ACUITY PDH

CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR SURVEYORS AND ENGINEERS

Simple Quality Assurance Measures for Land Surveyors

Acuity PDH Course Number: 11377-26

Florida Approved PDH Course Number: 11377

Credit Value: 1 PDH

Issue Date: August 2026

Disclaimer and Notice to Course Participants

The content presented in this course reflects the opinions, interpretations, and professional judgment of Acuity PDH and its contributing authors. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy, the material is provided for general educational and informational purposes only and should not be relied upon as a substitute for professional judgment, independent verification, or applicable legal or regulatory guidance. This course is not intended for use as a design basis, specification, or substitute for site-specific engineering or surveying work, and should not be applied directly to design or construction without independent professional evaluation.

This course is not a substitute for the standards, codes, statutes, regulations, or licensing board requirements of any local, state, or national authority. Where any information in this course conflicts with or differs from applicable local, state, or national rules, codes, or regulations, those governing rules and regulations shall control. Codes and standards change over time, and participants are responsible for confirming they are referencing the current edition of any code or standard discussed and for verifying current requirements in their own jurisdiction before applying any information presented here to actual practice.

Acuity PDH develops its courses with the goal of meeting applicable continuing education requirements in the jurisdictions where it operates and advertises, as identified on www.acuitypdh.com. Because continuing education and PDH requirements may vary by state, and not all states formally approve individual providers or courses, participants are encouraged to confirm that a course meets the requirements of their specific licensing board before submitting it for credit.

Based on Acuity PDH's review of the applicable requirements, it is the opinion of Acuity PDH that this course meets the continuing education requirements of the Surveying and Engineering Boards identified on the Acuity PDH website as of the effective date shown on the cover sheet of this course.

This course does not constitute engineering, surveying, or legal advice, and completion of this course does not establish a professional relationship between the participant and Acuity PDH. Application of any concept, method, or example discussed in this course remains the sole responsibility of the licensed professional, who must exercise independent professional judgment consistent with the standard of care in their jurisdiction. Acuity PDH is not affiliated with, and does not endorse or vouch for, any third-party publications, standards bodies, or organizations referenced in this course, and is not responsible for how any participant or employer applies the material presented.

Acuity PDH makes no warranty, express or implied, as to the completeness, accuracy, or currency of the information presented, and course content may not reflect the most recent changes in codes, standards, or regulatory requirements. Course materials are subject to human error, including in drafting, editing, and review. Review questions and course content are intended for learning reinforcement only and do not certify professional competency.

If you identify an inconsistency, error, or outdated reference in this course, please notify Acuity PDH immediately through the contact information listed on our website so that it can be reviewed and corrected. Your feedback helps maintain the quality and reliability of this course library.

By completing this course, the participant acknowledges that they have read and understood this disclaimer and agrees that Acuity PDH shall not be held liable for any loss, damage, or professional consequence arising from the use or misuse of the information presented.

Thank You

Thank you for choosing Acuity PDH for your continuing education needs.

We're a small firm, and that's by design. We started this company because we believe continuing education should actually be useful to the professionals who complete it, not just a box to check. Every course in our library is built with that goal in mind: content that respects your time, your intelligence, and the work you do every day in the field and in practice.

Being small means we don't have the resources of a large training company, but it also means something else: your business genuinely matters to us. When you choose one of our courses, you're supporting a firm that reads every piece of feedback that comes in, that takes corrections seriously, and that is still, after every course we publish, trying to get a little better at this. We don't take that trust for granted.

We know you have options when it comes to meeting your continuing education requirements, and we're grateful you spent this time with us. If there's ever anything we can do better, or anything you'd like to see us cover in a future course, we'd genuinely like to hear from you.

Thank you again for your business and for the work you do as a licensed professional. It's an honor to play a small part in supporting your career.

The Acuity PDH Team

Course Description

Land surveying is a discipline that demands precision at every stage, from the initial field reconnaissance through the final delivery of a recorded plat or boundary opinion. Even experienced surveyors working with well-calibrated instruments and proven field methods can introduce errors if quality assurance (QA) practices are not embedded into the workflow. Those errors, once committed to a recorded document or a construction stakeout, can be difficult and expensive to correct, and in some cases they carry professional liability consequences that follow a licensee for years.

This course addresses QA not as an abstract management concept but as a set of practical, field-tested habits and procedural checkpoints that a licensed land surveyor can implement without significant additional cost or time investment. The material is organized around six core areas where QA has the greatest impact on survey accuracy and defensibility: instrument care and field verification, traverse closure and adjustment, deed and record research verification, coordinate geometry checking, final deliverable review, and documentation practices.

The course is written for the working professional, not the student. It assumes familiarity with total station operation, traverse computations, deed interpretation, coordinate geometry (COGO), and the general workflow of a boundary or topographic survey. The intent is not to teach fundamental surveying skills but to identify the specific points in a survey project where a systematic check, a second look, or a documented verification step can prevent a mistake from becoming a problem.

QA in land surveying does not require a formal quality management system or a large staff. Many of the measures discussed in this course can be applied by a sole practitioner or a small firm with minimal overhead. What they do require is deliberate attention and consistent application. The professional who builds these habits into standard practice will produce more defensible work, reduce the likelihood of costly errors, and demonstrate the kind of professional diligence that reflects well on the license they hold.

Upon completing this course, participants will have earned one professional development hour (PDH) applicable to land surveying continuing education requirements.

Course Objectives

Upon completion of this course, participants will be able to:

1. Identify the key stages of a survey project where quality assurance checks have the greatest impact on accuracy and defensibility.
2. Describe routine field verification procedures for total stations, levels, and global navigation satellite system receivers that can detect instrument error before it affects project data.
3. Explain the principles of traverse closure analysis and identify acceptable closure thresholds relative to survey purpose and classification.
4. Apply systematic deed and record research verification methods to confirm that field measurements are consistent with record documents before final deliverables are produced.
5. Describe coordinate geometry checking procedures used to verify computed positions, areas, and distances before they are incorporated into final drawings or legal descriptions.
6. Identify the components of a final deliverable review checklist appropriate for boundary surveys, topographic surveys, and legal descriptions.
7. Explain the role of field notes, computation logs, and project files in supporting the defensibility of survey work and protecting the licensee in the event of a challenge.

Table of Contents

Course Description

Course Objectives

Table of Contents

Section 1 — Introduction

Section 2 — Instrument Verification and Field Calibration Checks

Section 3 — Traverse Closure and Adjustment Procedures

Section 4 — Deed and Record Research Verification

Section 5 — Coordinate Geometry Checking and Computation Review

Section 6 — Final Deliverable Review

Section 7 — Documentation Practices and Project File Management

Section 8 — Closing Summary

Section 9 — Review Questions

Section 1 — Introduction

Land surveying sits at the intersection of law, mathematics, and field measurement. The work product of a licensed surveyor carries legal weight. A recorded plat defines property boundaries that may stand for generations. A boundary opinion shapes the outcome of a dispute. A construction stakeout determines where a structure goes in the ground. When that work is correct, it is invisible. No one notices. When it is wrong, the consequences can be significant, and the professional license attached to the work is the first thing that comes into question.

Quality assurance in land surveying is not a bureaucratic exercise. It is the professional habit of checking work before it causes a problem rather than after. Every experienced surveyor has a story about catching an error at the last minute, and most have at least one story about not catching it in time. The difference between those two outcomes is almost always the presence or absence of a systematic checking process.

The term quality assurance, as used in this course, refers to the deliberate, proactive verification of measurements, computations, records, and deliverables at defined checkpoints throughout a survey project. It is distinct from quality control (QC), which typically refers to the detection and correction of defects after the fact. QA is upstream of QC. The goal of QA is to prevent errors from entering the work product in the first place, or to catch them at a stage where correction is still straightforward. This course focuses almost entirely on QA in that proactive sense.

The six main units of this course follow the general sequence of a survey project. That sequence is not perfectly linear in practice, and experienced surveyors know that field conditions, client needs, and record availability often require moving back and forth between stages. Nevertheless, the QA checks described in each unit are most effective when applied at the stage where they naturally fit. Applying them out of sequence, or skipping them with the intention of catching issues later, reduces their value.

The first unit addresses instrument verification and field calibration. Instruments are the starting point of every measurement, and an instrument that is out of adjustment introduces systematic error that compounds through every subsequent computation. The second unit addresses traverse closure and adjustment, which is the fundamental mathematical check on the consistency of field angle and distance measurements. The third unit addresses deed and record research verification, which is the check on whether field measurements are consistent with the record before a surveyor commits to a boundary position. The fourth unit addresses coordinate geometry checking, which is the computational verification layer that catches mathematical errors before they reach the final drawing. The fifth unit addresses final deliverable review, which is the structured check on the drawing, legal description, and associated documents before they leave the office. The sixth unit addresses documentation practices, which is the ongoing process of creating a project record that supports the work and protects the licensee.

Each of these areas represents a known failure point in survey practice. They are not theoretical risks. They reflect the categories of error that appear in licensing board complaints, professional liability claims, and post-construction disputes with enough regularity that any experienced surveyor recognizes them.

One theme that runs through all six units is the value of a second set of eyes. Many QA failures occur not because a procedure was unknown but because the person who made the error was also the person responsible for checking it. Self-review has limits. A computation that feels correct to the person who did it tends to read as correct when that same person reviews it. An independently performed check, even a partial one, is more likely to catch discrepancies. In a sole proprietorship or small firm, this independence is harder to achieve, and several units address how to design checking procedures that partially compensate for the absence of a dedicated reviewer.

Another recurring theme is documentation. A survey that was done correctly but documented poorly is more difficult to defend than one where the work and the checking process are both clearly recorded. Licensing boards and courts do not have the ability to observe the surveyor's thought process. They can only evaluate what was recorded. A project file that includes not just the final deliverables but also the field notes, computation logs, instrument records, and research documentation tells a story of professional diligence. A project file that contains only the final drawing tells a much shorter and less defensible story.

A third theme is proportionality. Not every survey requires the same level of QA rigor. A mortgage inspection in a suburban subdivision carries different stakes and different tolerances than a boundary retracement in an area with conflicting senior calls and significant acreage values. The QA measures described in this course should be applied with professional judgment about the nature and stakes of each project. What should not vary is the habit of checking. The specific checks may scale up or down in intensity, but the absence of any systematic checking is never the right answer regardless of project type or budget.

