

No. 133

ANNUAL REPORT
of the
ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS

Organized 1886

Incorporated 1892



PROCEEDINGS OF THE ONE-HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH
MEETING SINCE INCORPORATION
HELD AT THE SHERATON ON THE FALLS HOTEL,
NIAGARA FALLS, ON, CANADA
FEBRUARY 28, 2018 – MARCH 2, 2018

Preface

To the members of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors:

The Minutes of the Association at its One-Hundred and Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting are herewith presented.

Blain W. Martin
Executive Director
July 2018

Association of Ontario Land Surveyors
1043 McNicoll Avenue, Toronto, Ontario M1W 3W6
Phone: 416-491-9020 * Toll Free: 1-800-268-0718 * Fax: 416-491-2576
E-mail: admin@aols.org * Website: www.aols.org

Published by the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors.

This edition, 250 copies

Copies of the Annual Report for some of the past years can be obtained by applying to the Association Offices.

Views and opinions in Addresses, Presentations and Reports are not official expressions of the Association's policies unless so stated.

RECIPIENTS OF AOLS AWARDS

PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION AWARD

JOHN EDWIN JACKSON	1968
WILLIAM FREDERICK WEAVER	1971
EDWIN PERCY ARGALL PHILLIPS	1972
FREDERICK JOHN SIDNEY PEARCE	1973
JOHN GOURLAY PIERCE	1976
HERBERT HARVEY TODGHAM	1980
JOHN DONALD BARBER	1984
HAROLD STEWART HOWDEN	1991
NANCY LORRAINE PETZOLD	1992
MOIR NEIL SIMPSON	2000
JACK KEITH YOUNG	2004
WAYNE BRUBACHER	2005
DAVID WHITFIELD LAMBDEN	2006
MICHAEL J. O'SULLIVAN	2007
BRIAN MALONEY	2011
PAUL CHURCH	2015
IZAACK DE RIJCKE	2016

FELLOWSHIP AWARD

HARRY DOUGLAS GIBSON CURRIE	1979
MAURICE HEWITT	1979
JOHN DUNCAN BARNES	1982
RALPH ANGUS SMITH	1992
ANDREW GIBSON	1993
DARSHAN CHANDER KAPOOR	1993
ROBERT ALFRED FOWLER	1999
BOB HALLIDAY	2014
CRYSTAL CRANCH	2014
MICHAEL MARLATT	2017

CENTENARY AWARD

DANIEL ALPHONSE CYBULSKI	1992
BRYAN THOMAS DAVIES	1992
RONALD JAMES EMO	1992
SYDNEY GRENVILLE HANCOCK	1992
DAVID WHITFIELD LAMBDEN	1992
KENNETH HARVEY McCONNELL	1992
THOMAS EDWARD MERRIMAN	1992
WILLIAM CHARLES YATES	1992
JAMES NEIL GARDINER	1993
JAMES L. HILL	2009
JOHN GOLTZ	2010
ROBERT GUNN	2010
RON BERG	2011
JAMES FERGUSON	2013
DESMOND R. RASCH	2018
ANTHONY F. ROBERTS	2018
HENRIETTE J. VERHOEFF (posthumous)	2018

