# MINUTES COUNCIL OF THE ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS Tuesday, January 31, 2023 9:00 AM - 1:00 PM Zoom Conference Call

### Chair:

Andy Shelp President Ottawa Vice-President David Kovacs Thunder Bay Simon Kasprzak Intermediate Councillor Barry's Bay Amar Loai Toronto Intermediate Councillor Saša Krcmar Junior Councillor Toronto Ron Berg Junior Councillor St. Catharines Sophie Côté Junior Councillor Dartmouth Natalie Vibert Junior Councillor Thunder Bay James Hunt Lay Councillor Port Hope Peter Meerveld Lay Councillor Kitchener Bruce Clark Surveyor General (SG) Peterborough

Staff:

Brian Maloney Executive Director (ED) North Kawartha
Penny Connors Registrar Vaughan
David Whitton Recorder Toronto

Regrets:

Gavin Lawrence Past President Newmarket
Martha George Lay Councillor Kitchener

### **Guest:**

Maram Khalif, Compliance Analyst, Office of the Fairness Commissioner Toronto

# 1. Call to Order; Reminder of Conflicts of Interest and Confidentiality *The meeting was called to order at 9:03 AM.*

The President welcomed Maram Khalif of the Office of the Fairness Commissioner to the meeting.

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

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

### 2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was distributed prior to the Council meeting; a motion was called to approve the agenda.

Motion 22.56 MOVED: David Kovacs SECONDED: Natalie Vibert

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

DATE: January 31, 2023 Chair: Andy Shelp Carried: (Unanimous)

The motion was carried.

### 3. Consent Agenda

- 3.1 Staff Reports
  - a) Executive Director
  - b) Registrar
- 3.2 Approval of Previous Minutes
- 3.3 Financial Reports
- 3.4 Risk Summary/Strategy Update/Dashboard Review

A Consent Agenda has been introduced to AOLS Council meetings. The Consent Agenda groups routine Council business into one package. It includes the dashboard, financial reports, and staff reports. Any items of concern can be removed for discussion. The only item requiring a motion is the previous minutes. No questions of the reports arose.

A motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting was called.

Motion 22.57 MOVED: Peter Meerveld SECONDED: Sophie Côté

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council approves the minutes from the meeting of November 28–29, 2022.

DATE: January 31, 2023 Chair: Andy Shelp Carried: (Unanimous)

### 4. Review of Action Items Arising from Previous Minutes

The membership database is in staging and data is being loaded. There are some issues around permissions and views that need to be resolved before it can go live. The contingency fund for the project will be depleted but it should still be within budget.

D. Kovacs is working on the Discipline Committee recommendations; a meeting of the Committee is scheduled for later today.

The SRD Committee will meet later this week to consider Council questions related to the use of stickers and to provide recommendations to Council.

AERC will be looking at limiting licensing, an issue that will be discussed later in this agenda.

All other actions that came out of the joint Council/AERC meeting are underway.

### 5. President's Remarks

President Andy Shelp updated Council on recent developments.

Andy attended the Association of New Brunswick Land Surveyors AGM earlier this month. An issue of concern discussed in the President's Forum was the potential of a Professional Governance Act and the consequent possibility that their Association would be consolidated

with the Association of Professional Engineers & Geoscientists, and thus lose its voice. The PGA in Alberta is anticipated to be undergoing a third reading in the summer. In New Brunswick, unauthorized practice is another concern. Foresters in New Brunswick are setting lines for cutting; although they are not trying to set boundaries, these cutting lines are considered as such. They are waiting for an active case that will allow them to take it to litigation.

The AGM had some interesting topics, one of which involved the attraction and retention of survey employees. Andy will attempt to acquire the presenter's PowerPoint deck.

Andy attended a career day at COGS. While there were many GIS students, there were not many from the geomatic engineering or tech stream. Several Ontario firms were in attendance, attempting to attract a limited pool of talent. In contrast, the University of New Brunswick held an event that was well attended, with about 30 young candidates.

The schedules of Andy and the Dean of Engineering conflicted, so they were unable to meet in person, but they will try to meet via Zoom to talk about the national shortage of surveyors and a potential role for UNB. As an informal spokesperson for the various provincial associations, Andy will indicate that UNB has their support.