The measures described in this course are not exotic. They do not require specialized software, advanced statistical training, or a large support staff. Most of them require nothing more than a structured approach to tasks that a competent surveyor is already performing. The discipline lies in performing them consistently, at the right point in the project, and recording that they were performed. That discipline, applied systematically over the course of a career, is one of the clearest markers of professional practice.

Section 2 — Instrument Verification and Field Calibration Checks

Every measurement a surveyor takes begins with an instrument. Whether that instrument is a total station, an optical level, or a global navigation satellite system (GNSS) receiver, its output is only as reliable as its mechanical and electronic condition at the time of measurement. An instrument that is out of adjustment does not announce itself. It produces numbers that look like valid measurements, passes them to the data collector, and allows the field crew to proceed with complete confidence in data that contains a systematic error. By the time that error surfaces, it may be embedded in a traverse, a legal description, or a recorded document.

Instrument verification is the practice of testing the performance of a surveying instrument against known conditions or geometric relationships before relying on it for project measurements. It is distinct from factory calibration or annual service, both of which are also necessary but are not substitutes for field verification. Factory calibration establishes baseline performance. Field verification confirms that performance has been maintained under the conditions of actual use.

The distinction matters because instruments are subjected to real-world conditions that factory calibration cannot anticipate. They are transported in vehicles over rough terrain, exposed to temperature extremes, occasionally dropped or bumped, and used by multiple operators with varying levels of care. Any of these factors can shift an instrument out of adjustment without breaking it. The instrument still powers on, still acquires targets, and still displays angle and distance readings. The readings are simply wrong by a consistent and often undetected amount.

Total Station Verification

The total station is the primary measurement instrument for most boundary and topographic surveys, and it carries several potential sources of systematic error that can be detected through straightforward field procedures.

The horizontal collimation error, sometimes called the line of sight error or C-error, is the condition in which the instrument's line of sight is not exactly perpendicular to the horizontal axis. This error affects horizontal angle measurements and reverses sign when the instrument is transited. It is detected by the direct and reverse procedure, in which a target is observed in both the face-left and face-right positions and the two readings are compared. If the instrument is in adjustment, the mean of a direct and reverse observation cancels the collimation error entirely. If only direct observations are used, the collimation error is fully present in every angle. For surveys where accuracy matters, the direct and reverse procedure should be standard practice, not an occasional check. Verifying that the instrument's C-error is within acceptable limits before beginning a project is a basic QA step that takes only a few minutes and can prevent a systematic angular error from propagating through an entire traverse.

The vertical index error, sometimes called the vertical collimation error or I-error, is the condition in which the instrument's vertical circle zero does not coincide with the true zenith. Like the horizontal collimation error, it is detected and largely eliminated by averaging direct and reverse vertical angle observations. Checking vertical index error is particularly important when zenith angles are being used for trigonometric leveling over significant distances, where a small index error can produce a meaningful elevation error.

The horizontal axis error, also called the tilting axis error, is the condition in which the horizontal axis of the instrument is not perfectly perpendicular to the vertical axis. This error is less common in modern instruments than collimation errors but should be checked periodically, particularly after any incident that may have disturbed the instrument mechanically. The check involves observing a high target in direct and reverse positions and comparing the difference in horizontal circle readings.

The plate bubble and electronic tilt compensator are the instrument's self-leveling references. A two-axis compensator corrects for small leveling errors in both the longitudinal and transverse directions and is a standard feature on most modern total stations. Before relying on the compensator, however, its performance should be verified. The procedure involves leveling the instrument carefully, reading the compensator display, rotating the instrument 180 degrees, and comparing the compensator reading to the expected value. A significant discrepancy indicates that the compensator requires adjustment or service.

Optical plummet verification is often overlooked but is directly relevant to centering error over control points. A misaligned optical plummet causes the instrument to be set up off-center even when the operator believes it is centered correctly. The check involves centering the instrument over a point, rotating it 180 degrees, and observing whether the plummet reticle remains on the point. If it shifts, the plummet requires adjustment. Centering errors of even a few millimeters can introduce angle errors that are significant at short distances, and they accumulate through a traverse.

Electromagnetic distance measurement (EDM) accuracy should also be verified periodically against a known baseline. Many surveying offices maintain a calibration baseline of known distances measured under controlled conditions, against which the EDM can be checked. Alternatively, published calibration baselines available through government geodetic programs can serve the same purpose. EDM errors can arise from instrument aging, reflector mismatch, or prism constant errors, and a periodic baseline check is the most direct way to confirm that distance measurements are within expected tolerances.

Level Verification

The dumpy level and the digital level are used for differential leveling, which is among the most precise field operations in common surveying practice. A level circuit that meets closure requirements inspires confidence in the elevation data it produces, but that confidence is only warranted if the instrument itself is performing correctly.

The two-peg test is the standard field check for a level's line of sight. The procedure involves setting up the level equidistant between two rod positions, reading both rods, and computing the true difference in elevation between the two points. The instrument is then moved to a position close to one of the rod positions and both rods are read again. The difference in elevation computed from the second setup should match the true difference established from the equidistant setup. If it does not, the line of sight is not horizontal, and the instrument requires adjustment. The two-peg test should be performed at the beginning of any leveling campaign where the results will be used for project control, and the results should be recorded.

Circular bubble condition on a level affects the initial setup orientation and should be checked by verifying that the bubble remains centered as the instrument is rotated through multiple positions. A bubble that drifts significantly during rotation indicates a problem with the vial or the instrument's leveling mechanism.

Rod condition is part of instrument verification in the broader sense. A level rod with worn or misread graduations, a damaged base, or a faulty extension mechanism introduces errors that the instrument itself cannot detect. Rod graduation checks against a tape, base condition inspection, and extension joint inspection are simple QA steps that are easy to neglect and occasionally consequential.

GNSS Receiver Verification

GNSS-based survey methods are now a standard part of most survey practices, and they carry their own set of verification requirements. A GNSS receiver does not require the same mechanical checks as an optical instrument, but it does require systematic verification of the conditions under which observations are collected and processed.

Antenna height measurement is one of the most common sources of GNSS error in practice, and it is entirely a procedural issue, not an instrument defect. The antenna height must be measured correctly, recorded clearly, and entered into the data collector consistently. The measurement method, whether to the bottom of the antenna, the antenna reference point, or the phase center, must be consistent with the offset values used in processing. A QA check on antenna height entries at the beginning and end of each observation session, including verification that the measurement method is consistent with the processing configuration, catches the errors that are most likely to occur.

Initialization verification for real-time kinematic (RTK) GNSS surveys involves confirming that the integer ambiguity resolution has been achieved correctly before beginning point collection. RTK receivers display a solution quality indicator, but a fixed solution is not a guarantee of correctness. An initialization check over a point of known position, such as an established control monument, confirms that the RTK solution is producing correct coordinates before the crew proceeds with production measurements. This check should be performed at the start of each session and repeated after any loss of lock.

Base station setup verification for RTK surveys using a self-established base requires confirming that the base station coordinates are correctly identified and entered. A base station set up on an incorrect coordinate, or on a point whose coordinates have not been verified, propagates a systematic shift into every rover measurement collected during that session. Checking base station coordinates against at least one additional control point before beginning rover measurements is a fundamental RTK QA procedure.

Multipath and obstruction assessment is part of pre-observation site evaluation for any GNSS survey. Observations collected near reflective surfaces, under dense canopy, or in environments with significant obstructions to the sky view are subject to elevated multipath error and reduced satellite geometry. Documenting the conditions under which GNSS observations were collected, including any obstructions noted, sky plots if available, and dilution of precision (DOP) values recorded during observation, supports the defensibility of the data and provides context if questions arise later about measurement quality.

Implementing a Field Verification Routine

The instrument checks described above are most effective when they are performed as a consistent routine rather than as occasional responses to suspected problems. A surveyor who checks instruments only when something seems wrong is relying on the error to announce itself. Many instrument errors are subtle enough that they do not produce obviously wrong readings. They produce readings that are slightly wrong, and the survey closes within acceptable limits, and the error never surfaces.

A practical approach is to develop a written field verification checklist for each instrument type in the office inventory and to retain a record of check results with each project file. The checklist need not be elaborate. For a total station, it might cover collimation check, compensator check, optical plummet check, and EDM baseline check on a defined schedule. For a level, it might cover the two-peg test at the start of each leveling campaign. For a GNSS receiver, it might cover initialization verification, antenna height confirmation, and base station coordinate check at the start of each RTK session.

The frequency of checks should reflect the intensity of use and the nature of the work. An instrument used daily on high-precision boundary surveys warrants more frequent verification than one used occasionally for topographic reconnaissance. Any instrument that has been subjected to a rough transport, an impact, or an unusual environment should be verified before use regardless of how recently it was last checked.

Instrument verification records also serve a documentation function that goes beyond QA. If a measurement is later questioned, a record showing that the instrument was checked and performing correctly at the time of the survey provides a layer of professional protection. Conversely, the absence of any verification record leaves the surveyor with no documented basis for asserting instrument performance. In a dispute or licensing board inquiry, the ability to produce a coherent instrument verification record is a meaningful professional asset.

The instruments do not define the quality of a survey by themselves. They are tools, and their reliability depends on the professional who maintains and checks them. Treating instrument verification as a routine professional obligation rather than an optional precaution is one of the clearest expressions of QA discipline in field practice.

Section 3 — Traverse Closure and Adjustment Procedures

The traverse is the geometric backbone of most land surveys. Whether it is a closed loop around a parcel boundary, an open traverse connecting two control points, or a network of interconnected legs supporting a topographic survey, the traverse provides the framework of angle and distance measurements from which positions are computed. The quality of that framework is testable in a way that few other aspects of survey work are. Traverse closure analysis is the mathematical check that confirms whether the measured angles and distances are internally consistent and whether the survey meets the accuracy requirements appropriate to its purpose.

Understanding traverse closure not as a final reporting step but as a diagnostic tool is central to this unit. A traverse that closes poorly is telling the surveyor something. The question is whether the surveyor is listening, and whether the response is systematic enough to identify where the problem originated rather than simply adjusting it away.