PRESIDENT'S AWARD

BOB AARON	2014
CHARLES WILKINS	2017

ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS

Organized February 23, 1886

Incorporated 1892

PAST PRESIDENTS

1886	G.B. Kirkpatrick	1930	R.M. Lee	1974	J.D. Dearden
1887	G.B. Kirkpatrick	1931	J. van Nostrand	1975	G.T. Rogers
1888	A. Niven	1932	J.W. Pierce	1976	J.D. Barber
1889	A. Niven	1933	J.M. Empey	1977	M.J.M. Maughan
1890	V. Sankey	1934	R.M. Anderson	1978	D.W. Endleman
1891	V. Sankey	1935	E.G. MacKay	1979	T.E. Lyons
1892	E. Stewart	1936	H.M. Anderson	1980	G.J. Zubek
1893	E. Stewart	1937	E. Cavell	1981	D.F. Yates
1894	M.J. Butler	1938	R.S. Kirkup	1982	H.M. Graham
1895	M. Gaviller	1939	F.W. Beatty	1983	B.T. Davies
1896	W. Chipman	1940	G.L. Berkeley	1984	W.D. Brubacher
1897	T.H. Jones	1941	N.A. Burwash	1985	R.J. Meisner
1898	P.S. Gibson	1942	E.L. Moore	1986	H.R. Whale
1899	H.J. Bowman	1943	N.D. Wilson	1987	L.U. Maughan
1900	G. Ross	1944	W.J. Fulton	1988	J.K. Young
1901	J. Dickson	1945	C.H. Fullerton	1989	M.J. O'Sullivan
1902	W.R. Aylsworth	1946	E.W. Neelands	1990	T.E. Rody
1903	W.R. Aylsworth	1947	J.K. Benner	1991	J.W. Nicholson
1904	C.A. Jones	1948	H.G. Rose	1992	S.J. Statham
1905	J.W. Tyrrell	1949	W.F. Weaver	1993	P.C. Wyman
1906	O.J. Klotz	1950	S.W. Archibald	1994	D.A. Simmonds
1907	T. Fawcett	1951	C.G.R. Armstrong	1995	J.D. Annable
1908	A.J. van Nostrand	1952	A.L.S. Nash	1996	B. Maloney
1909	L. Bolton	1953	A. Gillies	1997	P.J. Stringer
1910	H.W. Selby	1954	W.G. Ure	1998	J.H. O'Donnell
1911	J.F. Whitson	1955	J.E. Jackson	1999	D.S. Urso
1912	T.B. Speight	1956	W.J. Baird	2000	C.M. Fraser
1913	J.S. Dobie	1957	W.H. Williams	2001	M.P. Allen
1914	J.W. Fitzgerald	1958	R.B. Erwin	2002	R.C. Dixon
1915	E.T. Wilkie	1959	R.F. Mucklestone	2003	D.D. Blais
1916	C.J. Murphy	1960	H.D.G. Currie	2004	T.A. Bunker
1917	J.J. MacKay	1961	M. Hewett	2005	P.L. Church
1918	H.J. Beatty	1962	J.G. Pierce	2006	D.E. Culham
1919	C.F. Aylsworth	1963	E.C. Brisco	2007	J.G. Boyd
1920	T.D. leMay	1964	M.J. McAlpine	2008	K.H. Campbell
1921	G.A. McCubbin	1965	R.W. Brotherhood	2009	A.J. Worobec
1922	G. Hogarth	1966	W.J.G. Wadsworth	2010	W. Kowalenko
1923	H.T. Routly	1967	R.R. Smith	2011	D.M. Brubacher
1924	W.G. McGeorge	1968	F.J.S. Pearce	2012	P.J. Benedict
1925	L.V. Rorke	1969	M.N. Simpson	2013	E.L. Ansell
1926	N.B. MacRostie	1970	D.T. Humphries	2014	D. Page
1927	H.W. Sutcliffe	1971	J.C. Kirkup	2015	T. Hartwick
1928	J.J. Newman	1972	S.G. Hancock	2016	T. M. Purcell
1929	A.T. Ward	1973	E.W. Petzold	2017	J. R. Hogan

ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS

Organized February 23, 1886

Incorporated 1892

PAST SECRETARY-TREASURERS

Col. Arthur J. Van Nostrand	1891 – 1900
Villiers Sankey	1900 – 1902
Capt. Killaly Gamble	1902 – 1912
Louis Valentine Rorke	1912 – 1923
Tracy Deavin leMay	1924 – 1936
Louis Valentine Rorke	1936 – 1943
Ralph Mackenzie Anderson	1943 – 1947
Charles Herbert Fullerton	1948 – 1954
Albert Victor Chase	1954 – 1955
Vernon Russell Davies	1955 – 1956
Russell Reeves Grant	1956 – 1957
Herbert McEwen Anderson	1957 – 1958
Wilmot Johnston Baird	1958 – 1963
Dr. Alexander Campbell McEwen	1963 – 1965
John Norris Emberson Bradbury	1965 – 1969
Albert Francis Allman	1969 - 1972