B. Maloney advised the President that it appears likely he will meet soon with the Dean of York University's engineering program. He has invited Joe Young, chair of the Geomatics Advisory Committee, Bruce Clark, and Alex Miller from Esri. The Dean is looking for significant changes to the program, and the AOLS coalition will be proposing just that: a three- or four-year GIS, geomatics core program, with no survey law. This would be supplemented with a two-year program designed for intake from civil engineering programs.

It would be in the interest of geomatics education providers to get word out that GIS programs are oversubscribed, that the real need is in geomatics, and that industry is coming to them looking for people they have trained. The AOLS marketing initiative should also address this.

### 6. Surveyor General's Report

Surveyor General Bruce Clark's report was distributed prior to Council.

The OSG held a competition for Coordinator of Crown Land Surveys and received 22 applicants, although only three were qualified candidates. Interviews were conducted last week; the new Coordinator will be announced soon. OSG will also be adding additional Crown surveyors and survey techs.

The OSG's vault remains closed to the public, although it will soon entertain requests for oneon-one visits.

Fifteen applications have been received for the lay councillor vacancies on AOLS Council. They have been screened and passed to the Public Appointment Secretariat. A briefing note went to the Minister for two new lay members as well as a renewal for Peter Meerveld's term, which is set to expire at the end of March 2023.

FARPACTA legislation passed on December 2; regulations are being discussed.

#### 7. Company Recommendations Policy

Brian Maloney outlined the Company Recommendations Policy for Council.

This policy was considered at the last Council meeting. This revised and clarified version is presented today for Council approval.

This is a forward-looking piece that deals with changes to the Surveyors Act. It came from a review of general practices. This is something that's been coming for some time, but particularly since the COVID pandemic changed how offices are managed.

Dramatic changes are afoot. There are challenges with encouraging surveyors to practise in northern Ontario; with the many rules around consultation and part-time offices; and with complaints about business operations in general. Even the Minister's office questioned the five-year requirement for surveyors to get a C of A.

The Professional Standards Committee has reviewed this policy and agreed with the recommendations.

Some of the changes in the policy are legislative and some are regulatory. The requirement for a C of A is included. The primary function of a corporation must be professional surveying services.

The cadastral surveying definition will be broadened to look at boundary rather than survey issues. And the definition of professional surveying will move to a licenced activity and will shrink dramatically. As a result, the wording that the primary function of a corporation obtaining a C of A must be professional surveying must be revisited.

A jurisdictional scan of other provincial regulators revealed that the majority of them have provisions in place around a certificate of authorization or similar permit for a business to offer survey services to the public. Most of them have very few if any restrictions around operating an office.

In Ontario, architects and lawyers are very restrictive. Engineers are at the other end of the spectrum, with few if any restrictions regarding ownership.

These provisions are about ensuring that the regulator can properly regulate the organization. Members must be held accountable and responsible for the operation of the company.

This is about public protection. There needs to be sufficient oversight to ensure that surveys are being done in accordance with the standards. We need the public to understand who they're dealing with as well.

Options considered in the policy include mechanisms to avoid undue influence, oversight of a corporation and their offices, the need to have a physical building, and the requirements to operate an office.

The policy recommends that the certificate of authorization should be maintained. That's a reasonable safeguard for the public. The requirement for 50 percent of the board of directors to be Ontario land surveyors should be maintained as well. That is a reasonable level in terms of control to ensure that surveyors are not being directed by somebody who is a non-surveyor.

The powers of the Discipline Panel should be augmented to allow the suspension or revocation a C of A. This is something that R. Steinecke recommended. This should be added to the Act to clarify that this authority exists.

The requirement for professional liability insurance is in the public interest and should be maintained.

The phrase "the primary function of the corporation is to engage in the business of providing services that are within the practice of professional surveying" will be changed to "a function of the corporation is to engage in the business of providing Cadastral Surveying or Professional Surveying services." This allows more flexibility for the company, and it makes sense when you look at the narrowing of the definition of professional surveying services.

As long as the service that a surveying company provides is properly managed and overseen, it shouldn't matter that it provides related services.

