

**MINUTES**  
**COUNCIL OF THE ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS**  
**Monday, November 29, 2021**  
**9:00 AM – 1:00 PM**  
**Zoom Conference Call**

<b>Chair:</b>	Gavin Lawrence, Andy Shelp, Andrew Mantha, Trevor McNeil, David Kovacs, Amar Loai, Simon Kasprzak Saša Kromar, Ron Berg, Martha George, Peter Meerveld, Andrew Dowie, John General, James Hunt, Bruce Clark,	President Vice President Past-President Senior Councillor Senior Councillor Intermediate Councillor Intermediate Councillor Junior Councillor Junior Councillor Lay Councillor Lay Councillor Lay Councillor Lay Councillor Lay Councillor Surveyor General (SG)	Newmarket Ottawa Windsor Stratford Thunder Bay Toronto Barry's Bay Toronto St. Catharines Kitchener Kitchener Tecumseh London Port Hope Peterborough
---------------	--	--	--

<b>Staff:</b>	Brian Maloney, Kevin Wahba, (Absent) Penny Anderson,	Executive Director (ED) Registrar Recorder	North Kawartha Vaughan Mississauga
---------------	--	--	--

**1. Call to Order; Reminder of Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality**

*The meeting was called to order at 9:01 AM.*

*The President provided a Land Acknowledgement prior to start of the meeting.*

*Council was reminded to declare conflicts of interest and maintain the confidentiality of this meeting.*

**2. Review Agenda**

*The agenda was distributed to Council.*

**Motion 21.66      MOVED: Bruce Clark      SECONDED: Dave Kovacs**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Council approves the agenda as provided.

**DATE: November 29, 2021      Chair: Gavin Lawrence      Carried: (Unanimous)**

**3. Approval of Previous Minutes/Review of Action Items**

**Motion 21.67    MOVED: Andrew Mantha    SECONDED: Martha George**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Council approves the Minutes from the meeting of October 19th, 2021.

**DATE: November 29, 2021    Chair: Gavin Lawrence    Carried: (Unanimous)**

*The I & IT Strategy is still ongoing. The database project is underway.*

*Dave Kovacs and his team are on track to implement Discipline Committee recommendations but it they are not yet complete.*

*In regard to developing a cautionary note for use on plans that will go to municipalities, Brian Maloney has to set up a meeting with the analyst from the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner. This has yet to occur.*

*The CNAR sessions are completed, and Brian Maloney provided his notes to Council from his attendance at CNAR.*

*The Land Acknowledgement Policy was implemented and posted on the website.*

*Brian Maloney sent the slides regarding modernization of the Surveyors Act to Council.*

*SRD Committee has yet to meet to review the Council questions related to the use of Stickers and provide recommendations to Council. This is ongoing.*

*The Mentoring Program discussion was included in this Council Meeting's agenda.*

#### 4. President's Remarks

*The President attended the Quebec AGM in person. It was really well run and safety protocols were evident. He felt quite safe.*

*The registration booth ran smoothly. Attendees were asked to sanitize their hands and to wear face coverings. They wore arm bracelets to identify who had been checked for proof of vaccination. They had water fountains in various rooms. They still had tea, coffee, and muffins, and most of the food items were prepackage. The lunch had the same set up with clear plastic container lids so attendees could see what the offerings were, and they had vegan and vegetarian options. It went really well, and the President has not heard any anything that happened from a pandemic standpoint.*

*There were probably around 100 to 150 people, maybe even more, maybe 250 people, and that was probably on the first day.*

*It was a joint meeting with the Geospatial Group in Quebec.*

*The Minister gave a presentation virtually. The Deputy Minister was there, and it seemed like they have a lot of work when it came to flood plane mapping.*

*The Presidents Forum had attendees from ACLS, the president of Alberta, and Quebec.*

*PSC was not invited to the forum since they were perceived more as an advocacy group.*

#### 5. Staff Reports

- **Executive Director**

*Brian Maloney shared his report to Council.*

*Brian had checked on Bill 27 this morning before the meeting and it went back to the house. It was up for debate for third reading. As of last week, there was no update, so we do not know if it has passed yet. It was in Standing Committee for a few days so we would expect that there have been some changes, but we don't know what they are.*

*We had a positive meeting met with Ryerson University and they willing to consider additional geospatial offerings which would make it easier for their graduates to become Ontario Land Surveyors.*

*Brian also met with the other Executive Directors from across the country.*

*Similarly, Alberta's Association is concerned about some tabled legislation related to the healthcare professions. It relates to limiting the activities of associations/regulators and they are concerned that it could transfer into other professions. They are taking a hard line on what other duties or things regulators can take on and so it will be interesting to see where that goes.*

*Richard Steinecke has similar recommendations for us to consider.*

*We did offer interviews for the Communication Specialist, and we anticipate interviewing five or six candidates. We have not set the date, but it will be next week sometime.*

- **Registrar**

*We had the professional examinations take place from November 17th to the 19th. 16 students participated.*

*None of the statistics have changed from the last Council Meeting.*

*We have not had any additional complaints submitted since the last meeting.*

*A Disciplinary Committee Meeting was scheduled in two days.*

*Carol Street had informed us that she can no longer be available to provide services to the Disciplinary Panels as she is retiring, and had suggested that her partner become her replacement in the New Year.*

*There is a Registration Committee matter that is currently on going. There was a draft of the procedural manual that was sent out to the committee.*

*There were no comments received as of yet, but they are hoping to bring it to Council next month. Nothing with fees.*

*It was about five months ago when the Registrar brought up a concern about a former member not paying costs awarded pursuant to a joint submission that was entered into back in 2017, 2018. We decided to enter the order of the Disciplinary Committee with the court, and we obtained a writ of seizure and sale against the former member. We have yet to inform him at this point that it does expire; about six or seven years from now. We are not aware of any property that the member owns at this point.*

*The costs are in the amount of eight thousand dollars, and we have not received any payment and that was due on August of this year. There certainly is an opportunity to approach them and perhaps just ask them to pay the costs without using or going through the writ. The Registrar intends to speak with the member soon.*

*Most of the Disciplinary costs that have been ordered in the past several years have been paid so only minor costs are outstanding. Hopefully in the next few weeks, we can have all any outstanding costs submitted. It was mentioned that there is one exception with a member that had his license revoked and owes in the order of \$270,000. Legal counsel is engaged and they did have a hearing with him where they went through significant documentation but additional records have been requested, which are required to move forward.*