PAST SECRETARIES

A. Francis Allman	1972 – 1976
N. Lorraine Setterington	1976 – 1981

PAST EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR - TREASURER

N. Lorraine Setterington	1981 – 1982
N. Lorraine Petzold	1982 – 1988

PAST SECRETARY - REGISTRAR

John Boyd	1987 – 1988

PAST EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR – TREASURER – SECRETARY

N. Lorraine Petzold	1988 – 1989

PAST EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR – TREASURER

N. L. Petzold	1989 – 1992
E. Peter Jacobs	1992 – 1993
Carl J. Rooth	1993 – Apr. 2000
Murray J. Legris	Apr. 2000 - 2006
S. James Statham	2006 – 2009
Blain W. Martin	2009 – 2018

Officers of the Association: 2017-2018

HONORARY MEMBERS

John D. BOGART, Q.C.	Toronto
Dr. Gordon GRACIE	Mississauga
N. Lorraine PETZOLD	Toronto
George WORTMAN	Richmond Hill
Eric J. BUNDGARD	Toronto

PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL

J. Russell Hogan	Burlington

VICE-PRESIDENT

Dan Dzaldov	Vaughan

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR / TREASURER

Blain W. MARTIN	Stouffville

REGISTRAR

William D. BUCK	Markham

DEPUTY REGISTRAR

Maureen V. MOUNTJOY	Brampton

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

T. Murray PURCELL	Newmarket
Past President	

Term Ending

E. ANSELL	2018
A. JERAJ	2018
A. MANTHA	2019
P. LAMB	2019
G. LAWRENCE	2020
T. MCNEIL	2020

S. F. MACGREGOR, Surveyor General	Peterborough

P. MEEHAN, Lay Councilor	Sudbury
M. SPRAGGETT, Lay Councilor	Toronto
K. A. GOWANLOCK, Lay Councilor	Ottawa
P. MEERVELD, Lay Councilor	Guelph
M. PAQUETTE, Lay Councilor	Ottawa
G. WORTMAN, Lay Councilor	Stouffville

Officers of the Association: 2018-2019

HONORARY MEMBERS

John D. BOGART, Q.C.	Toronto
Dr. Gordon GRACIE	Mississauga
N. Lorraine PETZOLD	Toronto
George WORTMAN	Richmond Hill
Eric J. BUNDGARD	Toronto

PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN OF COUNCIL

Dan DZALDOV	Vaughan

VICE-PRESIDENT

Al JERAJ	Brampton

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR / TREASURER

Blain W. MARTIN	Stouffville

REGISTRAR

William D. BUCK	Markham

DEPUTY REGISTRAR

Maureen V. MOUNTJOY	Brampton

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

J. Russell HOGAN	Burlington
Past President	

Term Ending

A. MANTHA	2019
P. LAMB	2019
G. LAWRENCE	2020
T. MCNEIL	2020
N. GROZELLE	2021
A. AKSAN	2021

S. F. MACGREGOR, Surveyor General	Peterborough

P. MEEHAN, Lay Councilor	Sudbury
K. A. GOWANLOCK, Lay Councilor	Ottawa
P. MEERVELD, Lay Councilor	Guelph
M. PAQUETTE, Lay Councilor	Ottawa
G. WORTMAN, Lay Councilor	Stouffville