Closure Fundamentals

A closed traverse, when computed correctly, should return to its starting point. In practice it does not, because every measurement contains some level of random error. The difference between the computed closing position and the starting point is the linear error of closure (LEC). The ratio of the LEC to the total traverse length is the relative precision, typically expressed as a fraction such as 1 to several thousand or better. This ratio is the standard metric for evaluating traverse quality and comparing it against applicable accuracy standards.

The angular closure is the check performed before computing the traverse. The sum of the interior angles of a closed polygon traverse should equal the theoretical value of (n minus 2) times 180 degrees, where n is the number of traverse stations. The difference between the measured sum and the theoretical sum is the angular misclosure. If the angular misclosure exceeds the allowable limit for the survey class, it must be investigated before proceeding. Adjusting an angular misclosure that is outside tolerance is not an acceptable substitute for identifying its source.

Allowable angular misclosure is typically expressed as a function of the number of traverse stations, with a common form being a constant multiplied by the square root of the number of angles. The specific tolerance values appropriate for a given survey depend on the survey classification, the instruments used, and any applicable standards governing the work. The important point from a QA perspective is that the angular closure check must be made before the traverse is adjusted and before coordinates are computed. A traverse that fails the angular closure check requires field investigation, not office adjustment.

Sources of Traverse Error

Effective QA requires understanding not just that a traverse closed poorly but why it might have done so. Traverse errors fall into three broad categories: blunders, systematic errors, and random errors.

Blunders are large mistakes, such as reading the wrong target, recording the wrong angle, transposing digits in a distance, or misidentifying a traverse station. Blunders produce large closure errors and are usually identifiable through the magnitude and direction of the misclosure vector. A misclosure that points strongly toward a single leg or station is a diagnostic indicator of a blunder in that area of the traverse. The first response to a poor closure should be a review of field notes for obvious recording errors before returning to the field for remeasurement.

Systematic errors are consistent biases introduced by instrument maladjustment, incorrect prism constants, atmospheric corrections not applied, or procedural habits that consistently favor one direction of error. Systematic errors produce closures that are poor in a consistent direction and do not average out with additional measurements. They are detected through instrument verification, which is why the field calibration checks described in Section 2 are directly relevant to traverse quality. A traverse that closes poorly after blunders have been ruled out should prompt a review of whether instrument verification was performed and whether any systematic corrections were properly applied.

Random errors are the residual variation that remains after blunders and systematic errors have been addressed. They are inherent in any measurement process and follow a statistical distribution that allows them to be managed through proper adjustment procedures. The goal of traverse adjustment is to distribute the residual random error across the traverse in a mathematically defensible way. It is not to compensate for blunders or absorb systematic errors that should have been corrected.

Performing the Closure Check

The mechanics of traverse closure computation are assumed to be familiar to the practicing surveyor. The QA emphasis in this unit is on the sequence and discipline of the closure check, not on the mathematical procedures themselves.

The first step after reducing field angles and distances is to compute the angular misclosure and compare it to the applicable tolerance. If the angular misclosure is within tolerance, it is distributed among the measured angles before coordinates are computed. The distribution method, whether equal distribution or some weighted scheme, should be consistent with the office's standard procedure and documented in the computation record.

The corrected angles are then used to compute the departures and latitudes for each traverse leg. The sum of the departures should equal zero for a closed traverse, and the sum of the latitudes should equal zero. The actual sums are the departure misclosure and latitude misclosure, respectively, and together they define the LEC and its direction. Computing the LEC and relative precision at this stage, before any adjustment, provides the unvarnished measure of field measurement quality.

Comparing the computed relative precision against the applicable accuracy standard is the acceptance decision point. If the relative precision meets or exceeds the required standard, the traverse proceeds to adjustment. If it does not, the surveyor must investigate before proceeding. Investigation begins with a review of the field notes and computation for obvious errors. If no arithmetic or recording error is found, the field measurements for the affected portion of the traverse must be reviewed and likely remeasured.

The adjustment method most commonly applied to traverse surveys in ordinary practice is the compass rule, also known as the Bowditch adjustment. The compass rule distributes the departure and latitude misclosures among the traverse legs in proportion to leg length. It is appropriate for traverses where angular and linear measurements are of roughly equal precision. The least squares adjustment is a more rigorous method that weights each observation by its estimated precision and minimizes the sum of the squares of the residuals. Least squares is appropriate for high-precision work, for traverses with redundant measurements, and for network adjustments involving multiple interconnected traverses. The method selected should be appropriate for the survey class and documented in the computation record.

Connecting Traverses to Control

A traverse that begins and ends on the same point is a closed loop, and its closure can be evaluated entirely from internal geometry. A traverse that begins on one control point and ends on another, sometimes called a closed traverse between fixed points or a link traverse, has the additional benefit of being checked against external control. This is a stronger check because it does not just confirm internal consistency but verifies that the traverse is positioned correctly in the control network.

For traverses connected to an established control network, the QA procedure includes confirming the coordinates and reliability of the control points used. Control monuments can be disturbed, misidentified, or incorrectly recorded. Before running a traverse from a control point, the surveyor should verify the monument's position by checking it against at least one additional published or established control point. A distance and bearing check to a nearby monument, or an azimuth check to a distant visible monument, provides an independent confirmation that the starting control is correct.

Control point research should include reviewing the published data sheet for the monument, noting the monument's stability rating and the date of the last observation, and comparing the published horizontal and vertical values to nearby monuments for internal consistency. A control point whose published coordinates are significantly inconsistent with the surrounding network warrants additional investigation before it is used as traverse control.

Connecting a traverse to a higher-order control network also provides an opportunity to detect scale errors in distance measurements. If the computed distance between two control points, derived from the traverse, differs from the published distance by more than would be expected from random measurement error alone, a systematic distance error may be present. This is one reason why redundant connections to the control network, when achievable, are preferable to a single connection.

Proportional Accuracy and Survey Classification

Different types of surveys are held to different accuracy standards, and the appropriate closure tolerance for a traverse depends on its classification and intended use. A boundary survey in a rural area may require a different standard than a subdivision plat, a right of way (ROW) survey, or a control survey supporting construction layout. Understanding the applicable standard before beginning fieldwork, and designing the traverse to achieve it, is part of QA at the project planning stage.

Accuracy standards for traverse surveys are generally expressed in terms of relative precision, with classifications ranging from a looser standard acceptable for lower-order surveys to a considerably tighter one required for high-order surveys. Some applicable standards also specify requirements for angular closure per station, minimum number of direct and reverse observations, and other procedural requirements in addition to the closure ratio. Familiarity with the applicable standard for a given project type is a professional obligation, and checking the traverse against that standard before finalizing deliverables is a fundamental QA step.

Survey classification also affects the adjustment method that is appropriate and defensible. A traverse adjusted by the compass rule and meeting a typical relative precision standard for routine work is appropriate for many boundary surveys. The same traverse used as horizontal control for a bridge project may require a least squares adjustment and a much higher precision standard. Using a method that is mismatched to the survey purpose, even if the mathematics are correct, can expose the work to a legitimate professional challenge.

Redundant Measurements as a QA Tool

One of the most effective QA practices in traverse work is the collection of redundant measurements that provide independent checks on angle and distance values. In a standard traverse, each leg is measured once for angle and once for distance. This provides no internal redundancy and no means of detecting a blunder in a single measurement without remeasuring it. Adding redundancy, even selectively, improves the ability to detect and locate errors before they affect the final product.

Redundant angle measurements include multiple sets of direct and reverse observations at each traverse station, tie shots to additional visible points that can be used to verify the observed angles, and independent resection checks where geometry permits. Redundant distance measurements include multiple independent EDM observations on each leg, particularly for critical or long legs, and cross-checks using tie distances between non-adjacent traverse points where direct measurement is possible.

In loop traverses, measuring diagonals across the figure provides cross-checks on the computed positions of interior points. In link traverses, an additional connection to the control network at an intermediate point, if achievable, divides the traverse into independent sections that can each be checked against external control.

The value of redundancy is not just mathematical. Redundant measurements encourage the field crew to identify discrepancies in real time, while the crew is still on site and correction is straightforward. A crew that measures each angle once and moves on has no field-level check on measurement quality. A crew that routinely takes two sets of angles, compares them immediately, and investigates discrepancies before moving to the next station is performing QA in the field, where it is most efficient.

Closure Documentation

The closure computation and its results are part of the project record and should be retained with the project file. The documentation should include the unadjusted traverse computation showing measured angles and distances, the angular misclosure and its distribution, the departure and latitude computation, the LEC and relative precision, a comparison of the computed relative precision to the applicable standard, the adjustment method used and the adjusted coordinates, and any notes regarding remeasurement or investigation of anomalous values.

This documentation serves two purposes. First, it demonstrates that the closure check was performed and that the survey meets the applicable standard. Second, it provides the information necessary to reconstruct the traverse computation if the work is ever reviewed, challenged, or used as the basis for future surveys. A project file that contains only final coordinates with no record of the traverse computation that produced them is a professional liability in the event of a dispute.

The habit of retaining complete traverse documentation, including the unadjusted computation as well as the final adjusted result, distinguishes a defensible project file from one that merely appears complete. The unadjusted computation shows what the field measurements actually produced. The adjustment shows how the residual error was distributed. Both are necessary to tell the complete professional story of how the survey was done.

Section 4 — Deed and Record Research Verification

A land survey does not exist in isolation. Every boundary survey is an interpretation of record evidence, and the quality of that interpretation depends directly on the quality and completeness of the research that supports it. Field measurements, no matter how precise, cannot compensate for research that missed a senior deed, overlooked a recorded easement, or failed to identify a gap or overlap in the chain of title. The deed and record research phase of a survey project is where the surveyor establishes what the record says the boundary should be before going to the field to find where it actually is.

Quality assurance in the research phase is not about doing more research than necessary. It is about doing research systematically enough to be confident that the relevant record evidence has been identified, correctly interpreted, and verified for internal consistency before field measurements are committed to a boundary position. A systematic research verification process catches the errors and omissions that are most likely to produce a defensible problem later.