*We had an action commenced against the AOLS last week related to a claim that property had been "stolen". It named numerous parties and had hundreds of incomprehensible pages and a demand for millions of dollars. It is unfounded and was sent to John Breese to address. We sent the claimant a letter informing them that they have no reasonable action, no cause against us and should they continue, we will seek an order and intend to look for costs to be awarded. We also noted our immunity under Section 44 of the Surveyors Act.*

*We also got a response back that from the Office the Fairness Commissioner who has designated all of the regulators into relative risk categories.*

*They indicated that the AOLS is in the lowest risk category, which was welcome news.*

## **6. Surveyor General's Report**

*The Surveyor General (SG) followed up regarding the workplace in Ontario Public service. The return to the workplace was started on November 1<sup>st</sup>, and it is a gradual return. Not everyone is back and not everyone is back full-time, however, it seems to be working at this point in time. There are a lot of questions about how long it will continue, what it looks like, and especially some of the news over the weekend about the Omicron variant. The Crown survey records vault remains offline will continue to be offline for the members of the public. However, service to anybody who has request by emails, or by mail will continue as necessary.*

*The interviews with the Crown Land Surveyors position will end today.*

*We were able to attract 5 qualified candidates for the position from inside and outside the civil service. From that competition, 2 (two) Crown Surveyor positions will be filled.*

*They are probably looking at a January 1<sup>st</sup> start date but hopefully earlier than that.*

*There is a problem with the job posting and that apparently classification was not done correctly. There were discussion going on internally within OPS around professional staff, surveyors and engineers and how they are classified and how they get slotted into positions, and consequently how they are compensated.*

*There was a major reclassification done. A number of people have appealed, and we have yet to see how that will go.*

*Jen McMurray did a presentation to the Kawartha-Haliburton Regional Group.*

*The Geographic Names Board have finally had a new chair appointed for three years.*

*Morgan Goadsby is the Board Secretary, and Bruce Clark also sits on the board.*

*Regarding the Public Lands Act, they are looking at removing adverse possession against Crown Land, and they are also looking at ways to speed up disposition of Crown Lands.*

*This came directly from the Minister who was in conversations with some counselors up in the Kenora area about the conversion of surplus crown land to development land.*

*They also received early notice on Friday from the Communications division that they are in the early stages of the Elections protocol, which means communications outgoing and internally will be somewhat restricted and much more controlled in the near future.*

*There is a potential election by June next year.*

*Regarding Bill 27, the SG was given an opportunity to make some comments on an early proposed legislation that ended up partially in schedule three of the proposed Bill 27.*

*However, the SG did not see the legislation itself before it was made public.*

*They did scan current practices within the regulatory bodies across Ontario just to make sure that what we were commenting on is fair.*

*There were concerns about the assessment of international trained professionals.*

*The AOLS does not have a policy that talks about Canadian work experience specifically.*

*The SG interpreted the articling process as training or learning required to do the job and that he did not see this changing based on what they are proposing.*

*Specifically, this is aiming at other professions such as professional engineers, professional geoscientists, which talk about work experience that must be Canadian.*

*Bruce Clark is more than willing to have more discussions with the association, and AERC on this topic.*

*The Registrar and ED received some questions from the Office of the Fairness Commissioner as part of them moving forward with the risk management approach. The Fairness Commissioner is behind Schedule 3 of that legislation moving forward and they had some very specific questions for us related to our articling process. We may not know unless we are challenged.*

*The ED wrote to Minister Rickford and Minister McNaughton, who were responsible for legislation. We have not received any response back from either one.*

## **7. Financial Reports – Budget Review**

*We are still well ahead on Investments this year (around 15%) although we had taken a bit of a hit last month.*

*The ED, and Finance Councillor, D. Kovacs have a meeting with Logan Wealth Management in early December. The meeting will discuss expected future markets and it will be interesting to see how the new COVID-19 variant will impact the market.*

*The ED shared the year end operating statement which has yet to be audited.*

*Our fiscal year end now is the end of October.*

*Although we have not completed the audit, yet we did end up in a very positive position at the end of the year.*

*There were many reasons for the surplus.*

*Some of it was delay related, such as the Steinecke report as an example, that did not get paid out yet. It will likely get pushed into this next fiscal year. It will be discussed further in the discussion on budget.*

*The SRD finished well ahead of budget primarily due to very strong sticker sales coupled with the fact that we had raised the rate.*

*Our overall General Reserve Fund was not that high, so in a way this is good. This brings us back closer to where we should be in terms of having some cash on hand to deal with rainy days that could come forward.*

*Changing the year-end to October had no serious impact.*

*The impact was last year when we moved last year. We had that 10 month period as opposed to 12.*

*If we have prepaid things for next year, those get removed from the expenditure and get pushed into next year's budget. We have done those adjustments but that will be verified as part of the audit.*

*The ED presented the proposed budget. If approved, with no changes, we would have a surplus of just over \$100,000.*

*Our number of surveyors has gone up. Last year we had quite a few new surveyors brought in which results in an increase of roughly \$50,000 in revenue.*

*The ED had recommended salary increase of 4% for most staff, which was approved at Executive Committee prior to this meeting. Our CPI inflation rate was 4.7% for the last year when it was published at the end of October, so 4% did not seem unreasonable.*

*The cost of living is going up and so that is reflected in some of the costs.*

*We did revert our expectations for interest income. We are back to previous years*

*expectations. We had a pretty pessimistic view last year and ended well ahead of budget.*

*We are back to a 5% basis for next year, which is our target in terms of interest revenue on our investments.*

*A question was posed around the PSRI fees where provinces do not pay. We are losing a little bit of money on this, because the provincial government had decided not to contribute.*

*The original rate was worked out on the basis of provincial surveyors paying. The funding model is on a per surveyor basis. We do have more surveyors in the private sector now, and so this may come a little closer to budget. Now, we are running a slight deficit on this. Looking at the cost side of the equation, our costs are projected to be to be 136K and we are taking in 120K. There is about 16K difference. We would have to pass a bylaw to change that. One way to solve this, to be truly on a per surveyor basis, would be to include it into fees and then the government surveyors will have to pay it. If we run a deficit, it is paid by all the Members. We did have an additional cost for 2021/22 of \$6k that has already been approved by the PWSRI Committee and is included in the budget. We had a bit of an oversight on constructing the application to deal with "Practice Area". We thought it was going to be just as simple as putting a regular survey record in. Unfortunately, if we took that approach spatially it would obliterate all of the other records, so we had to do a little bit of coding to make it work.*

*In Licenses, we were expecting an increase and we will see some retirements. We hope that the new Members offset the retirements that will happen.*

*We lowered the revenue a little bit related to Exam given the number of students.*