ACADEMIC AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE

2018 - 2019

Mark Tulloch, Presiding Officer

	<u>Term Ending</u>
A. V. SHELP	2017
A. BUCKLE	2017
J. WILBAND	2018
K. SMITH	2018
R. G. BENNETT	2019
B. CAMPBELL	2019
A. JEFFRAY	2020
A. JERAJ	<i>Council, Vice President</i>
G. L. WORTMAN	<i>Lay Councilor</i>
M. A. CHAPMAN	<i>Ryerson Liaison</i>
C. ARMENAKIS	<i>York Liaison</i>
M. V. MOUNTJOY	<i>Deputy Registrar</i>
W. D. BUCK	<i>Registrar</i>

ASSISTANTS TO THE AERC

A. T. BOUNSALL, Milton	N. A. LEGROW, Newmarket
G. W. BOWDEN, Georgetown	A. S. MANTHA, Windsor
P. W. CHITTY, Gananoque	D. S. MARION, Cambridge
J. A. COLE, Sudbury	R. M. MCDERMOTT, Port Sydney
T. W. DEL BOSCO, Sudbury	P. A. MILLER, Belleville
L. G. DELORME, Rockland	R. NICULAE, Thornhill
R. L. FLEGUEL, Lakefield	S. M. PERKINS, Ottawa
P. J. GREGOIRE, Richmond Hill	G. W. PHILLIPS, Toronto
E. H. HERWEYER, Gloucester	P. T. RAIKES, Shanty Bay
S. HODGSON, Toronto	R. J. REID, Stirling
P. J. HOMER, Brampton	A. P. SANI, Scarborough
B. C. IRWIN, St. Catharines	A. D. SANKEY, Mississauga
J. C. G. KEAT, Peterborough	R. A. SIMONE, Windsor
L. A. KINGSTON, St. Catharines	S. SINNIS, Newmarket
P. B. LAMB, St. Catharines	I. D. SMITH, Fonthill
D. A. LAMONT, Dundas	G. B. VANDERVEEN, Whitby
M. J. LEGRIS, Oakville	M. D. VERDUN, Keswick
	H. J. WIMMELBACHER, Lindsay

REGIONAL GROUP CHAIRS
2018-2019

SOUTH WESTERN

Jeremy Matthews

EASTERN

Paul A. Miller

GEORGIAN BAY

Christopher MacDonald

HAMILTON & DISTRICT

Brent R. Larocque

KAWARTHA-HALIBURTON

Morgan Goadsby

NORTH EASTERN

Dave Urso

NORTHWESTERN

Tudor Nisioiu

SOUTH CENTRAL

Eduardo Linhares

AGM 2018 Sponsors

EVENT SPONSOR

Arthur J. Gallagher Canada Limited

PLATINUM SPONSOR

Protect Your Boundaries
The Connectors Insurance Group
CANSEL
SOKKIA Corporation

GOLD SPONSORSHIP

Canon Canada

SILVER SPONSORS

Teranet
Pimarc PRL Info Systems
Logan Wealth Management
MicroSurvey Software Inc.

CONVOCATION LUNCH SPONSOR

Land Survey Records Inc.

VETERANS DINNER SPONSOR

Georgian Bay Regional Group

PRESIDENT'S DINNER AND DANCE

Russ and Vicki Hogan

MEET AND GREET SPONSORS

South Central Regional Group
Hamilton & District Regional Group
Eastern Regional Group

COFFEE SPONSORS

North Eastern Regional Group
Teranet

AGM 2018 Exhibitors

ChiDa Polaris Trading and Consulting Inc.
Urban X
Microdrones Canada Inc.
Canadian UAV Solutions Inc.
Tekmet Limited
Airborne Imaging
Teranet
T2 Utility Engineers Inc.
Logan Wealth Management
Tulloch Mapping Solutions Inc.
Carlson Software
GeoShack
Leica Geosystems Ltd. USA
Leica Geosystems Ltd.
MicroSurvey Software Inc.
Multiview Locates Inc.
Northway / Photomap /Remote Sensing Ltd.
Phoenix Measurement Solutions Inc.
Teranet
CANSEL
SOKKIA Corporation
The Drafting clinic