The Research Foundation

Boundary surveying is fundamentally a legal exercise supported by technical measurements. The surveyor's job is to locate on the ground the boundaries that were described in legal documents, applying the rules of deed construction and the hierarchy of calls that govern how conflicts between record elements are resolved. That hierarchy, which generally places natural monuments above artificial monuments, artificial monuments above courses (bearings), bearings above distances, and distances above area, is the interpretive framework within which the research must be evaluated.

Before any boundary position can be responsibly established, the surveyor must have a working understanding of the chain of title for the subject parcel, the record descriptions of adjoining parcels along each boundary line, any easements, restrictions, or other encumbrances of record affecting the parcel, and the record evidence of how the boundary was previously located by prior surveyors if prior surveys exist.

Research that is limited to the deed for the subject parcel alone is insufficient for most boundary surveys. A boundary line is shared by two parcels, and the description of that line in one deed may differ from its description in the adjoining deed. Senior deeds govern over junior deeds, and a junior deed that appears to describe a clear boundary may actually conflict with a senior conveyance that controls the true boundary location. Identifying and resolving those conflicts in the research phase, before field measurements are taken, is far more efficient than discovering them during computation when the field crew has already moved on.

Deed Verification Procedures

The first QA step in deed research is confirming that the deed being worked from is the correct and current conveyance. Deeds are occasionally misidentified in county records, and a surveyor who pulls a deed by reference to a prior survey without independently confirming it against the current ownership record may be working from the wrong instrument. Checking the deed against the current tax records, the county assessor's parcel map, and the recorded chain of title is a simple verification step that confirms the correct instrument is in hand before research proceeds further.

The legal description in the deed must be read carefully for internal consistency. A metes and bounds description that does not close, a lot and block reference that does not match the recorded plat, or a description that references a monument or map that cannot be located in the record are all indicators that additional research is needed before the description can be reliably interpreted. Computing the closure of a metes and bounds description from the deed before going to the field is a fundamental QA check that takes little time and frequently reveals problems that would otherwise surface only after field measurements have been taken.

Deed calls that reference adjoining owners by name, particularly in older descriptions, require verification of the current adjoining deed to confirm the boundary that was described at the time of the original conveyance. Adjoining owner calls are relational rather than geometric, and they tie the subject parcel's boundary to the record of the adjoining parcel at the time of conveyance. If the adjoining parcel has been subsequently subdivided, conveyed in separate pieces, or redescribed, tracing the senior boundary through those subsequent transactions is necessary to correctly identify the controlling boundary call.

Distance and bearing calls must be checked for consistency with the overall geometry of the parcel and with adjoining record descriptions. A bearing that is stated in one direction in the subject deed and in the opposite direction in an adjoining deed for the same shared line is not necessarily an error, as it may simply reflect the reversal of direction when running the line from the other parcel's perspective. But a distance that differs significantly between the two deeds for the same shared line requires investigation to determine which record controls. That investigation belongs in the research phase, not in the field.

Plat and Map Research Verification

Many surveys involve parcels that were created by a recorded subdivision plat, and the plat is typically the controlling document for lot boundaries within the subdivision. Plat research verification involves confirming that the plat being relied upon is the correct and current recorded version, that the lot dimensions and bearings shown on the plat are internally consistent, and that the plat's control monuments, if any were set and described, are identified and available for use as field control.

Subdivision plats are occasionally amended, vacated, or partially replatted, and a surveyor working from an original plat without checking for subsequent amendments may be relying on a document that has been superseded for the relevant portion of the subdivision. Checking the county recorder's index for amendments, corrections, and vacations of the plat is a necessary research step for any survey involving a recorded subdivision.

The geometry of the recorded plat should be verified before fieldwork begins. Plat dimensions should be checked for mathematical consistency, including lot frontages, depths, and curve data. Curve data on a plat, including radius, delta angle, arc length, and chord bearing and distance, should be verified for internal geometric consistency before being used as the basis for field layout. A set of curve data that does not check internally is either recorded incorrectly or has been transcribed incorrectly into the working notes, and the error needs to be identified before field measurements are taken.

Right of way (ROW) plats, easement plats, and other special purpose recorded maps are part of the research base for surveys in areas where they exist. ROW taking boundaries, particularly for highway projects, are often described in separate ROW maps that are recorded separately from the property deed records. Failing to identify and incorporate ROW maps into the research base for a survey in an affected area can result in a boundary determination that ignores a senior conveyance to a public entity, which is a significant professional error.

Prior Survey Research

One of the most valuable and frequently underutilized research resources available to a boundary surveyor is the record of prior surveys affecting the subject parcel and its immediate vicinity. Prior surveys, whether recorded as plats, filed as record of survey maps, or referenced in deeds and title reports, provide evidence of how a competent licensed professional previously interpreted the record and located the boundary on the ground.

Prior survey research serves several QA functions. It identifies monuments that were set by a prior surveyor and that may be recoverable in the field, providing physical evidence of prior boundary locations. It identifies measurements and boundary positions that have been previously accepted, providing a baseline against which new measurements can be compared. It identifies conflicts or ambiguities in the record that a prior surveyor encountered and resolved, providing context for interpreting the current record evidence. And it identifies cases where a prior surveyor's work may have been in error or may have been superseded, which the current surveyor needs to know before relying on prior monuments as controlling evidence.

Prior survey research should include a search of the county recorder's records for recorded surveys affecting the subject parcel and its adjoining parcels, a review of available local surveying firm records if accessible, and a review of any surveys referenced in the title report or chain of title. The geographic scope of the prior survey search should extend beyond the immediate parcel boundaries to include adjoining parcels whose boundaries share lines with the subject parcel, and to include nearby section corners, block corners, or other controlling monuments whose prior locations may be documented.

When prior surveys are identified, they should be evaluated for consistency with the current record evidence and with each other. Multiple prior surveys that place a boundary in consistent locations provide stronger evidence of the correct boundary position than a single prior survey. Prior surveys that conflict with each other require the surveyor to investigate which survey relied on superior evidence, which monuments were controlling at the time, and how the conflict should be resolved under applicable legal principles.

Title Report and Encumbrance Verification

The title report, when available, is a valuable research starting point but not a complete substitute for independent deed research. Title reports are prepared for the purpose of identifying encumbrances affecting marketability of title, and they may not identify all boundary-relevant record documents. Easements that were created by dedication rather than separate instrument, prescriptive rights that have not been judicially established, and boundary line agreements that were not separately recorded are among the encumbrances that may affect a survey but may not appear prominently in a standard title report.

Reviewing the title report against independently researched deed records to confirm that the instruments listed are consistent with the surveyor's research is a useful cross-check. Instruments listed in the title report that the surveyor has not independently located and reviewed should be obtained and reviewed. Instruments identified through the surveyor's independent research that do not appear in the title report should be noted and, where appropriate, communicated to the client or the title company.

Easement research is particularly important for surveys where the location of easement boundaries is part of the work product. An easement described by reference to a centerline, a fixed width, or a specific description must be researched as carefully as a fee boundary. The instrument creating the easement, any amendments or partial releases, and any prior surveys locating the easement should all be part of the research base before field locations are attempted.

Record Consistency Verification

After the relevant record documents have been assembled, a QA step that is easy to skip but professionally important is a systematic check of internal consistency across the assembled record. The individual documents in the research base rarely contradict each other in obvious ways. Conflicts are usually subtle, appearing as small differences in distances, slightly different bearings for shared lines, or references to monuments whose descriptions are inconsistent with the physical characteristics of monuments found in the field.

A record consistency check involves mapping the assembled record onto a working diagram, either manually or using COGO software, to identify geometric conflicts before field measurements are taken. Deed calls that do not reconcile with adjacent deed calls, plat dimensions that conflict with deed distances for the same line, and described monument positions that are geometrically inconsistent with other described points are all visible in a diagram that most easily remain invisible in a stack of documents read sequentially.

The working diagram produced during the record consistency check also serves as the field research guide. It identifies the monuments that should be searched for in the field, the approximate locations where they should be found based on record evidence, and the distances and bearings that should be verified against field measurements. A well-prepared working diagram reduces the likelihood of misidentifying a found monument, overlooking a relevant monument location, or failing to check a field measurement against its record counterpart.

Documenting the research process, including the sources consulted, the instruments reviewed, any conflicts identified and how they were resolved, and the basis for any interpretation made, is as important as the research itself. A research log that records what was searched, what was found, and what was concluded provides the foundation for a defensible boundary opinion. It also provides the information necessary for a future surveyor to understand the basis of the current survey, which is a professional courtesy that strengthens the overall quality of the recorded boundary evidence in an area over time.

Section 5 — Coordinate Geometry Checking and Computation Review

Field measurements and record research produce the raw material of a survey. Coordinate geometry (COGO) computation is where that raw material is transformed into the positions, distances, bearings, areas, and curve data that ultimately appear on the final drawing and in the legal description. It is also where a category of error that has nothing to do with field conditions or record research can enter the work product: the computational error. A number transposed in data entry, a wrong point number called in a routine, an incorrect curve parameter, or a misapplied coordinate transformation can produce a result that is mathematically precise but factually wrong. The computation produces a confident answer, the software displays it cleanly, and the error proceeds undetected into the deliverable.

Computational errors are particularly insidious because they do not look like errors. A correctly executed inverse between two wrong points produces a distance and bearing that are exactly right for those two points. The problem is that those were not the intended points. Software does not know intent. It executes instructions and returns results. The QA obligation is to verify that the instructions were correct and that the results are consistent with independent checks before they are relied upon.

The Nature of Computational Error

Computational errors in survey practice fall into several recognizable categories, each with its own detection strategy.

Data entry errors occur when field measurements or record values are entered into the computation with a mistake. Transposed digits, sign errors in angles or coordinates, incorrect units, and misidentified point numbers are common forms. Data entry errors tend to produce results that are locally wrong, meaning that the specific computation involving the incorrect value is wrong while adjacent computations may be correct. Detection requires checking each entered value against its source, not just reviewing the computed output.