*We accounted for some work for the psychometric analysis. The AERC wishes to do some work this year on their exam bank and we have a few items to clean up. Likely, we will require some consultancy for this work.*

*We will have to think long and hard about how many in-person meetings we actually do.*

*The virtual meetings could accomplish half of our meetings and still perform the business of the association. Although there is value in in-person meetings, and we will likely want to do that for more strategic conversations such as strategic planning and perhaps some of the more important policy discussions.*

*The PAC (Public Awareness Committee) and GRLC (Geomatics Recruitment & Liaison Committee) had put forward very detailed budgets together. PAC was to attend the Ontario Good Roads Conference, and we decided not to do that this year, so this was subtracted from their budget request.*

*The President's budget was left at half of where it was at in the past. We expect to see some virtual meetings. New Brunswick's AGM is already committed to go virtually but there are others looking at trying to hold in-person meetings.*

*The website budget is of note. It includes the work being done on the membership database. We have not received an invoice from our Developers, so we pushed the entire cost into the next year, which is potentially \$90,000 and that bumped the budget significantly.*

*There was an error under pensions and benefits in last year's budget, which has been corrected in this budget. CPP, EI, and WSIB costs were not built in properly. We were well higher than our budget. The 4% increase in salaries has some trickle-down effect in benefits such as for pension contributions. We match RRSP contributions from our staff up to a maximum of four and a half percent of their salary.*

*In terms of SRD, there was a high level of work this year for our consultants, but a lot of that gets bumped into next year. We had 86 files this year where our normal load is around 65. Even with this extra work and an anticipated normal number of stickers sold, we will still end up with a surplus.*

*It was noted that we have an internally controlled surplus fund of \$700,000 for SRD.*

*We have always made the promise to Members that we would keep SRD funds separate.*

*This is based on unaudited numbers yet, so when we finally finish the audit, this may get adjusted slightly.*

*It was mentioned that in a previous Council meeting around a year or two ago, there was discussion that an acceptable surplus could be 1.5 times the operating budget. At the end of 2020 our general operating fund was about \$800,000 plus or minus. If we add that this year's surplus we are a little over \$1.5 million. That is closer to where we want to be because we should typically have at least a year of operating expenses in a reserve fund. We are close to being on target in terms of reserve.*

*It was suggested that, for nominations, we can promote that some meetings are not necessary to attend in-person to increase the talent pool. The ED had a conversation on this with the Nominating Committee, and the committee is well aware of that.*

*Our budget for the AGM is in the black in either a hybrid or in-person format. We are planning and budgeted for an in-person meeting. We do have two sets for budget for both Hybrid and In-Person. At the moment, we have about 20K surplus, which allows for unforeseen expenses. If we go hybrid we expect no penalties per se, because we would use the force majeure clause. We may have to absorb half of the meeting room costs, which are waived if we meet our food and beverage targets. This would be the \$7500 and is included in the draft budget.*

*The ED prepared three motions around the budget/finances. The first one relates to the Discipline Reserve Fund, which is an internally controlled fund. We transferred some money across to the Discipline Reserve Fund earlier this year, but the fund remains low.*

**Motion 21.68      MOVED: Andrew Mantha      SECONDED: Dave Kovacs**

**WHEREAS:** Council previously decided to set aside an internally restricted Discipline Reserve Fund to address discipline costs

**AND WHEREAS:** Council normally transfers funds to the Discipline Reserve Fund annually

**AND WHEREAS:** The current Discipline Reserve Fund sits at \$12,561.90 (un-audit) and Council wants to ensure that sufficient funds are in the reserve

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Council approves the transfer of \$30,000.00 from the General Operating Funds to the Discipline Reserve Fund.

**DATE: November 29, 2021      Chair: Gavin Lawrence      Carried: (Unanimous)**

*We will have no fees by-law that is active for next year, which is a bit of a challenge because we need to send out the invoices within this next week.*

*Last year, we decided to hold the line on fees but the by-law only covered last year and did not cover anything going forward.*

*If no other bylaw regarding fees is forthcoming, then fees will remain in future years.*

**Motion 21.69      MOVED: Andy Shelp      SECONDED: Andrew Mantha**

**WHEREAS:** By-Law 2020-01 updated the Fees payable to the AOLS for 2021 to retain Fees payable from 2020 but did not address future years.

**AND WHEREAS:** Council agrees to retain the same fees for 2022.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Council approves By-Law 2021-02 as attached as Appendix A.

**DATE: November 29, 2021      Chair: Gavin Lawrence      Carried: (Unanimous)**

**Motion 21.70      MOVED: Bruce Clark      SECONDED: Trevor McNeil**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Council approves the Budget for 2021/22 as presented.

**DATE: November 29, 2021      Chair: Gavin Lawrence      Carried: (Unanimous)**

#### 8. Risk Summary/Strategy Update/Dashboard Review

*The Dashboard tracks our risk mitigations.*

*The ED will have the front slides updated and will include them as part of the first dashboard that was out of the year and then following that will likely only have those that are changing.*

*We have had a few more liability insurance claims. Although the number of claims is down values of claims are not. We need to recognize that it is difficult to get good estimates on the legal claims and so these are likely understated. The values included tend to be more of the construction related claims, but we have had a couple of fairly significant ones that are coming in at the \$50K to \$100K range and at least one very large claim.*

*In terms of the kinds of causes, there hasn't been a lot of change. The numbers are starting to stabilize in terms of where we are finding the sources of error and the type of claim.*

*As new claims are add, these numbers are bumping around by 1% .*

*We still tend to have the communication issues, consider things like wrong version of a plan or a document, and we are still seeing a lot of those similar kind of problems that are coming forward.*

*About 20% of claims are reported out of an abundance of caution and never result in actual loss. So we have about 80% with some likelihood of payout.*

*Construction claims amount to 64% of the number of claims, not the value.*

*By value, it would be a different story and the problem is we do not have good values on them because we really only get the value after it has been settled.*

*We also track public inquiries. These are phone calls and emails that come in. We still receive directory type calls, and we would like to move that to the website.*

*The member database is going to help with that as well.*

*Currently, the website displays only those firms that are providing public services and not individual surveyors.*

*The PSRI usage is increasing. We have more firms than ever this last month inputting records. The searching numbers can still improve.*

*The ED had sent an email out to those firms that had not inputted records since the regulation change came in. It generated a significant uptick, there still are a few firms that are not there, and we are going to rerun the report and get in touch with a few more firms to see what's going on.*



*There was 31% increase in sticker sales from the previous year. There was significant increase in workload for surveyors.*

*On website usage, the "Find a surveyor" has the highest number of searches, and our FAQ page.*