Exhibitor Tables:

Arthur J. Gallagher Ltd
AOLS Public Awareness Committee
AOLS Archival and Historical Committee
AOLS Geomatics Recruitment & Liaison Committee
URISA Ontario Association
Nova Scotia Community College



PROGRAMME: 2018 ANNUAL MEETING

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27th, 2018

Council Roast Dinner
Meet and Greet for all Members

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28th, 2018

Exhibits Open
Opening Ceremonies
Commission Reports
Introduction of Exhibitors
Lunch with Exhibitors
Keynote Speaker: Eric Termuende
Exhibitor Presentations throughout the day
Reports from Committees and Initiatives: ODCC and Province-Wide SRI
The Need for Surveyors: the state of the Surveying Industry in Ontario and Canada
Fees for Research
Open Forum Part 1
Veterans' Reception
Veterans' Dinner
Welcoming Party

THURSDAY, MARCH 1st, 2018

Copyright Enforcement Group Meeting
Municipal Surveyors Meeting
Educational Foundation Meeting
Discipline Committee Meeting
ACLS Meeting – Ontario Chapter
Accompanying Persons' Program throughout the day
Plenary Sessions: Beach Task Force and Policy on Sketches
Convocation Lunch

Concurrent Sessions:

Teraview on the Web & OnLand Presentation
Policy on Sketches Overview
Writing Workshop
Council Q & A
Complaints
Province-wide SRI
SRD Field Notes

Hockey Night with Cansel
President's Reception
President's Dinner and Dance

FRIDAY, MARCH 2nd, 2018

Women Surveyors' Breakfast
Accompanying Persons' Breakfast
Exhibitor Presentations throughout the day

AOLS Business Meeting:
President's Report – J. Russell Hogan
2017 Financial Update – Al Jeraj
Surveyor General's Report – Susan MacGregor
Executive Director's Report – Blain Martin
Registrar's Report – Bill Buck
Public Awareness Report
Continuing Education Report
Survey Review Department Report
Open Forum Part 2
AGM 2018 Report
AGM 2019 Welcome
Closing Ceremonies

Contents of AOLS Business Meeting

Opening Remarks.....	1
Introduction of AOLS Council.....	5
Introduction of AGM Sponsors.....	6
Introduction of Associate Guests.....	8
Tribute to Deceased Members.....	8
Introduction of New Councilors.....	9
Motion to Accept the Minutes of the 2017 Annual Meeting.....	10
Outreach and Professional Education Overview.....	12
Professional Standards and Practice Overview.....	14
Member Services Overview.....	16
Legislation and Regulation Taskforce Overview.....	19
Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee Presentation.....	24
York University Presentation.....	27
Professional Surveyors Canada Presentation.....	32
Introduction of 2018 Exhibitors.....	36
Keynote Speaker's Address.....	44
Ontario Digital Cadastre Corporation Presentation.....	62
Province-Wide Survey Records Index Presentation.....	63
The Need for Surveyors.....	71
Constitutional Challenge Update.....	83
Open Forum – Part 1.....	84
Plenary Session: Beach Task Force	106
Plenary Session: Policy on Sketches Overview.....	119
Concurrent Session: Teraview on the Web & OnLand Presentation.....	128
Concurrent Session: Policy on Sketches	152
Concurrent Session: Complaints.....	177
Concurrent Session: Province-Wide Survey Records Index.....	196
Concurrent Session: Survey Review Department (SRD) Field Notes.....	223
President's Report: Closing Remarks.....	245
Financial and Budget Report.....	250
Surveyor General's Presentation.....	255
Executive Director's Presentation.....	257
Registrar's Presentation.....	259
Survey Review Department Manager's Presentation.....	261
Public Awareness Committee Report	262
Continuing Education Committee Report.....	263
Open Forum – Part 2.....	267
AGM Committee Chair Report.....	284
PHOTOGRAPHS	287