Logic errors occur when the correct values are entered but the computation is structured incorrectly. Using a supplement angle instead of the measured angle, applying a bearing in the wrong direction, computing an area by the wrong method, or calling the wrong base point for a radiation are examples of logic errors. Logic errors can be difficult to detect by reviewing the computation in isolation because the procedure appears to have been followed correctly. Independent recomputation, using a different method or a different software routine, is the most reliable way to detect logic errors.

Transformation errors occur when coordinates are converted between systems, datum realizations, or projection zones, and the transformation parameters are incorrect or the transformation is applied in the wrong direction. A coordinate transformation that shifts a position by a small but consistent amount can be difficult to detect without an independent check against a point whose coordinates are known in both systems. Transformation errors are particularly relevant for surveys that connect Global Positioning System (GPS) derived coordinates to a local control network, or that span a projection zone boundary.

Propagated errors occur when a correct computation uses the output of a previous incorrect computation as its input. Because each subsequent computation builds on the previous result, the error is carried forward and may be amplified. Propagated errors are detected by tracing the computation chain back to the point where the first incorrect value was introduced, which requires a complete and organized computation record.

Independent Recomputation

The most reliable QA check for any computation is an independent recomputation performed by a different person using a different method. If the two computations agree, confidence in the result is high. If they disagree, the discrepancy must be resolved before the result is used.

In practice, full independent recomputation of every computation in a survey project is often not feasible, particularly in a small firm or sole proprietorship. The practical application of this principle is to identify the computations that carry the highest consequence if wrong and to apply independent recomputation selectively to those. For a boundary survey, the highest consequence computations typically include the final adjusted coordinates of boundary corners, the dimensions used in the legal description, the lot or parcel area, and any curve data that will be recorded on a plat or described in an instrument.

Independent recomputation does not always require a second person. A single practitioner can achieve partial independence by recomputing a result using a different software routine, a different computational path, or a manual calculation as a check on a software result. The independence comes from using a method that does not share the same potential error as the original computation. Recomputing the same calculation using the same software routine with the same inputs is not an independent check. It verifies that the software is consistent, not that the inputs or method were correct.

For area computations, an independent check can often be performed by dividing the parcel into triangles and summing the triangle areas against the total. For distance and bearing computations, an independent inverse between two computed corner coordinates, compared against a measured or record distance between those same corners, provides a check that does not rely on the computation path used to establish the coordinates. For curve computations, verifying that the arc length, chord length, radius, and delta angle are internally consistent using the geometric relationships between those elements takes only a few minutes and catches the errors that are most likely to occur.

Checking Computed Positions Against Field Measurements

One of the most effective COGO QA procedures is comparing computed positions against independent field measurements that were not used in the computation. If additional field measurements were collected specifically for checking purposes, the computed coordinates of relevant points can be used to predict what those check measurements should be, and the predictions can be compared against the actual measurements.

For example, if a boundary corner was set by radiation from a traverse station, and an independent distance and angle observation was made to that corner from a second traverse station as a check shot, the computed position of the corner can be used to predict what the check shot distance and angle should have been. A significant discrepancy between the predicted and observed check shot values indicates either an error in the computation or an error in the field measurement, and further investigation is needed to determine which.

Tie measurements to found monuments provide another form of this check. If a found monument was not used as a control point in the traverse but was located by a tie measurement from a traverse station, its computed position can be derived from the tie and compared against its position as derived from the traverse computation and record evidence. Agreement between those two independently derived positions builds confidence that both the traverse and the record research are correct. Disagreement requires investigation.

The discipline of collecting check shots and tie measurements specifically for QA purposes, rather than only the minimum measurements needed to complete the survey, reflects a professional investment in the quality of the work product. It adds time to the field operation, but it catches errors at the point in the project where they are cheapest to correct.

COGO Software Verification

Modern COGO software is reliable for the computations it is designed to perform, but it is not infallible, and it is entirely dependent on the quality of the inputs it receives. Several software-specific QA checks are relevant to survey practice.

Point number management is a fundamental software QA issue. In a COGO database with many points, it is possible to call the wrong point number and receive a plausible-looking result. A computation that inverses from point 101 to point 201 when it should have inversed from point 101 to point 202 could return a distance and bearing that appear correct for the wrong pair of points. Verifying that the point numbers called in each routine correspond to the intended points, particularly in a large project database, is a basic but important check. Descriptive point naming conventions that make point identity clear reduce the likelihood of point number confusion.

Coordinate system settings must be verified before performing any computation that depends on them. The projection, datum, ellipsoid, and zone parameters must be correct for the coordinate system in use on the project. A computation performed in the wrong coordinate system may appear internally consistent but will produce positions that are incorrect relative to the established control. Verifying coordinate system settings at the beginning of a project, and again whenever coordinates are imported from an external source or when a transformation is performed, is a straightforward QA step.

Unit settings require similar verification. Distance computations performed with the unit set to meters when the project uses feet, or vice versa, produce results that are wrong by a factor of approximately 3.28. This is a large enough error that it should be obvious, but it has caused real problems in practice when the error was not immediately apparent in the context of the project. Confirming that the software unit setting matches the project unit convention before beginning computations takes seconds and prevents an embarrassing and potentially significant error.

Data import verification is necessary whenever coordinates, alignments, or other data are imported from an external file. The imported data should be checked against the source to confirm that the import was complete and correct. Coordinates that imported with a systematic offset, a unit conversion error, or a truncation of precision are not always obvious from visual inspection of the imported dataset. Checking a sample of imported values against the source data, and verifying that the overall extents of the imported data are consistent with expectations, is a practical import verification procedure.

Legal Description Computation Verification

The legal description is often the final computation product of a boundary survey, and it carries a level of legal consequence that makes its accuracy especially important. A legal description with a wrong distance, an incorrect bearing, a missing call, or a curve that does not check geometrically is a defective instrument that may be used in a conveyance, recorded in the public record, and relied upon by subsequent surveyors and title professionals for years.

Legal description verification begins with closure computation. Every metes and bounds description produced by a survey should be computed for closure before it is delivered. The closure computation confirms that the description is geometrically complete, that the calls connect correctly from one to the next, and that the description returns to the point of beginning. A description that does not close to within the precision stated in the description itself contains an error that must be found and corrected before delivery.

Bearing consistency within a legal description requires verification. All bearings in a description should be expressed in a consistent reference system, whether true north, magnetic north, grid north, or an assumed bearing basis. The bearing basis should be clearly stated in the description, and all bearings should be verified to be consistent with that basis. A description that mixes true and grid bearings, or that applies a declination correction inconsistently, is internally inconsistent and potentially misleading to anyone who attempts to retrace it.

Curve data in a legal description must be verified for internal geometric consistency before delivery. The four primary curve elements, being the radius, delta angle, arc length, and chord bearing and distance, are related by fixed geometric equations. Any three of them determine the fourth. Checking that all four elements stated in a description are mutually consistent takes only a few minutes using a calculator or COGO routine and catches errors in transcription or computation that would otherwise be invisible to the reader of the description.

Area statements in legal descriptions and on recorded plats must be verified against the computed area derived from the adjusted boundary coordinates. An area stated in a description that does not match the computed area of the described parcel indicates either a computational error or a discrepancy between the description and the coordinates from which it was derived. Both require resolution before the description is delivered.

Computation Record Keeping

The computation record for a survey project should be organized well enough that a competent surveyor who was not involved in the project could reconstruct the computation from the record alone. This is a meaningful standard. It requires that the record include not just the final results but also the inputs, the method, and the sequence of steps used to arrive at the results.

For COGO computations performed in software, the computation record typically includes the software project file, printed or saved computation reports, and a notation of the software version and coordinate system settings used. For hand computations or spreadsheet computations, the record includes the completed worksheets with inputs clearly identified and the computational steps shown. For any computation where an independent check was performed, the record includes both the primary computation and the check computation, along with a note confirming that they agreed or describing how a discrepancy was resolved.

Computation records should be retained with the project file as a permanent part of the project documentation. They are part of the professional record of how the survey was done and provide the evidence necessary to demonstrate that the computations were performed correctly and checked. In the event of a challenge to the survey, a complete computation record is a significant professional asset. In the absence of such a record, demonstrating that the computations were done correctly and verified may be difficult or impossible, regardless of how careful the actual work was.

Section 6 — Final Deliverable Review

Every step in a survey project, from the initial research through field measurements, traverse adjustment, and coordinate geometry computation, ultimately produces a set of deliverables that leave the office and enter the hands of clients, title professionals, recording officers, contractors, or regulatory agencies. Those deliverables carry the surveyor's seal and signature, and once delivered they represent the surveyor's professional statement that the work is correct and complete. A systematic final deliverable review is the last opportunity to catch an error before that statement is made, and it is the checkpoint where the entire preceding workflow is confirmed to have produced a coherent and accurate work product.

Final deliverable review is not proofreading in the conventional sense. It is a structured technical verification that checks the internal consistency of the drawing, the agreement between the drawing and the supporting computations, the completeness of required elements, and the conformance of the work product to applicable standards and client requirements. It is distinct from the computation checks described in Section 5, which focused on verifying the correctness of the numbers. Final deliverable review assumes the numbers are correct and asks whether they are correctly and completely represented in the deliverable.

Survey Drawing Review

The survey drawing, whether a boundary plat, a topographic map, a record of survey, or a construction layout plan, is the primary deliverable for most survey projects. Its review should be conducted against a defined checklist that covers both technical content and presentation requirements.

Dimensional accuracy is the first and most fundamental check. Every distance, bearing, angle, and curve element shown on the drawing must agree with the adjusted computation. A drawing that was generated directly from the COGO software database is less prone to transcription error than one that was drafted manually or populated by reference to printed computation reports, but it is not immune. Software-generated drawings can contain errors from incorrect point calls, wrong layer assignments, or label placement that does not match the geometric element it is intended to describe.

Verifying a representative sample of drawing dimensions against the computation, including at least one complete closure check of the drawn boundary, is a minimum review standard.

Curve data shown on the drawing must be checked for internal consistency using the same geometric verification described in Section 5. Radius, delta, arc length, and chord data shown on the drawing should be verified to be mutually consistent and to match the computation. Curve data that was correctly computed but incorrectly transcribed to the drawing is a common source of deliverable error, and it is not caught by reviewing the computation alone.