*The Committees are all reasonably on track. There were a couple of Task Forces that have not met in a while, and mainly because they have accomplished their goals.*

*The Risk Summary is a tracking document in terms of making sure we do not miss items of issue. We have crossed off a few.*

*We have items that got bumped over to new items that came out of our current strategic plan.*

## **9. External Review (Steinecke)**

*Richard Steinecke joined the meeting.*

*Richard Steinecke was reviewing most regulatory areas of the association and provided feedback.*

*Richard received an amazing amount of cooperation from everyone that he spoke with and the lots of documents.*

*The review covered 8 topics. This was a comprehensive review of the things that Richard was asked to look at.*

*The only major gap was in registration because the AOLS recently conducted an external review as a result of requests from the Office of Fairness Commission.*

*On registration, Richard only looked at the Registration Committee in relation to registrations. Richard looked at other areas comprehensively.*

*Richard spoke of the concept of best practices, and that there is no universally accepted set of best practices, and it varies somewhat with the nature of the profession.*

*While the Survey profession involves relations, relationships with the clients, it is more technical and judgment orientated and also the best practices vary with the size and resources of the profession.*

*Best practices amount to an experienced professional opinion. At the end of the day, there will be judgement calls to be made as to what is valuable, important, and relevant for the AOLS.*

*Richard noted that the AOLS has a very positive, constructive collaborative culture.*

*Richard noted he had witnessed a very good tone of discussions at Council and felt that he received a representative view of what was observed; it was respectful and principled and an amazing staff who suggest things, provide information, do research, prod you in the good sense of that word, but still let you make the decisions. The AOLS is active and proactive. The AOLS is looking for ways to improve and doing many of the right things such as strategic planning, policy making, and oversight. There is a strong commitment to the public interest. This was mentioned frequently by folks in every aspect of your activities.*

*There was a pretty good emphasis on the fiduciary duties, confidentiality, and conflict of interest. It was mentioned frequently in AOLS materials, handbooks and in meetings, and the AOLS has high quality outputs.*

*The AOLS have initiatives, such as diversity and inclusion.*

*The SRD Program is an amazing program. Usually, these external reviews occur when there are problems with the organization, or at least stagnation. It is rare for an organization to do this when they are on already engaged in rapidly improving activity, so it speaks volumes for the organization that the AOLS requested this review.*

*In terms of the methodology, Richard established the review criteria and provided it to the AOLS, and the AOLS did not quibble on that.*

*Richard reviewed the legislation, and then reviewed the AOLS website. He also reviewed the documents provided. There were a lot of documents to review (over 1000).*

*Richard performed interviews for each regulatory area of interest (3 per area), and observed meetings such as the Strategic Planning, Council, Practice Standards, and Complaints. He had seen the Discipline process before. He reviewed written and verbal reports, as part of the methodology.*

*The criteria that Richard used were based on other reports that were done by other respected auditors from the United Kingdom and from British Columbia, Ontario, and he developed 19 criteria for evaluation. General criteria consider things like public interest, transparency, diversity, accountability. In terms of governance, Richard looked at a number of aspects such as the selection and training, the roles of people in the organization, how fiduciary duties were performed.*

*Richard observed how the AOLS develop standards and made policy: the process, how the AOLS address changes, such as societal expectations, or technology changing, how effectively the AOLS assists people, especially the licensees, and once a policy is made, how they get members up to speed on the policy, which the AOLS does a pretty good job of. Richard also looked at Registration and quality assurance and also reactive regulation such as Complaints and Discipline; He looked at making sure the process was fair, that the AOLS was acting proportionately and that the AOLS were using a risk-based criteria.*

*There were certain themes that emerged from this.*

*The first theme that was recommended is to consider focussing on important things: Strategic planning, policy making, and high level oversight. Council is already doing this, but the AOLS Council is doing too many other things.*

*For example, Council is involved in individual regulation matters, such as referring things to discipline. Richard suggested that Council rethink those activities.*

*Richard made a specific recommendation in respect to the AOLS professional liability insurance program. Is this something that the AOLS as a regulator should do? It creates a perception about who the AOLS is protecting and defending. It creates a possibility of a conflict of interest. Very few regulators do this, although some do. It takes time and energy away from regulatory activities, and others could do that as effectively. Even if AOLS had an arms length insurer do this, under the legislation, the AOLS can still get the reports from them to use for regulatory purposes. This was specifically to illustrate the point.*

*Richard also recommended that Council not sit on regulatory committees to ensure that complaints, discipline, registration, and such are as independent from the policy making as possible. If Council is to spend its time on strategic planning, policy making, and having high level oversight, Council is not going to have time to do this or do it effectively.*

*Additionally, the skills of people who serve on council are different from the skills of people who serve on those regulatory committees, and so it makes sense that those people be different.*

*Richard also talked about ways in which the AOLS could enhance its policy making process. The AOLS already follows many of the things that policy making involves but it could be formalized and done with increased intent and structure to ensure that all the steps are covered and that the best possible decisions are made.*

*The AOLS have a requirement that regulations and bylaws be approved by the membership. That is a holdover from the days when the AOLS was truly an association, and now focusing on being a regulator, no observer of professional regulation supports that anymore and it conveys this perception that the membership controls regulatory activities. The organizations that are continuing to do this are getting out of that business. Although Richard appreciates why it is valuable since it engages the profession and engages the buy in. However, in today's day and age, that is just not viewed as appropriate for a professional regulator to have that requirement. Of course, this requires a legislative change.*

*Richard also recommended to take a hard look at the AOLS charitable foundation, the awards, the salary survey, and job board. These are things typically associated with a professional advocacy group rather than a regulatory body.*

*And the sixth recommendation was to enhance the orientation process. It is important to have a formal, structured, comprehensive orientation for everyone who joins council or any committee about the role and their duties which should include criteria for decision making, identifying skills that should be developed, ensuring that there is an understanding of how conflicts of interest and confidentiality breaches can creep in even with the best of intentions, and perhaps a formal mentoring system to ensure that people are up and running as soon as possible, understanding their role.*

*The seventh recommendation was to have explicit criteria for decision making for everybody, the Council and the committees. It should be in writing. There are criteria the AOLS can use for policy making or for dealing with complaints or dealing with registration or deciding what to do with an unauthorized practice case.*