The policy recommends removing the five-year restriction for C of A holders. The Registrar may refuse to issue a C of A to an applicant or impose conditions when the Registrar is of the opinion, upon reasonable and probable grounds, that the member does not have sufficient knowledge or experience to operate a professional business. This puts the onus on the Registrar to have evidence that the potential C of A holder is unfit to run a business. Guidelines for the Registrar's decision-making were approved at a previous Council meeting.

The other rules around operating offices all remain in the regulation, so they are not required to be changed in the Act. There is a recommendation that the requirement for a physical office should remain. This is so the public is able to find a surveyor in the event of a problem.

It is recommended that, if a surveyor has a physical office, it does not necessarily have to be staffed by an OLS at all times. This will need to be defined in in the regulations, not the Act itself.

As far as consultation offices, an OLS would attend as needed, and this would be defined in the practice standard. Surveyors have a responsibility to have a certain amount of client contact.

Stakeholder consultations have been difficult to arrange, although information derived from the complaints that AOLS receives suggests where problems lie and how they might be addressed. This policy could improve competition and offer the public more options when getting surveys.

Council discussed the merits of a physical office versus a virtual office, and whether a physical office is required in Ontario to register a business. It is not required, although a mailing address is. The motion was duly amended.

Motion 22.58 MOVED: Saša Krcmar SECONDED: Ron Berg

**WHEREAS:** technology and public expectations have changed related to managing offices and having in-person interactions

**AND WHEREAS:** the AOLS is considering potential changes to the *Surveyors Act* 

**AND WHEREAS:** Council has considered the Company Recommendations Policy version 1 as provided to this meeting

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Council recommends the following when revising the *Surveyors Act* and its regulations:

- The provisions to require businesses providing cadastral services to the public to require
   Certificates of Authorization should be maintained as should the requirement for at least 50% of the board of directors to be Ontario Land Surveyors.
- The powers of the Discipline Panel should be augmented to allow the suspension or revocation of a C of A.
- The requirements to maintain professional liability insurance are in the public interest and should remain.
- The services provided by surveying companies should be changed from "the primary function
  of the corporation is to engage in the business of providing services that are within the practice
  of professional surveying" to "a function of the corporation is to engage in the business of
  providing Cadastral Surveying or Professional Surveying services."
- The ability of the Registrar to accept or reject a C of A where a member has not practised professional surveying within the last 5 years should be modified to: "The Registrar may refuse to issue a Certificate of Authorization to an applicant or impose conditions where the Registrar is of the opinion, upon reasonable and probable grounds that the member does not have sufficient knowledge or experience to operate a professional business."
- Rules around operating offices remain in the regulations. When regulations are changed the
  requirements related to one surveyor operating one office and requirements related to
  consultation offices should be dropped in favor of clearer practice standards. The requirement
  to have a mailing address in Ontario should remain.

DATE: January 31, 2023 Chair: Andy Shelp Carried: (1 opposed, 2 abstentions)

# 8. Council Involvement Policy (Complaints/Discipline, Compensation Fund, Reinstatement of Revoked Licence)

Brian Maloney updated Council.

This policy addresses several recommendations that came out of R. Steinecke's report about removing Council from Association processes, particularly Council involvement in the complaints and discipline process, the compensation fund, and reinstating revoked licences. In Steinecke's view, these are distractions from Council's governance role.

Of the referrals Council has received from the Complaints Committee over the past two years, 10 were resolved through mediation, two went to Discipline, and six were dismissed or resulted in non-disciplinary action. In some ways, Council may have overstepped its authority under the Act.

A jurisdictional scan revealed a variety of processes around discipline. In some jurisdictions, the legislation is quite old, and their councils will act as a Discipline Committee. In those with more modern legislation, Council is not involved other than in the appointment of committee members. Most other regulators don't have a compensation fund.

We could leave the status quo, and continue to refer complaints to Council, although this adds six weeks to the process, and it is questionable whether Council's involvement has added significant value.

Because we try to get councillors onto different committees, including the Complaints Committee, to give them experience, we have a lot of turnover by design. While this is a good learning experience for the councillor, it is unclear that this is helping the decision process. Therefore, the recommendation is to consider removing Council from the discipline process altogether, strengthening the Complaints Committee with tools such as decision trees, rubrics, and additional training, and moving the compensation fund over to Complaints.

Another recommendation is that Council be removed from the reinstatement of licences, which should be handled by the Registration Committee.