Bearing references and basis of bearing statements must be consistent throughout the drawing. The basis of bearing should be clearly stated and should match the bearing basis used in the computation and in any legal description that accompanies the drawing. All bearings shown should be verified to be expressed in the stated reference system. A drawing that shows a grid north basis of bearing but includes a boundary bearing that was derived from a magnetic compass observation without conversion is internally inconsistent, and that inconsistency may not be apparent without a deliberate check.

Monument calls on the drawing must match the field notes for found monuments and the setting records for set monuments. A monument symbol that does not match the monument description in the field notes, a found monument shown as set or vice versa, or a monument type that is incorrectly labeled is a deliverable error that can create confusion for future surveyors attempting to retrace the boundary. Monument descriptions should be specific enough to allow positive identification of the monument type, size, and condition.

Adjoining information shown on the drawing, including adjoining owner names, deed references, and adjoining boundary dimensions, must be verified against the research record. An adjoining owner name that was current at the time of the original deed but has since changed through conveyance, a deed book and page reference that is incorrect, or an adjoining boundary dimension that conflicts with the adjoining deed record are errors that reflect on the quality of the research and may create problems for title professionals or future surveyors relying on the drawing.

Easements, ROW lines, and other encumbrances shown on the drawing must be verified against the research record for correct location, width, and instrument reference. An easement that is shown in the approximate correct location but with an incorrect width, or that is referenced to the wrong recorded instrument, is a deliverable error that may have practical consequences for the client and future users of the drawing.

Title block information, including the surveyor's name and license number, the date of the survey, the scale, the north arrow, and the legal description of the surveyed parcel, must be complete and correct. A title block that references the wrong date, an expired license number, or an incorrect parcel description is both a professional error and a potential legal problem if the drawing is recorded or used in a conveyance. The date of the survey shown in the title block should reflect the date of the most recent field work, not the date of drafting.

Scale verification is necessary for any drawing that will be reproduced or used for field measurement. A drawing whose plotted dimensions do not correspond to the stated scale, whether because of a drafting error or a plotting configuration issue, can mislead anyone who attempts to scale measurements from it. Verifying the scale by measuring a plotted dimension and comparing it to the stated scale is a simple check that takes seconds and prevents a straightforward but embarrassing error.

Legal Description Review

The legal description, when it accompanies the survey drawing, requires its own dedicated review that is separate from and in addition to the drawing review. The legal description is a standalone legal instrument that will be incorporated into deeds, easement agreements, and other recorded documents, and its accuracy is independent of the drawing.

Closure verification of the legal description, as described in Section 5, must be confirmed as part of the final deliverable review. If the description was modified at any point after the initial closure check, the closure must be recomputed. A description that was correct in an earlier draft but was subsequently edited, even for minor wording changes, may have introduced an error that a recomputation will detect.

The point of beginning stated in the description must be clearly and unambiguously referenced to an identifiable point in the record. A point of beginning described only by distance and bearing from an adjacent corner, without any tie to a monument, road intersection, section corner, or other identifiable reference point, may be difficult or impossible to locate on the ground without the survey drawing. The point of beginning should be described with enough specificity that a competent surveyor could locate the starting point independently.

Calls for monuments in the description must be consistent with the monuments shown on the drawing and described in the field notes. If a corner is described in the legal description as being marked by a particular type of monument, that monument description must match what was actually set or found in the field and what is shown on the drawing. Inconsistency between the description and the drawing regarding monument calls creates a record ambiguity that a future surveyor will have to resolve.

Directional consistency in the description must be checked. The description should run consistently in one direction, either clockwise or counterclockwise around the perimeter, and should not reverse direction without a clear reason. A description that inadvertently reverses direction partway through, perhaps as a result of copying a portion from an older description, may still close mathematically while describing a figure that is different from the intended parcel.

Plat Review for Recording

Survey plats that will be submitted for recording are subject to specific content requirements that vary by jurisdiction and recording authority. The final review of a plat intended for recording must confirm that all required elements are present and correctly formatted before submission.

Required certificates and acknowledgments, including the surveyor's certificate, any required owner's acknowledgment, and any agency approval signatures, must be present and correctly worded. A plat submitted for recording with a missing or incorrectly worded certificate will be rejected by the recording officer, and correcting it after the fact may require additional signatures or re-acknowledgment.

Lot and block designations must be sequential and consistent with any prior phases of the subdivision if the plat is a phase of a larger development. Gaps in lot numbering, duplicate lot numbers, or designations that conflict with a previously recorded phase are errors that can create title problems and will require a corrective plat to resolve.

Dedication language for streets, alleys, easements, and other public areas must be reviewed for completeness and legal sufficiency. Dedication language that fails to clearly identify what is being dedicated, to whom, and for what purpose may result in a dedication that is legally ineffective, which can create significant problems for the development and for the public entities intended to receive the dedication.

Boundary closure of the overall plat, each block, and each lot should be verified as part of the plat review. A plat in which the overall boundary closes but individual lot closures do not is a defective plat, and the errors within it will complicate future surveys and title work. Verifying closure at each level of the plat geometry, not just at the overall boundary, is a thorough and defensible review practice.

Topographic Survey Deliverable Review

Topographic survey deliverables present a different set of review challenges than boundary deliverables. The primary quality concern for a topographic drawing is not legal sufficiency but geometric accuracy and completeness, and the review must address both.

Contour interval consistency must be verified across the drawing. Contours that are labeled at the stated interval in one area but skip an interval or double up in another area indicate either a data collection gap or a drafting error. Contour lines that cross each other, except in the specific case of an overhanging feature, indicate a data or drafting error that must be corrected. Spot elevations shown on the drawing should be checked against the field notes for a representative sample to confirm that the values were correctly transcribed.

Drainage patterns depicted by the contour lines should be evaluated for physical plausibility. Contours that indicate water flowing uphill, that fail to show a depression around a visible drainage feature, or that depict a ridge where the field clearly shows a swale indicate contour data that does not correctly represent the terrain. A review of the drawing by someone familiar with the field conditions, even informally, is a useful check on the physical plausibility of the depicted surface.

Feature location accuracy should be checked for a representative sample of surveyed features by comparing the plotted positions of features against the field notes or data collector records. Features that are plotted in the wrong location, that carry the wrong description, or that are missing from the drawing despite being recorded in the field notes are deliverable errors that reflect on the completeness of the work product.

Utility information shown on a topographic drawing, including the locations of above-ground utility structures and any underground utilities identified during field work, should be reviewed for accuracy and for appropriate qualification of the data. Underground utility information derived from surface markings or record drawings rather than direct excavation should be clearly distinguished from surveyed above-ground features, with appropriate notation of the data source and its limitations.

Deliverable Completeness Review

In addition to the technical content of the individual deliverable components, a final review should confirm that the complete set of deliverables required by the client agreement, the project scope, and any applicable recording or regulatory requirements is present and ready for delivery.

A deliverable checklist, prepared at the beginning of the project based on the project scope and applicable requirements, provides the framework for the completeness review. The checklist should identify every required deliverable component, the standard to which it must conform, and the person responsible for the final verification of each component. Reviewing the checklist at the final delivery stage confirms that nothing has been overlooked.

Digital file formats and naming conventions, when specified by the client or required by a regulatory agency, must be verified before delivery. A digital deliverable submitted in the wrong format, with incorrect georeferencing, or in a coordinate system different from what was specified may be rejected or may cause problems for the recipient's use of the data. Confirming format requirements and verifying the digital file against those requirements before delivery is a straightforward QA step that prevents a frustrating and sometimes costly re-delivery.

The final deliverable review should be documented. A completed review checklist, signed or initialed by the person who performed the review, provides a record that the review was conducted and what it covered. This documentation is part of the project file and supports the defensibility of the work product. It also provides accountability within the office for the review process, making it less likely that the review will be abbreviated or skipped under time pressure.

Applying a seal and signature to a survey deliverable is a professional act with legal and ethical consequences. The final deliverable review is the process that makes that act defensible. A surveyor who can point to a documented, systematic review process has demonstrated professional diligence. A surveyor who cannot is relying entirely on the hope that the work was done correctly the first time, which is a professional posture that the complexity and consequence of survey work does not support.

Section 7 — Documentation Practices and Project File Management

The preceding five units of this course addressed quality assurance measures applied at specific stages of a survey project: instrument verification before and during field work, traverse closure analysis after measurements are reduced, deed and record research verification before boundary positions are committed, coordinate geometry checking before computations are finalized, and final deliverable review before the work product leaves the office. Each of those measures produces something beyond its immediate QA function. Each produces a record. The collection of those records, along with the field notes, research files, correspondence, and project administration documents that accompany them, constitutes the project file.

The project file is not an afterthought or an administrative burden. It is the professional record of how the survey was done, why decisions were made, what evidence was considered, and what checks were performed. It is the document that a licensing board examiner reviews when a complaint is filed. It is the exhibit that an expert witness evaluates when a boundary dispute reaches litigation. It is the resource that a future surveyor consults when retracing the work years or decades later. The quality of the project file is a direct reflection of the quality of the professional practice that produced it.

This unit addresses documentation not as a clerical function but as a professional discipline. The habits described here are not separate from the QA measures described in previous units. They are the means by which those measures are recorded, preserved, and made available to anyone who needs to evaluate the work.

Field Notes

Field notes are the primary record of what was observed and measured in the field. They are the foundation of the project file and the most direct evidence of field conditions at the time of the survey. A set of field notes that is complete, legible, organized, and internally consistent is a professional asset. A set of field notes that is incomplete, ambiguous, or inconsistent with the final deliverable is a professional liability.

Field notes should be recorded at the time of observation, not reconstructed from memory after the fact. Notes recorded in the field reflect actual conditions as they existed at the time of the survey. Notes reconstructed later, even by the same observer, are a secondary record that may not accurately capture details that were apparent in the field. When questions arise about field conditions, the value of the field notes depends entirely on whether they were recorded contemporaneously.

The content of field notes for a boundary survey should include at minimum the date, weather conditions, and names of field personnel; the instruments used and their identification numbers; the control monuments occupied and their identifications; angle and distance observations for each setup; descriptions of found monuments including type, size, material, condition, and any markings; descriptions of set monuments including type, size, and material; ties to found monuments from traverse stations; observations on occupation and use patterns relevant to boundary location; and any field conditions that affected the measurements or that a future reviewer would need to understand the context of the work.