*Overall, that was a summary of the recommendations.*

*The list of recommendations starts on page 56.*

*Richard expanded on the policy making piece. The recommendations #12, #13, and #14 discuss this in more detail. The AOLS should have a deliberative thorough approach and should have a written policy development process; a tool to identify what the issues are, the priority, the harm that it is going to cause the public, and the research that was done on it. We want to have a briefing note that talks about the harms, the options, the risks and benefit of each option, the likely consequences that we might not anticipate, and then perform a consultation process almost every time. Do an external consultation, unless there is an exceptional reason not to, then have criteria to help decide which policy option to choose.*

*Richard uses the professional Standards Authority in United Kingdom, that has some criteria about the impact of a policy change being proportional to the harm they are trying to protect, or if it's the right touch or a heavy touch response to this concern.*

*Once the policy is approved, not only it is put out on various communication tools, but it is also systematically monitored and reviewed and decide whether any changes should be made.*

*The AOLS does some of this already but making it explicit and systematic will improve this.*

*Be more systematic, be more detailed. And that's just an example of what the best regulators are doing. Recently the Government of Ontario just released a report on how the health professions are doing, and they commended the College of Midwives on their documented policy development process.*

*Recommendations #1 and #2 were really about the scope of Council.*

*Recommendation #21, the Compensation Fund; perhaps this is not something Council should be doing or similarly should Council have the ability to restore someone's license, or leave that to the committee that took it away. Council should consider getting out of the individual regulatory activities.*

*Recommendations #3 and #4 talk about transparency and most regulators today are moving towards public Council meetings with the materials made public on their website. Consider making more of the material provided to the membership available on the public website.*

*Recommendations number #5 and #6 deal with accountability. There should be a formal systematic review process of the performance of the Council itself, and of individual Council and committee members. This is something to be working towards.*

*It can start small, for example, everyone completes a poll at the end of a meeting and rates the meeting's effectiveness and makes it mandatory that it gets done or you could have a self evaluation form.*

*Recommendation #7 speaks to recruitment and training. It could be expanded to have formalized training for every Council member, every committee member, and that you try to get more public members. The AOLS has a very small percentage of public members on Council and Committees. You could consider adding non-voting guests to help. It was also recommended to have training for your Council Members on their skill areas and reduce the amount of time spent on operational matters such as procurement. Procurement is not a prudent thing for Council to be spending a lot of time on. You would decide if the procurement is necessary, how much you want to spend and let staff or committees deal with this.*

*Recommendation #11 recommends that AOLS develop a code of conduct for its Council and Committee members. It would need a legislative change, but the AOLS should also have a mechanism for dealing with problems.*

*Recommendations #12 #13 and #14 is the policy development. Richard stressed the importance of recommendation #14 of not letting the technology work fall between the cracks.*

*Recommendation #15 gets into Complaints and Discipline. The trend really is to have a person or a committee to review appeals from a complainant or a practitioner to determine if the investigation was adequate, and if the decision was reasonable so that there is that level accountability for complaints, just like there is a level of accountability for Discipline in the Divisional Court.*

*Recommendation #16. Minimize and as soon as possible, eliminate having council members on the complaints committee for the reasons given previously, independence, and skill set etc.,*

*Recommendation #17 is about having more public members; 50% public members.*

*Recommendation #18 is that Council should not be involved in referring matters to Discipline or to mediation. In most regulatory bodies, that is in the hands of the Complaints Committee. This is something the AOLS can remove through legislative amendment.*

*Recommendation #19 speaks about the Complaints committee being more assertive in exploring its remedial options.*

*Recommendation #20 is expanding that legislatively, so that the committee could require someone to attend for a caution and require someone to do remediation. The Complaints Committee is already looking at that.*

*Recommendation #21 speaks about removing Council from making compensation fund decisions.*

*Recommendation #22 - The Complaints Committee would benefit from having criteria, perhaps a flow chart or a risk matrix, that would help them walk through decisions. They could have training on that.*

*Recommendation #23 requires legislative amendment to modernize the Discipline process to enable a Discipline panel to suspend or revoke a certificate of authorization and to remove authority to compel a practitioner to repay, waive, or reduce fees.*

*Recommendation #24 speaks about eliminating the Fees Mediation Committee, but it would require legislative changes. In Richard's view the Fees Mediation Committee is not really serving the public interest the best way. It is not appropriate for AOLS as a regulator to be resolving fee disputes. That is more for the courts. There really are very few cases that are just about fees. Most complaints overlap with other issues about retainer or delay and that should be before the Complaints Committee. The Fees Mediation Process is incredibly complex. If the Fees Mediation Committee is not removed, Richard has made recommendations in #25, #26, #27 and #28 about how to improve the process to enhance the process so that concerns are dealt with in appropriate cases and effectively.*

*Recommendations #29, #30, and #31 spoke to the Registration Committee. The Registration Committee in living memory has not really done any registration hearings. Since it has not had any hearings, we could not find any active files to review, so this is more an abstract thing, but again, the website page could be a little friendlier.*

*The last recommendation dealt with unauthorized practice. The AOLS had some discussion about whether there needs to be a committee to look at cases and how to approach them. The recommendation is to have a document based on risk to the public that sets out how staff, probably, the registrar, will approach an authorized practice. Concerns identifying the ones that might require a letter of advice, those that might require stronger letter of cease and desist, and those that might require legal action, and just balance the competing interest. On the one hand, public must be protected from harm by unauthorized practice. On the other hand, it can easily turn into turf protection, and this could have bad publicity if too aggressive. This requires thoughtful approach.*

*There were no actual recommendations made for SRD, Practice Standards, and the CEC. There was nothing there that Richard found warranted a recommendation. Although there were a number of suggestions.*

*Suggestions are different from recommendations. Suggestions are things that are less significant in terms of the public interest or public protection, so they were not as important. They were not as necessary or as urgent as the as the recommendations.*

*A question was posed to Richard whether the role of the Complaints Committee is to adjudicate a bad boundary decision. In response, Richard referred to the recommendation of developing a criteria for decision making. The role at Complaints and even Discipline is not to adjudicate whether there is boundary error but rather the role would be to adjudicate whether there was a failure to maintain the standards of practice when it came to research, consultation, care of measurements, and writing of the report and not whether there was a mistake in the outcome.*

*Richard recommended that the Committee focusses on standards of practice.*

*A question was posed whether it is fair to develop a penalty schedule as well, instead of going to a whole process, in the event that there may not be sufficient evidence to go to Discipline or even Mediation, however, the effect on the public could be larger than just the actual infraction.*

*The complaints Committee needs to look at consistency and they could have a bit of a guideline or matrix of how they dealt with similar concerns in the past, recognizing that every case is unique.*