The Complaints Committee should be given more power if Council is to be removed from the process. It is currently updating its manual and looking at some additional processes and tools. There is nothing to prevent it from entering mediation already based on a legal opinion that we have received.

AOLS staff members get messages from the public that are not formal complaints and staff steers these discussions, explaining what the complaints process can and cannot achieve. The average number of complaints that AOLS receives in a year is around 18, plus ~150 inquiries that are not appropriate for a complaints process.

Council considered certain issues around motion 22.59, including: the value of Council's input in the complaints and discipline process; the possibility of a phase-in period; whether language should be amended to specify that the Complaints Committee make its recommendations directly to Discipline; if it would be a mistake to remove Council, as a second opinion, from the process; how much authority Complaints should possess.

Once a complaint is referred to Discipline, a significant process will be initiated and charges will be prepared. Even if there is a joint submission, a panel has to be struck, which will hear the case and agree with the joint submission or not. However, if Complaints is properly trained and has access to proper metrics and risk categorization, only the most grievous complaints will be referred to Discipline.

These are notional changes that comprise part of a suite of changes that will be taken to the Minister to be incorporated into the Surveyors Act. No changes will be implemented soon, and there will be many months to revise the Complaints Committee manual.

A member of Council will still sit on Complaints and Discipline, either as an ex-officio or non-voting member, so a reporting structure will continue.

An appeal process within the Association will be eliminated; however, the role of the complaints review councillor might be strengthened to fulfill some of those functions. This is one of R. Steinecke's recommendations that has yet to be considered.

If Council were to continue to vet Complaints Committee referrals, councillors would require three to four hours of training every year to be competent to deal with the cases.

# Motion 22.59 MOVED: Sophie Côté SECONDED: James Hunt

**WHEREAS:** the external review completed by Richard Steinecke recommended removal of Council from a variety of activities

**AND WHEREAS:** Council has considered the Council Involvement Proposed Policy

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Council recommends the following changes to the Surveyors Act:

- Council should not be involved in dealing with individual disciplinary actions and complaints.
- Where warranted, complaints should flow directly from the Complaints Committee to the Discipline Committee
- Applications to the Compensation Fund should be considered by the Complaints Committee with no involvement by Council
- The role of Council in considering reinstatement applications should be removed, leaving it solely to the Registration Committee.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:** the Complaints Committee be strengthened with tools (e.g., decision trees and rubrics) and training (e.g., mediation training) to make consistent appropriate decisions. The Act should be modified to give the Complaints Committee additional tools including the authority to appoint a mediator.

DATE: January 31, 2023 Chair: Andy Shelp Carried: (6 in favour, 3 opposed)

## 9. Limited Licence Policy - Preliminary Discussion

Brian Maloney updated Council.

There is no motion for this item. It is a forward-looking piece presented strictly for feedback from Council. It should likely be considered by members at the AGM as well.

The Legislation and Regulations Task Force and the AERC have discussed these proposals and suggested tune-ups. They will drive changes to the Act. At the end of 2023, provisions in FARPACTA will no longer allow mandatory Canadian experience. AOLS will need processes to deal with applications from internationally trained applicants.

A second issue is the emerging shortage of surveyors, particularly when one considers the 1.5 million new homes promised by the Ontario government, which doubles the amount of subdivisions required moving forward.

There are no good statistics on increased workload for surveyors, but there has been an almost 20 percent increase in sticker sales and many surveyors are reporting significant backlogs of work.

The length of articles has been creeping up toward three years on average. Can this lengthy process be decreased?

A complete consultation on this has not been done. A jurisdictional scan reveals nothing for other surveyor associations, although PEO does have it. For PEO, a limited licence is not a stepping stone, but a permanent designation.

If the status quo is maintained, the challenges will be twofold. One, we would not be addressing the potential shortage of surveyors, and two, we would have to find a way to provide knowledge and competency for all of the EAKs for someone who was internationally trained but chose not to article. It's unclear whether this could be implemented within the year.

After considering alternatives, the proposal here is a limited licence with the ability to sign specific plans. This will limit the knowledge and the competencies required for the surveyor, allow us to get them licensed more quickly, and allow us not to have to test them and educate an internationally trained candidate to the same level at the outset. That candidate could then move on to full licensure in the future if they so choose.