Monument descriptions in the field notes deserve particular emphasis. The description of a found monument should be specific enough that a future surveyor reading the notes could determine whether a monument found at the same location in the future is the same monument or a different one. A description that records only found iron pin tells a future surveyor almost nothing useful. A description that records found one-half inch diameter iron pin with plastic cap stamped with license number, set in concrete, top flush with ground surface, in good condition provides the kind of specific, useful information that supports the future retracement of the boundary.

Photographs are a supplement to field notes, not a substitute. A photograph of a found monument, a fence line, an occupation pattern, or a field condition provides visual documentation that words alone may not fully capture. Digital photographs taken with a GPS-enabled device and properly labeled with the point number and description they document are a valuable addition to any project file. They are particularly useful when field conditions relevant to a boundary determination, such as a fence that has been in place for many years or evidence of long-standing occupation, are part of the basis for the surveyor's professional judgment.

Data collector files and raw data downloads from total stations and GNSS receivers are part of the field record and should be retained with the project file. The raw data represents the unprocessed field observations before any reduction or adjustment, and it is the most direct record of what the instrument measured. Retaining the raw data separately from the reduced and adjusted data allows the computation to be independently verified or reconstructed if necessary.

Research Documentation

The deed and record research described in Section 4 produces a body of documentary evidence that must be organized and retained as part of the project file. Research documentation serves two functions: it provides the evidentiary basis for the boundary determination, and it demonstrates the thoroughness of the research process.

Research documentation should include copies of all deeds, plats, easement instruments, and other record documents that were reviewed and relied upon in the boundary determination. Copies should be legible and complete, including all pages and exhibits. A partial copy of a deed, or a copy so poor that the dimensions are illegible, is not adequate documentation.

A research log describing the scope of the research, the sources consulted, the search parameters used, and the results of the search provides context for the assembled documents. The research log should note not only what was found but what was searched and not found, which is relevant if a subsequent question arises about whether a particular instrument was considered. A search that did not turn up a particular easement instrument, for example, is more defensible if the research log shows what sources were searched and confirms the instrument was not discoverable through those sources.

Instruments that were identified but determined to be irrelevant or inapplicable to the boundary determination should be noted in the research log with a brief explanation of why they were set aside. This record of considered-and-rejected documents demonstrates that the research was thoughtful rather than merely broad.

Prior survey records identified during research, as discussed in Section 4, should be copied and retained with the project file. Annotations noting how the prior survey was evaluated, whether its monuments were sought and found, and how its boundary positions compared to the current determination are a valuable addition to the research documentation. Prior survey documentation provides the historical context for the boundary determination and supports the consistency of the record over time.

Computation Records

Computation records for a survey project should be organized to support independent review and reconstruction. The standard for computation record keeping is that a competent surveyor who was not involved in the project should be able to follow the computation from inputs to final results using only the project file.

Meeting that standard requires that computation records identify the source of each input value, show the method used for each computation, present results clearly and in a logical sequence, and include documentation of all QA checks performed. For software-based computations, the record typically includes saved project files, printed or exported computation reports, and notes on software settings such as coordinate system and units. For spreadsheet or hand computations, the record includes completed worksheets with labeled inputs and documented steps.

Adjustment records are a specific component of the computation record that deserves attention. The traverse adjustment, as discussed in Section 3, should be documented to show the unadjusted traverse computation, the angular misclosure and its distribution, the departure and latitude computation before adjustment, the LEC and relative precision, and the adjusted coordinates. Retaining the unadjusted computation alongside the adjusted result is important because the unadjusted computation shows what the field measurements actually produced, which is evidence of field measurement quality separate from the adjustment.

When computations are revised, the revision history should be preserved. Overwriting an earlier computation with a corrected version, without retaining a record of the original computation and the reason for the revision, leaves a gap in the project record. A simple version control practice, such as retaining dated copies of computation files with a notation of what was changed and why, provides a complete record of the computation history.

Correspondence and Decision Documentation

Survey projects involve professional judgments that do not appear directly in the field notes or computation records. The decision to accept a found monument as controlling, to reject a monument as disturbed or non-original, to resolve a conflict between senior and junior deed calls in a particular way, or to adopt a particular boundary position in an area of uncertainty are professional judgments that shape the final deliverable. Documenting the basis for those judgments is part of professional practice.

A boundary decision memorandum, whether a formal document or a brief notation in the project file, records the significant professional judgments made in the course of the survey and the evidence or reasoning that supported them. It does not need to address every minor decision but should address any decision where a competent reviewer might reasonably ask why a different approach was not taken. A memorandum that explains why a particular found monument was accepted as controlling, what evidence supported that determination, and what conflicting evidence was considered and why it was given less weight tells a professional story that field notes and computations alone do not tell.

Client correspondence that affects the scope, purpose, or deliverables of the survey should be retained with the project file. Instructions from the client that modified the original scope, requests for additional work, communications that clarified the intended use of the deliverable, and any client representations about property conditions or history are all potentially relevant to understanding the context of the survey. Email correspondence, in particular, is a convenient and complete record of project communications that is easily retained in the project file.

Communications with adjacent property owners, utility companies, government agencies, and other parties encountered during the course of the survey may also be relevant project documentation. A notation that a neighbor was contacted and confirmed the location of a fence line, or that a utility company provided as-built information for an underground facility, provides context for field observations that might otherwise appear unexplained in the field notes.

Project File Organization

A project file that contains all the right information but is disorganized to the point that relevant documents cannot be located quickly is only marginally better than an incomplete file. Organization is part of documentation discipline.

A consistent file structure applied across all projects in an office reduces the time required to locate information and ensures that documentation requirements are not overlooked. A typical project file structure might organize documents into categories such as administration, research, field data, computations, deliverables, and correspondence. Within each category, documents should be labeled clearly enough that their content and date are apparent without opening them.

Digital project files require the same organizational discipline as physical files, with the additional requirement of a backup strategy that ensures the records are preserved against data loss. A project file stored only on a local workstation is vulnerable to hardware failure, and a project file stored only in a cloud service that the firm no longer subscribes to may become inaccessible. A backup strategy that includes at minimum one copy stored separately from the primary working location provides reasonable protection for irreplaceable project records.

File retention periods for survey records vary by jurisdiction and by the nature of the record. Original field notes, recorded plats, and the project files supporting them represent the kind of permanent or long-term record that most professional standards treat as deserving indefinite retention. Computation records and research documentation for projects that did not result in recorded instruments may be subject to shorter retention requirements, but retaining them for a reasonable professional period, typically measured in years rather than months, is defensible practice. Familiarity with applicable record retention requirements and compliance with them is a professional obligation.

The Documentation Mindset

The documentation practices described in this unit are most effective when they are treated not as a collection of separate tasks to be completed at the end of a project but as an ongoing discipline integrated into the workflow from the first day of research through the final delivery of the work product. A field crew that records complete and specific notes at each setup, a researcher who logs each source consulted as the search proceeds, a technician who saves and labels each computation as it is completed, and a project manager who assembles and reviews the file before delivery are collectively practicing documentation as a professional discipline rather than a clerical afterthought.

The practical value of this discipline is not primarily defensive, although its defensive value is real and significant. The primary value is that good documentation supports good decisions. A surveyor who has clearly documented the research basis for a boundary determination can evaluate a conflicting found monument with confidence, because the research record shows what controls. A surveyor who has clearly documented the computation sequence can identify a discrepancy quickly, because the record shows where each value came from. A surveyor who has clearly documented the professional judgments made in the course of the survey can explain and defend those judgments coherently, because the reasoning was recorded at the time it was applied.

Documentation does not make a survey correct. It records the process by which correctness was sought and achieved. Combined with the QA measures described in the preceding units, thorough documentation produces a project record that reflects the professional standard that a licensed surveyor is expected to maintain, and that demonstrates, to anyone who reviews it, that the work was done with the care and diligence that the license demands.

Section 8 — Closing Summary

Land surveying is a profession in which errors have consequences that extend well beyond the office or the field crew that made them. A boundary corner set in the wrong location, a legal description with an incorrect distance, a plat with a closure error, or a topographic survey with a systematic elevation shift can affect property rights, construction outcomes, and legal records for years or decades after the survey was completed. The professional license attached to that work is not merely a credential. It is a public statement that the holder is competent to perform work whose accuracy other people will rely upon without independent verification.

The quality assurance measures described in this course are the practical expression of that professional responsibility. They are not theoretical ideals. They are specific, implementable procedures that a working surveyor can apply within the normal workflow of a survey project, without specialized equipment, large staff support, or significant additional time investment. What they require is deliberate attention, consistent application, and the professional discipline to treat checking as a core part of the work rather than an optional addition to it.

Summary of Core Principles

The six main units of this course addressed distinct but interconnected areas of survey practice, each representing a known category of professional risk and a corresponding set of QA measures.

Instrument verification, addressed in Section 2, establishes that the tools used to make measurements are performing within acceptable limits at the time of use. No amount of computational sophistication or research thoroughness can compensate for measurements that were made with an instrument that was out of adjustment. The field calibration checks described in that unit, including collimation checks for total stations, the two-peg test for levels, and initialization verification for GNSS receivers, are the first line of defense against systematic error. They are most effective when performed as a consistent routine rather than as an occasional response to suspected problems, and when the results are documented as part of the project record.

Traverse closure and adjustment, addressed in Section 3, is the fundamental mathematical check on the internal consistency of field angle and distance measurements. The closure check does not just confirm that the survey meets a numerical standard. It is a diagnostic tool that can identify the presence of blunders, systematic errors, and excessive random error before those problems are propagated into final coordinates and deliverables. Understanding the distinction between closing a traverse and understanding what a closure result means is central to using closure analysis as a genuine QA tool rather than a reporting formality.

Deed and record research verification, addressed in Section 4, ensures that field measurements are interpreted against a complete and correctly understood record before boundary positions are committed. A boundary determination made on the basis of incomplete research, or research that failed to identify a senior conveyance or a prior survey, may be geometrically precise while being legally wrong. The research verification procedures described in that unit, including deed closure computation, plat geometry verification, prior survey research, and record consistency checking, are the professional investment that separates a defensible boundary opinion from one that merely looks like one.