*Richard suggested that the legislation be amended so that the Complaints Committee has additional powers, such as requiring someone to attend a remediation course or program or mentoring program of some sort requiring them to come and attend before the Complaints Committee for an oral caution. If a matter is sent to Discipline, Discipline Committees sometimes have developed penalty tables or guidelines, and recently the Supreme Court of Canada had said those are OK at least the criminal context, so long as they are not binding. So, there could be some value in that. However, the question refers to a third option, which is an administrative monetary penalty. This was not dealt with in the External Review Report, but there are some regulators in Ontario that are developing those, and so that is another option that is worth considering. Having a third tier, perhaps is something that could be administered by the Complaints Committee, or at least administered by the Registrar for clear infractions not requiring a lot of judgment, and that is becoming increasingly common for regulators but less so for the professions.*

*It was asked whether the composition of Council is adequate enough with respect to lay members to alleviate any potential or perceived conflicts of interest, and if Council has adequate representation of unbiased members, and whether training of Council upon joining would be adequate enough to alleviate any perceived conflicts of interest.*

*It was recommended to increase the number of public members throughout the process, along with training. There is a trend to move away from an electoral process to have a competency-based selection process.*

*It was suggested to use a competency-based criteria, especially for committee appointments, but even for Council as part of the nomination stage when recruiting or nominating people. It started in British Columbia, where they moved away from the election process for professional regulators and replaced it with the competency-based selection process, usually with 50% of professional members and 50% of public members.*

*The AOLS can start to get more public members, use the nomination process, have training and so that in the following years, when this comes to Ontario, the AOLS will be ready to be part of the pure competency-based selection process.*

*As to how the public members will be appointed, it will depend on what the government is willing to do because this requires a legislative change. The most important thing is to have 50% there even if it is through the existing process. It would be ideal if AOLS could add people to the committees separately from the Public Appointments Office. First priority is get 50%, second priority is to see if AOLS can have some control over who that 50% is. And thirdly, have the training.*

*In terms of unauthorized practice, the report spoke about taking a principled balance approach to concerns. Step back and understand the scope of the profession, and if we should be expanding, and who should be part of the expansion, and should we be expanding the status that people in different categories have, and how should we be incorporating technology.*

*In recommending that Council step outside of the referrals to Discipline, Richard was asked for comments about Council acting as buffer to ensure whether or not there was harm to the public before the Member was referred to Discipline, and should not have been there.*

*Although that was the rationale to keep Council involved, conceptually the Complaints Committee should be in a better position to make those decisions, and Council generally would not be in a good position to make those decisions because they do not have the full access to the entire details of the files, and the prior history.*

*If the Complaints Committee knew that it was their responsibility that they had to justify and that was their job solely and exclusively, then there might be fewer of those cases, and in any event that if it gets referred to discipline when it should not be, there are mechanisms in the Discipline process to address that. There are pre-hearing conferences, there are resolutions. There is the ability to withdraw things.*

*There are some mechanisms there to address any mistakes that might have slipped through the system. But if the AOLS had good criteria for the Complaints Committee, good training and they knew that their decision was the final decision and they had more tools to deal with cases and knew that they could use those tools, overtime at least, the role of Council would be superfluous.*

*With respect to transparency, it was asked at what point should a complaint become public information. Richard commented that it is an important policy decision and the AOLS have gone through the process, and currently have a fairly conservative approach: that only when it is referred to discipline that it becomes public, and that is fine.*

*Other regulators have become a little bit more liberal on this, and they have said if there is a significant outcome at the Complaints Committee level, for example if there is mandatory mediation or if there is attendance for caution, that should also be put on the public register and so that becomes public, not if its dismissed or not a little reminder in the text of the decision, but if there was a significant outcome, it gets published. This is what the health professions do right now.*

*Richard suggested that is the kind of the policy debate that AOLS should have, and Council went through that a few years ago, and it is probably time in a year or two to start it again and start examining what more should be available to the public. Consider what the expectations are, what the other regulators are doing, and that the AOLS has the authority to do that and to make more information publicly available. But do this on a systematic policy basis.*

*Council thanked Richard Steinecke for his time, and his report.*

*Richard exited the meeting.*

*The ED had put a slide deck together with some questions around Richard Steinecke's External Review Report.*

*The first was around public release of the report, how broadly we should make it available, and how do we consider all these recommendations.*

*There is a lot of work in dealing with all 32 recommendations.*

*We would likely need some type of prioritization process.*

*We likely need a conversation around who will be doing this, and ultimately, what the time frame is for dealing with them.*

*The ED recommended that the Membership should see it, and the Committees need to see this report.*

*We should release it broadly. The ED included a communication plan around this that basically highlights the key speaking points to the report.*

*We are on a journey to improvement.*

*This is about us getting better and becoming a better regulator, it's a positive thing.*

*By releasing it, we would be committing to at least considering the recommendations, which is a positive message. It may allow us to get some feedback.*

*There are a lot of recommendations here, and some are easier to implement and some are going to take more consideration and thought.*

*In terms of recommendations, that for the time being, focus on those that do not require legislative change first because those are ones we can do right now.*

*There's nothing to prevent us from moving forward on those. We should look at them in terms of some cursory review in terms of the level of effort, what it would take to move forward, potential impact, potential risk to the public if we do not move forward on that front, alignment with other priorities.*

*We also need to look at potential order of implementation, as an example, the policy on policy making. We should prioritize it highly so that we can use that in making further policy decisions.*

*ED proposed that the recommendations get sorted through and be brought in prioritized list for Council for the next meeting in January.*

*We should have some notion of where Council needs to focus themselves and try to move this forward.*

*In terms of who should undertake the review, some of these are clearly with the committees. Perhaps we send it back to both Complaints and Discipline Committees and get their feedback.*

*We can get recommendations from some of the committees in terms of moving some of the pieces forward. If there is an alignment with committees, it will be sent to their attention to look at and return with recommendations. And if there is no specific alignment, the Legislation and Regulation Task Force can examine this and perhaps they can bring recommendations.*

*In time frame, we should review all of these recommendations within a year. Whether we adopt them or not is another matter. But we need to have done the homework to think about them and understand where we want to go.*

*It was recommended that there be a motion to receive this for information.*

*It was pointed out that redoing the whole insurance program will require a review of our budget and the finance of the association.*

*It was noted that the point is that it does need to be thought through.*

*It was suggested that this report should go to the Committee Chairs. They should all be aware of this, regardless of whether it directly affects them or directly mentions them or not. It will help in terms of planning, and planning process for the year.*

*It will also give a good idea of how engaged committees are in terms how they received this report.*

*For the Complaints Committee, there are new members with heavy workload. It was suggested if we should have someone like Richard Steinecke assist them in developing tools and procedures that they could use.*