A limited licence holder would be allowed to undertake a survey, sign a plan of survey, sign an SRPR, or sign a reference plan where it was in an existing, recent plan of subdivision where the parcels are in land titles and where there are no easements, no roads, and no natural boundaries.

A limited licence holder would not be allowed to sign a subdivision plan, an expropriation plan, a condo plan, a plan out of the Mining Act, or a plan for the Ministry of Transportation.

Much of the work that would be required to meet the province's goal of 1.5 million new houses in the next 10 years could be performed by somebody with a limited licence. This will not work across the province, such as up north, where there are many water boundaries.

Limited licence holders were still need to know certain EAKs, such as ethics and professionalism, business practice, research, general boundary retracement descriptions, and spatial referencing. But the others could be held until they moved from limited licence to full licence. There would be no time limit for this move, and no requirement to earn a full licence.

This might be achievable by the end of 2023.

Limited licence holders could not have a C of A. They would have to operate under a C of A holder. Whether in private practice or government, they would operate under the supervision of a licensed surveyor.

AOLS currently has about 100 articling students; if the licensing of some were sped up, the profession would get an injection of possibly 20 or 30 surveyors. However, there is no easy fix for the shortage of surveyors. There are still educational issues, marketing issues, and articling issues.

It might also be worth discussing whether experienced technical staff could be allowed a limited licence.

Regulators in other jurisdictions would not be expected to allow limited licence holders from Ontario to practise outside of this province.

If technical staff are allowed to earn a limited licence without meeting current academic requirements, we might have to consider a situation where, after meeting a minimal academic check, they would not be allowed to move on to a full licence. PEO has a system like this.

### 10. Review of Strategic Plan

Brian Maloney updated Council.

At the strategic planning session in July, Council agreed to undertake a review of the strategic plan after six months to understand the progress it has made on its action items.

Brian presented a chart for Council indicating what is on track or completed, what is underway but behind schedule, and what has yet to be started.

Council has made good progress on most of its objectives. Risk management is in good shape, as is the one licence model. The number of articling students has increased and the marketing strategy is on track. The CBEPS syllabus has been developed and is moving forward. The number of members compliant with CPD is down. Joint initiatives with other associations have yet to yield material achievement.

We are well along on the registration project. The provincial survey records index continues to grow. We made some progress on reducing the number of committees.

We have dealt with entry to practice. We are behind schedule in identifying and securing agreement to required changes in legislation/regulations that will sustain the relevance of the Association in the future. We are about 75% complete. By next Council meeting, we will be close to being able to hand the material over to MNRF.

The Inclusivity and Diversity Committee has been very active.

We are on track for 25 new qualified surveyors this year. We have had an average of 26 over the last three years.

We have struggled with a strategy for geomatics education, largely because we are unable to get clear direction from York. On the other hand, the Toward an Online Degree project is moving along, if somewhat behind schedule. There is an opportunity for another university coming forward. We are behind schedule but should be on track in the next few months.

We have gone through 16 of R. Steinecke's recommendations; about half are substantially complete, six are in active review, three we have decided are not required. Six are related to governance, some of which will be brought forward to the next meeting.

The voluntary mentoring program is established but is not active.

A review of the detailed action plan reveals the following: the outreach committees have been united; the robust communications plan is behind schedule, but is moving forward with Humber College. Once a marketing plan is in place, we can liaise with other associations.

The model for restructuring council and committees is something that needs to be developed. We have not dealt with the alternatives for approvals, but some recommendations will be brought to the next Council meeting. The ethical approach to dealing with remote non-familiar work policy is under development. The technology review is complete. Plans for separation of regulatory and member services is in progress. The articling surveyor handbook is being developed by staff. The update of the EAKs exam and experience requirements is well underway. The project to make English proficiency requirements more clear and mandatory around exam writers has yet to be dealt with. It was discussed at the joint meeting with AERC. We will likely need to hire a consultant to look at what the requirements are and be able to justify what the language standard is. We have assembled a downloadable list of surveying

education programs but it is missing the relationship to the CBEPS syllabus. AERC has discussed competency-based assessment and decided to use the CBEPS process for challenging exams.

