up warmup action and being on the field holding the Canadian flag during the anthem.

After learning something new at the Sunday morning educational seminars, slide right



into an optional Sunday afternoon activity. An assortment of activities are available to suit many appetites and all energy levels. You'll be able to join us on a high-flying adventure at Snow Valley Aerial Park, the first aerial park tower of its kind built in Canada and third in North America. Alternatively, come see where it all began for our industry at the Leduc #1 Energy Discovery Center where in February 1947, oilfield workers tripped pipe and pumped mud in the dead of winter, eventually striking oil. In honor of their work, the Discovery Center was born. If you enjoy a little hoppy, frothy goodness, come join us



on a microbrewery tour and learn a bit about Edmonton's thriving craft brewery scene, or join us on the Farm to Table Tasting Culinary Adventure at RGE RD where farm, food and friends intersect for an afternoon butcher demonstration and tasting experience of the best that Western Canada has to offer. Of course, we couldn't go without offering a fun afternoon of NFL Fantasy Football at one of Edmonton's finest pubs, don't forget your favorite jersey!

Sunday evening, we head back to our home base at the JW Marriot in Edmonton's Ice District for our Welcome Reception to enjoy great food, a cold beverage and engaging conversation with our industry counterparts.

After Monday's action-packed speakers and breakout sessions, it's time to put on your finest denim and make your way to the ballroom to meet your friends in low places for our Canadian Tuxedo Formal Gala. Partake in a classic can of Pilsner, good all-Canadian food and ageless entertainment.

These events don't happen without an outstanding group of volunteers, so thank you to our activities committee for all of their efforts in planning this year's 2020 CAPL Conference Activities.

Mandy Cookson	Canadian Natural Resources Limited
Jim Eistetter	Seaton-Jordon & Associates Ltd.
Kim King	Seven Generations Energy Ltd.
Rob Mardjetko	Lynx Energy ULC
Gary Morris	XTO Energy Canada
Craig Tyler	Torc Oil & Gas Ltd.

The road leads to Edmonton September 12-15, 2020. Looking forward to seeing you there. ♦

Connie De Ciancio



TELFORD

LAND & VALUATION INC.



KNOWLEDGE | EXPERIENCE | RESULTS

- Land Acquisition & Administration
- Regulatory / Renewable Energy Consultations
- Project Management
- Accredited Appraisers & Expert Witnesses for Regulatory and Compensation Proceedings
- Certified Arbitrators / Mediators
- Valuation Impact Studies
- Real Estate Services

P: 403.503.5263 | E: info@telfordland.com | #138, 5700 - 1st Street SW. Calgary AB, T2H 3A9 | telfordland.com

Get Smart

Month	Course	Date	Time	Location	Contact Name	Phone	Email
April	Mineral Engagement Speaker Session 3: Presented by OWA's Lars DePauw & CAPP's Richard Wong	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
April	Acquisition & Dispositions - Deep Dive into Crown Royalties (Morning)	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
April	Conventional Agreements: Junior Level	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
April	2015 CAPL Farmout and Royalty Procedure (2 Day)	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
April	Indian Oil & Gas Canada (Afternoon)	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
April	Surface Rights Law (PSL®) * New Instructor	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
April	Fundamentals of Surface Agreements (PSL®)	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
April	Good Writing is Good Business	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
May	Acquisition & Dispositions - Understanding Corporate Documents (Morning)- NEW COURSE	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
May	A Practical Guide to Acquisitions and Divestments - Everything You Need to Know from A to D	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
May	Understanding the Surface World	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca
May	Advanced Surface Rights	POSTPONED	POSTPONED	CAPL Office	Karin Steers	(403) 237-6635	ksteers@landman.ca

Roster Updates

ON THE MOVE

John Boone	Pipestone Energy Corp. To Carnarvon Energy Ltd.	Tina Kalmbach	Kalmbach Consulting To Vermilion Resources Ltd.
Del Borggard	Reflex Enterprises Inc. To Louise Investments	Andy Prefontaine	Petroworld Energy Ltd. To Triple Five Intercontinental Group
Mark Darrah	Ikkuma Resources Corp. To Pieridae Energy Ltd.	Lenni Werner-Schmidt, P.Land	2149408 Alberta Inc. To Convega Energy Ltd.
Ann Dyck	Devon Canada Corporation To Canadian Natural Resources Limited	Brad Williscroft	Pengrowth Energy Corporation To Cona Resources Ltd. ♦
Meghan Jasper	Bellatrix Exploration Ltd. To Spur Petroleum Ltd.		

In Memoriam

DOUGLAS WILLIAM REYNOLDS

It is with deepest sadness that the CAPL announces the unexpected passing of Douglas William Reynolds at the age of 63. He is survived by his wife Cher (nee Timmons), sons Bradley (Lindsay), Gregory (Samantha) and granddaughter Peyton.

Announcement of a service in celebration of Doug's life will be made by the family at a later date.

Doug enriched the lives of those who knew him and will be truly missed by all of those that had the opportunity to know him. ♦



Thanks go out to many amazing people as Jaguar Land Group Ltd. celebrates it's **20th ANNIVERSARY in 2020!!!**

www.jaguarland.ca

Ever wondered how the name Jaguar Land came to be?

A case of wine is on the line if you can figure it out!

Name as many of the **TOP 20 WORDS** (or small phrases) you believe went into determining the name **JAGUAR LAND** and send them to us at contest2020@jaguarland.ca with the words "20 for 20" in the subject line.

We will provide everyone a few months to figure it out before we reveal all 20 words.



The Social Calendar



Event	Date	Time
Election Lunch	CANCELLED	CANCELLED
CAPL 2020 Squash Tournament	CANCELLED	CANCELLED

PLEASE NOTE:

All CAPL Events Are Cancelled Until Further Notice.

INFORMATION AND ONLINE REGISTRATION

General Meetings: <http://landman.ca/events/general-meetings/> Social: <http://landman.ca/events/social-events/>

April Elections



April 15, 2020

Time: 11:30 p.m.
 Where: Calgary Petroleum Club
 319 5 Avenue S.W.
 Cost: Members \$36.75
 Non-Members \$63.00
 Register by: April 8, 2020