*We have had challenges over the years around the understanding of what can and cannot happen from an administrative law perspective. We would want some Council review on that for sure.*



*It was suggested to break this out into who are the best parties to give some more detailed kind of thoughts on it. Perhaps let the people who are in the Committees mentioned in the recommendations, and who are heavily involved start with the feedback*

*It was also suggested that the President share this at the Presidents Forum.*

*It was suggested to include in the resolution that the committees provide some initial feedback around the report and return to Council just so Council has an idea of what their thoughts are around making these changes, and how long it will take.*

<b>Motion 21.71</b>	<b>MOVED: Peter Meerveld</b>	<b>SECONDED: Sasa Krcmar</b>
<b>WHEREAS:</b> Council on its journey to improvement requested an external review and has recently received it		
<b>BE IT RESOLVED THAT:</b> Council receives the external review completed by Richard Steinecke and agrees with making it public.		
<b>BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:</b> The report be shared with Committees for their initial feedback.		
<b>DATE: November 29, 2021</b>	<b>Chair: Gavin Lawrence</b>	<b>Carried: (Unanimous)</b>

**Action: Brian to post the Steinecke report on the website and circulate it to all Committee and Task Force Chairs.**

**Action: Brian to work with the Legislation and Regulations Task Force to develop priorities for review of the recommendations.**

#### 10. Fair Fees for Field Notes – Action Plan

*All the information was gathered and reviewed.*

*The Task Force performed a review of the numbers themselves.*

*They did not seem to move too much from the \$150 numbers that were on the report before.*

*The Task Force looked deeper into what the concerns were.*

*We had approximately 50% of the Members indicating they are satisfied and 50% of the Members who are not. The SurveyMonkey that was generated was the same that was done a few years previous because we wanted to keep the metrics and the ability to compare things consistent. The only question that was added was if they were happy with the bulletin that was issued in 2019.*

*The committee had put together a draft report to Council, but then the committee also thought that we should dig a little deeper into what are the actual costs for providing field notes, not just what fee is charged.*

*In the interest of fairness, the Committee took a step back and tried to find people to provide some information on the actual costs of providing field notes.*

*A request for proposal was circulated looking for people who would be willing to help the Committee with this, but no responses were received.*

*The ED also cold called a few information managements firms to see if they would take this on. There were two firms that said they would consider it but at the end of the day they declined.*

*We were looking for an independent firm that had nothing to do with surveyors altogether to be able to come in and do this.*

*The ED also had gone out to the membership about a year ago and asked companies if they would be willing to participate in a review. We tried to get survey companies that have*

*traditional paper records; some that were in between paper and digital records and then those that were fully automated.*

*We had several companies that were willing to participate in a survey and provide information to help understand the costs. iLookabout (VOXTUR) had originally offered to do the study but were requested not to respond given their affiliation with survey records. But since no company was willing to take this on, other than iLookabout, the ED asked them to consider this and put forward a proposal. The proposal was circulated to Council. The question to Council was about their level of comfort to this approach and if Council is comfortable with iLookAbout taking this on.*

*Council was reminded that the bulletin that was issued back 2019 did not usurp or overwrite existing bulletins that also said that when one is determining what a fair fee is, one can look at the cost of storage.*

*It was pointed out that there was no indication in the proposal that asked the proposed vendor to look at what constitutes a search for those various companies.*

*We could certainly add that as part of the scope of work to look at various types of searches, but it would not be up to them to define that kind of thing. They are looking at the costs associated with it, but we could have them identify if it is a single record search versus a search for a whole block.*

*A question was asked whether we are ignoring the acquisition cost of a record. It was noted that the costs are more than simply what did it take to scan this one particular plan that got sold yesterday.*

*It was pointed out by the ED that acquisition costs are not a fair cost. The Surveys Act requires surveyors to keep records and requires them to make those records available. It doesn't require a firm to buy records, so if they choose to buy records for their business, that's their choice. That's a business decision. Other surveyors should not be penalized in terms of that, so acquisition costs are not a fair cost to consider. It was also noted that from a tax perspective, survey records would be amortized over a few years and then theoretically have zero book value.*

*The second concern was price escalation for automation based on volume. If the record was sold only once, should it bear the full costs of automation. In making a decision to automate a company would anticipate of volumes, sales, benefits, etc. and there is nothing that forces a firm to automate. There are still firms that have a hundred thousand records that have not automated in some fashion because they did not believe there was a business case. It is not fair to say that the first record sold costs \$3 million. You should have a reasonable idea of the number of searches and responses you provide in a year. There's a business case to move forward.*

*It was noted that in the last 20 years we have halved the number of survey firms. We currently have about 150. In the next 20 years, there could be 75 and that is not a good trend.*

**Motion 21.72    MOVED: Dave Kovacs    SECONDED: Trevor McNeil**

**WHEREAS:** The cost of survey records remains a contentious issue for many surveyors.

**AND WHEREAS:** Council would like to get a better sense of the costs to preserve and make available survey records to other surveyors.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Council approves the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with iLookabout to prepare a report on the costs of preserving and making available survey records considering conventional storage and retrieval, automated electronic solutions, and hybrid models that are a mixture of conventional storage and some automation.

**DATE: November 29, 2021      Chair: Gavin Lawrence      Carried: (3 Against)**

#### 11. Mentorship Program

*Council had talked about simplifying the program and opening it up to a broader group and moving forward,*

*We have 60% of our practitioners who are sole owners.*

*It would be nice to have a mentoring program to allow them to ask questions perhaps if they if they so chose.*

*In less than two years, we've had 10% of our current Members sworn in.*

*There is many young surveyors out there that could likely benefit from a mentoring program, so that's some of the rationale for moving forward.*

*In terms of who can be a mentor or mentee, the recommendation was basically to leave it open. Let it be open to any mentor that believes they have experience to share and that they can still share it, and anybody who believes that they can gain knowledge by having a mentor can reach out and ask for support.*

*We would facilitate this on the website in some fashion.*

*Mentors and mentees can decide what that interaction looks like. They can decide the frequency of their meeting.*

*The ED had put a couple of points around the benefits of being a mentor.*

*There are valid reasons for being a mentor. It can be a rewarding thing to do.*

*There was initially a concern around privacy and how we actually operate this and how we make it available.*

*We have to consider and think about what information is made available.*

*We would have to put together a very short template to have mentors complete and we would put a separate area under the Members website, which is essentially a portal like we have for our committees. We would then provide access to that area for any member seeking a mentor, thereby limiting exposures. We are only putting it out to those members that have expressed interest. Essentially the only thing we do is facilitate that and act as a gatekeeper.*