In summary, we are reasonably on track, although behind track on the Surveyors Act changes. If we fail to develop the limited license provisions, we will have challenges in meeting FARPACTA requirements. We need to develop an emergency plan. But the biggest challenge is the Canadian experience requirement. We have not had a lot of progress with York University. Staff will meet with the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board.

### 11. Open Forum Discussion Topics

Andy Shelp updated Council.

Rather than reading commission reports at the upcoming AGM, it could be more valuable to simply post the reports on the AOLS website and allow anyone who is interested to read them there. If those parties require clarification on a matter, they can talk to the chair at their leisure.

AGM time might be more productively spent having a discussion with members where they respond to topics we have introduced. Members would be given the topic ahead of time and told to come with their questions and offer Council some direction. Input from the membership on important topics in an open forum would offer insight into where the membership believes we should turn our attention.

The proposal is that we offer a framework for the discussion: explain why the issue is important, then pose questions, and open it to discussion.

This will not replace the usual open forum. It would take place for an hour and 15 minutes on Friday morning.

Possible topics include: the limited licence and one-licence model; university status; Toward an Online Degree; a presentation by the Executive Director of PSC on member services; the pricing of survey records; the use of coordinates as evidence until monuments are set for subdivision plans and for easements on an ongoing basis; the marketing and recruitment strategy; the registration project; the shortage of surveyors in certain areas of the province.

The membership is largely unaware of the larger issues that Council and the profession faces, so this will be an opportunity to tell them which four or five problems it would like input on.

#### 12. Awards & Citations

Brian has received no requests for awards; the recommendations presented are all citations.

D. Kovacs suggested some members of the Discipline Committee.

The citation for Pat Hills should be handed out separately at the AGM welcoming party to encourage other exhibitors to be equally responsive to supporting the Association.

S. Krcmar recommended a citation for Kevin Thom for his work as chair of the Complaints Committee but it was noted that he intends to remain on the committee and this should be considered later..

Simon Kasprzak and Gavin Lawrence will be acknowledged for their work on Council.

S. Krcmar recommended a citation for Brian Maloney for his work as Executive Director. Brian noted that he had received the professional recognition award and didn't feel any further award was appropriate.

Motion 22.60 MOVED: Saša Krcmar SECONDED: Bruce Clark

WHEREAS: Council annually considers awards and citations

**AND WHEREAS:** Council has deemed the following individuals worthy of citations for their substantial contributions to the AOLS

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Council thanks and awards citations to the following:

- Doug Hunt for his service on the Discipline Committee
- David Wilton for his service on the Discipline Committee
- Pat Hill for his services related to the Annual General Meeting
- Simon Kasprzak for his service on Council
- Gavin Lawrence for his leadership and service on Council

DATE: January 31, 2023 Chair: Andy Shelp Carried: (Unanimous)

Motion 22.62 MOVED: Saša Krcmar SECONDED: James Hunt

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Motion 22-60 be reopened.

DATE: January 31, 2023 Chair: Andy Shelp Carried: (Unanimous)

Motion 22.63 MOVED: Saša Krcmar SECONDED: Dave Kovacs

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The following be added to Motion 22-60

Terry Dietz from the Discipline Committee

DATE: January 31, 2023 Chair: Andy Shelp Carried: (Unanimous)

### 13. Appointments

Brian Maloney updated Council.

The motion presented is simply to acknowledge resignations.

D. Kovacs suggested the addition of Terry Dietz to the list of resignations and also to the list of citations. This will require an additional motion to reopen the previous motion, which is noted above.

Motion 22.61 MOVED: Natalie Vibert SECONDED: Bruce Clark

WHEREAS: several members have expressed a desire to resign from committees

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:** Council acknowledges the following resignations:

- Doug Hunt from Discipline Committee
- Paul Benedict from Complaints Committee, Monument Protection Committee and Underground Utilities Committee
- Dave Wilton from Discipline Committee

DATE: January 31, 2023 Chair: Andy Shelp Carried: (Unanimous)

### 14. IN CAMERA Session: Disciplinary Matters

A disciplinary matter was dealt with in camera.

### **End of IN CAMERA Session**

The next Council meeting will be held in person on February 28, 2023 in Niagara Falls ON in advance of the AGM.

There were no further comments from Council.

President A. Shelp thanked everyone for attending.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 PM