Coordinate geometry checking, addressed in Section 5, addresses the category of computational error that can enter the work product independently of field conditions or research quality. Data entry errors, logic errors, transformation errors, and propagated errors are all capable of producing incorrect results from correct inputs, and software does not distinguish between correct and incorrect instructions. Independent recomputation, checking computed positions against independent field measurements, and verifying legal description closure and curve data are the computational QA measures that catch errors at the point where they are cheapest to correct.

Final deliverable review, addressed in Section 6, is the structured verification that the complete and correct work product has been produced before the surveyor's seal and signature are applied. It confirms that the drawing, legal description, and any associated documents are internally consistent, agree with the supporting computations, include all required elements, and conform to applicable standards and client requirements. The final deliverable review is the last checkpoint before the work enters the permanent record, and a documented review process is the professional basis for the act of sealing and signing.

Documentation practices, addressed in Section 7, are the means by which all of the preceding QA measures produce a lasting professional record. Field notes that are complete and specific, research documentation that shows the scope and results of the research process, computation records that support independent review and reconstruction, and decision documentation that explains the professional judgments made in the course of the survey collectively constitute a project file that reflects professional diligence. That project file is the surveyor's most important professional asset in the event of a challenge, a complaint, or a future retracement.

The Relationship Between QA and Professional Liability

Quality assurance and professional liability are directly connected. The licensing board complaints and professional liability claims that affect survey practitioners most commonly arise not from sophisticated errors that evaded detection despite rigorous checking, but from basic errors that were never checked at all. The monument that was accepted without verification, the deed closure that was never computed, the traverse that was adjusted without investigation of a poor closure, the legal description that was delivered without a closure check, the plat that was sealed without a complete review are the sources of the complaints and claims that appear in licensing board records and court dockets with discouraging regularity.

The QA measures in this course do not guarantee error-free work. No procedure eliminates all possibility of error in a discipline as complex and variable as land surveying. What these measures do is reduce the probability that an error will go undetected, and demonstrate, when errors do occur despite reasonable precautions, that the surveyor exercised the professional diligence that the standard of care requires. That demonstration, supported by a documented project file, is the difference between a licensing board complaint that is dismissed after review and one that results in disciplinary action.

Proportionality and Professional Judgment

This course has emphasized throughout that QA measures should be applied with professional judgment about the nature and stakes of each project. Not every survey requires every check at maximum intensity. A survey of a small lot in a well-platted subdivision with clear monuments and a simple legal description carries different stakes than a boundary retracement in an area of conflicting senior calls, disturbed monuments, and significant adjoining land values. The QA investment should reflect the complexity and consequence of the specific project.

What should not vary with project complexity is the habit of systematic checking. The decision about how intensively to apply a given QA measure is a professional judgment. The decision to skip systematic checking entirely, because a project seems straightforward or a deadline is tight, is a professional risk. The surveys that produce the most damaging errors are often the ones that seemed least likely to present problems before they were begun.

Building QA Into Practice

The most effective QA programs in survey practice are not elaborate systems imposed from outside the normal workflow. They are habits and routines that experienced practitioners have integrated into the way they work, to the point where checking is as natural a part of the survey process as measuring. Building that kind of integrated QA culture in a survey practice, whether a large firm or a sole proprietorship, begins with the recognition that checking is part of the work, not extra work layered on top of it.

Practical steps toward building an integrated QA practice include developing written checklists for each stage of the survey workflow and using them consistently, establishing clear office standards for field note content, computation record keeping, and project file organization, creating accountability for final deliverable review by assigning a specific person to perform and document the review for each project, and treating QA failures, meaning errors that were caught internally, as learning opportunities rather than embarrassments. An error caught during final deliverable review, before the drawing is sealed and delivered, is a QA success. The system worked. The professional response is to correct the error, understand how it occurred, and consider whether a procedural adjustment would make it less likely to occur again.

The licensed professional land surveyor who applies these principles consistently, who treats instrument verification, closure analysis, research verification, computational checking, deliverable review, and thorough documentation as standard professional practice rather than optional enhancements, is practicing at a level that reflects the public trust embedded in the professional license. That is the standard this course has been written to support.

Section 9 — Review Questions

The following ten questions are based on the course material presented in Sections 1 through 8. Each question has four answer choices. The correct answer is identified and referenced to the section of the course where the supporting material appears.

Question 1

Which of the following best describes the distinction between quality assurance and quality control as used in this course?

A. Quality assurance refers to the detection and correction of defects after the fact, while quality control refers to proactive verification of measurements and computations.

B. Quality assurance is the deliberate, proactive verification of measurements, computations, records, and deliverables at defined checkpoints throughout a survey project, while quality control typically refers to the detection and correction of defects after the fact.

C. Quality assurance and quality control are interchangeable terms that describe the same process of reviewing survey deliverables before they are sealed and signed.

D. Quality control is performed in the field while quality assurance is performed in the office during the computation and drafting phases of a survey project.

Question 2

When performing a collimation check on a total station, what is the purpose of observing a target in both the face-left and face-right positions?

A. To verify that the optical plummet is correctly centered over the occupied point and that the instrument is level within compensator limits.

B. To confirm that the EDM is producing consistent distance measurements to the target from both instrument positions.

C. To detect and eliminate the horizontal collimation error, which reverses sign when the instrument is transited, by averaging the direct and reverse observations.

D. To verify that the vertical index error is within acceptable limits by comparing zenith angle readings from the two instrument positions.

Question 3

According to the course, what is the correct professional response when a traverse angular misclosure exceeds the allowable limit for the survey classification?

A. The angular misclosure should be distributed equally among the measured angles and the traverse should proceed to coordinate computation.

B. The angular misclosure must be investigated before proceeding, and adjusting an angular misclosure that is outside tolerance is not an acceptable substitute for identifying its source.

C. The traverse should be rerun in its entirety before any further computation is performed, regardless of the magnitude of the misclosure.

D. The allowable angular misclosure limit may be relaxed at the surveyor's professional discretion if field conditions prevented more precise angle measurement.

Question 4

Which of the following best describes the purpose of computing the closure of a metes and bounds description from the deed before going to the field?

A. To confirm that the deed description is consistent with the adjoining owner's deed and that no gap or overlap exists along the shared boundary line.

B. To verify that the bearing basis stated in the deed is consistent with the bearing basis that will be used for the field traverse.

C. To confirm that the description is geometrically complete, that the calls connect correctly from one to the next, and that the description returns to the point of beginning, revealing problems before field measurements are taken.

D. To establish the approximate area of the parcel so that the surveyor can estimate the field time required to complete the boundary survey.

Question 5

According to the course, why is recomputing the same calculation using the same software routine with the same inputs not considered an independent check?

A. Because software routines are not reliable enough to be used for primary computations in survey practice without manual verification of each result.

B. Because it verifies only that the software is consistent, not that the inputs or method were correct.

C. Because independent checks must always be performed by a different person in order to satisfy the professional standard of care for survey computations.

D. Because the same software routine may produce different results depending on the coordinate system settings in effect at the time of each computation.

Question 6

Which of the following curve elements, when all four are stated in a legal description, can be used to verify internal geometric consistency?

A. Radius, delta angle, arc length, and chord bearing and distance.

B. Radius, tangent length, external distance, and middle ordinate.

C. Delta angle, degree of curve, arc length, and tangent bearing.

D. Chord length, chord bearing, point of curvature coordinates, and point of tangency coordinates.

Question 7

According to the course, what does a monument description that records only found iron pin fail to provide?

A. The legal basis for accepting the monument as a controlling corner in the boundary determination.

B. Specific enough information that a future surveyor reading the notes could determine whether a monument found at the same location in the future is the same monument or a different one.

C. The tie distance and bearing from the nearest traverse station required to locate the monument position in the coordinate geometry database.

D. The instrument type and operator identification required to associate the monument observation with a specific field session in the project record.

Question 8

According to the course, what is the primary distinction between a closed loop traverse and a closed traverse between fixed points with respect to quality assurance?

A. A closed loop traverse requires a least squares adjustment while a closed traverse between fixed points may be adjusted using the compass rule.

B. A closed loop traverse can only be evaluated for internal consistency, while a closed traverse between fixed points has the additional benefit of being checked against external control, verifying that the traverse is positioned correctly in the control network.

C. A closed traverse between fixed points requires more redundant measurements than a closed loop traverse because the closure cannot be evaluated from internal geometry alone.

D. A closed loop traverse provides a stronger quality assurance check than a closed traverse between fixed points because it does not depend on the accuracy of external control monuments.

Question 9

According to the course, what professional function does a boundary decision memorandum serve in the project file?

A. It provides the legal basis for the surveyor's boundary determination and serves as the instrument of record for the boundary position established by the survey.

B. It records the significant professional judgments made in the course of the survey and the evidence or reasoning that supported them, addressing decisions where a competent reviewer might reasonably ask why a different approach was not taken.

C. It documents the client's instructions regarding the scope and purpose of the survey and provides the contractual basis for the surveyor's scope of work and fee.

D. It summarizes the field measurements and traverse closure results in a format suitable for submission to a licensing board or court as evidence of survey accuracy.

Question 10

According to the course, what is the professional significance of the distinction between an error caught during final deliverable review and an error that reaches the client in the delivered work product?

A. An error caught during final deliverable review carries greater professional liability than one that reaches the client, because it demonstrates that the review process identified a deficiency in the work that should have been prevented earlier in the workflow.

B. There is no meaningful professional distinction between the two outcomes because the standard of care requires error-free work regardless of when and how errors are identified.

C. An error caught during final deliverable review, before the drawing is sealed and delivered, is a quality assurance success because the system worked, while an error that reaches the client represents a failure of the checking process that the quality assurance measures in this course are designed to prevent.

D. An error caught during final deliverable review must be reported to the licensing board as a self-identified deficiency, while an error that reaches the client is subject to complaint procedures initiated by the affected party.

For PDH Credit

Purchase a PDH Quiz from

www.acuitypdh.com

(must make a 70% to pass – unlimited attempts)

or

contact support@acuitypdh.com for other invoice options or for Corporate Discounts