*The proposed action is to develop a template for members.*

*The ED would like to discuss it with CEC to talk about what mentoring has before we launch if there is CPD available if a member is acting as a mentor.*

*We would circulate the template through In Sight, and we would create the portal group, and we should develop a little bit of a resource tool for mentors to help them get on the right track and move forward.*

*And then basically advertise it and let the mentors and mentee's work out the relationship and move forward. Areas of specialty would be built into the Mentor's template.*

**Motion 21.73**

**MOVED: Andrew Dowie**

**SECONDED: Sasa Krcmar**

**WHEREAS:** Council identified the need for a mentorship program to help members provide good public services

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** The Executive Director be directed to:

- Develop a template for Mentors
- Discuss the CPD opportunities for Mentors/Mentees with the Continuing Education Committee
- Circulate the template and advertise for Mentors through In Sight
- Create a Mentors Group on the Members' website (Portal)
- Develop a resource tool for mentors, which will be stored on the Portal
- Once we have a group of Mentors, advertise the opportunity to members
- Provide access for mentees to the Mentors Group

**DATE:** November 29, 2021

**Chair:** Gavin Lawrence

**Carried:** (3 Against)

## 12. PSRI Exemption

*Council received a request for PSRI exemption from Adam Kasprzak Surveying Limited, The request was included with the package and it does meet the same requirements that that we had for the last one.*

*They would not have to load any of their historical survey records in their area of practice. There was concern around the whole exemption about never having to scan the records. Perhaps it would still be possible to do if given around five-year grace.*

*Our goal is to ensure that proper research is being done and in many areas of the province the PSRI will facilitate it, but if you're in an area of the province where there is only one practitioner, then the question is are we being overly strong arming to put all the records into a system and there are only one or two requests a month. And that was why we put the exemption in there, if that truly is the situation, are we still not allowing good research to occur if all you have to do is reach out once a month and they respond to it.*

*If the records change hands, in that case it needs to be revisited. It only goes to the scenario given the circumstances and conditions that are currently before us. It goes with the CofA, and if they continue to operate that CofA in perpetuity, we do not get a chance to revisit it, but if the firm is sold to somebody else, then it gets revisited at that point.*

*If they acquired a record outside their area of practice, they are required to enter it into the system.*

**Motion 21.74**

**MOVED:** Andrew Dowie

**SECONDED:** Sasa Krcmar

**WHEREAS:** Sub-Section 35.3(4) of Ontario Regulation 216/10 allows Council to exempt a firm from the requirement set out in subsection (2) (loading all historical records) upon receiving a written request from the holder of a certificate of authorization, if the following conditions are met:

1. The request is in respect of an area where there is limited searching activity by other firms.
2. The firm enters a record into the provincial Survey Records Index that describes its normal area of practice.
3. The firm agrees to provide timely and reasonable responses to research requests from other firms. O. Reg. 507/21, s. 10.

**AND WHEREAS:** Council is in receipt of a request for an exemption under sub-section 35.3(4) from Adam Kasprzak Surveying Ltd., that meets the conditions for exemption.

**BE IT RESOLVED** that Council approves the exemption as requested from Adam Kasprzak Surveying Ltd. to load their historical records on the condition that they:

- enter a practice record into the Provincial Survey Record Index (PSRI),
- continue to provide timely and reasonable responses to other survey firms for requests for survey records,
- enter any historical survey records that are outside of their normal area of practice, and
- enter records for all surveys completed after June 24th, 2021.

**DATE: November 29, 2021**

**Chair: Gavin Lawrence**

**Carried: (1 Against, 1 Abstention)**

**13. Municipal requirements for As-builts (no material)**

*The City of Mississauga does not require final as built drawings at the end of new construction projects, which poses challenges for the surveyor coming down the road, to survey adjacent properties. At the same time, it poses future risk to the public as well. Council was asked for some type of guidance or advice, or maybe some type of nudge towards one of the Committees to ask the City of Mississauga to reconsider its practice.*

*When a new building goes up, there is a survey needed to get the permits on the site plan and all the drawings to prepare for construction. But when the construction is finished, there was no record on that building and so that becomes a problem over the next couple of years because especially when looking at Mississauga that has a lot of new development. The problem will get magnified in the next 10 years, there can be a lot of pockets of missing cadastral information.*

*When it comes to re-establishing that parcel fabric in the future, not only are you at a loss on where that building was located, but now the retracement is significantly weaker because there is less information, which in effect poses a new challenge for the owner adjacent to the new building.*

*Perhaps we can get some type of feedback from the City of Mississauga hopefully, maybe through one of the Committees.*

*It was pointed out that this could be a legal issue and perhaps some legal advice should be proffered on it, and there should be a formal submission made to Council and a request by perhaps a legal practitioner on behalf of the AOLS should be made.*

*There will be pockets all over Mississauga with no documentation on them.*

*This will push up the future prices of surveys because they have to re-establish the whole block.*

*Depending on how well this conversation goes, it would be a good idea to get a formal briefing note on this.*

***ACTION ITEM: Councillor A. Loai will prepare some more information and come up with points and possible ideas, and present this at the next Council meeting for another discussion.***

*Firstly, is to define the issue, the risks, and facts that can support that.*

*It was pointed out that this can be a very huge undertaking and to consider extra care.*

**14. Appointments (no material)**

*There's no material on this.*

**Motion 21.74    MOVED: Sasa Krcmar    SECONDED: Dave Kovacs**

**WHEREAS: Some committee resignations have been received**

**BE IT RESOLVED that Council approves the following changes to Committee/Task Force membership:**

- Doug Sutherland be removed from the Archival and Historical Committee
- Dan Cormier be removed from the Complaints Committee
- Paul Gregoire be removed from the Discipline Committee

**DATE: November 29, 2021                      Chair: Gavin Lawrence    Carried: (1 Against, 1 Abstention)**

**15. Other Topics**

*It was observed that resignations from Committees is something does not need to be brought forward to Council for approval as a motion.*

*If somebody has written and gone to the trouble of putting together a resignation letter, we have no option but to accept it.*

*We have always done it just to keep track of everything  
We can just modify the Committee list.*

*An idea was proposed for the AGM to honour the senior/older Surveyors to give them special recognition, for example provide them a special table at the front, or a badge, other than just the Veterans Dinner.*

*We actually have 13 members over 80 years of age.*

*Maybe we can make the extra step to identify the most senior surveyors.  
It will be brought at the AGM Committee meeting.*

*There no further comments from Council.*

*President G. Lawrence thanked everyone for attending.*

**The meeting was adjourned at 12:59 PM**