Surveyor General's Report.....	299
President's Report.....	305
Executive Director's Report.....	309
Registrar's Report.....	319
Survey Review Department Manager's Report.....	325
Inaugural President's Address.....	326
Archival and Historical Committee Report.....	329
FINANCES:	
2017 Financial Statements.....	331
2018 Budget.....	343
BIOGRAPHIES:	
Gordon Lancelot Spragge.....	349
Anthony Owen Stickings.....	350
Edward La Fontaine.....	354
Lachlan Eoin McRae Ross.....	355
David Aaron Rabin.....	355
Dieter Klaus Zeuner.....	357
George Merton Lowe.....	357
Kenneth Stephen Bunton.....	358
Donald Frank Walton.....	359
David Matthew Bews.....	360
Nicolaas Hendrik Verhoef.....	361
Ronald G. Theyers.....	363
Lawrence Preston Tomkins.....	365
Donald D. McGeorge.....	366
Henriette Jocelyn Verhoef.....	367
Henry Gerrits.....	369
Ralph Willis Barry.....	370
William Douglas Ratz.....	371
William Arthur Brewer.....	372
Andrew Miles MacKenzie.....	373
John 'Jack' Young.....	374
Eulogy for Jack Young by Drew Annable.....	377
Fernando De Luca.....	381
Robert Douglas Tomlinson.....	382
LIST OF ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP.....	384
LIST OF RETIRED MEMBERSHIP.....	408



President Russ and Vicki Hogan

Following proceedings, transcribed by Paul M. Garton, have been edited for publication

(A full transcript of the proceedings of the Annual Meeting can be obtained through the AOLS Office)

Wednesday, February 28th, 2018 – Niagara Falls, Ontario

OPENING REMARKS:

Niagara Falls, ONTARIO

--- Upon commencing on Wednesday, February 28, 2018 at 8:00 a.m.

--- The Proceedings Opened as follows

RUSS HOGAN: Order, please. Thanks. Welcome, everyone. We will commence our opening ceremonies with singing of O Canada. Dave Horwood, one of our members, will lead us today in the national anthem. Please stand, thanks.

DAVE HORWOOD: (The Canadian national anthem was sung)

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, David. Welcome fellow surveyors and guests, I'm Russ Hogan, President of our Association, and I will be chairing this year's Annual General Meeting. Will the 126th Annual Meeting of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors please come to order?

Proper notice has been given, the meeting has been scheduled within the terms of our governing legislation, the Surveyors Act, and a quorum of at least 15 members as defined by AOLS Bylaw 2004-1 are present, therefore I declare this meeting properly constituted.

Yeah, I think there's at least a quorum. I'm looking out over - there's a lot of chairs over in this corner still available, but it's quite a turn out and I'm pretty happy to see that.

Anyways, as with all AOLS meetings and seminars, and in consideration for our speakers and fellow participants, I ask that cell phones and other electronic devices be silenced. If such a device should happen to ring during the meeting, our Sergeant-at-Arms will be very pleased to collect your generous donation of \$100, which will double to \$200 should you dare answer the call.

The donation will immediately go to the AOLS Education Foundation, and I think this was a tradition that started a few years ago. But, anyways, for every rule breaker will be noted personally by the Chair at the beginning of each day to ensure their phone is silenced.

Welcome, all to the 126th Annual General Meeting at the Sheraton on the Falls Hotel. As a matter of safety, emergency exits are located on either side of the room. And as a matter of urgency, washrooms are located out the main doors to my left and just across from the business center. So, just out this way.

To our out of province guests, I extend a very special welcome to Ontario. I hope you enjoy your stay in Ontario, wherever it may take you. I also hope that everyone has a chance to enjoy the amenities and hospitality that the city of Niagara Falls and the region of Niagara have to offer. I am wearing the Presidential Chain of Office, which is the official symbol of the authority of the President. This new chain was donated by the AOLS Senate and was first worn last year by past President, Murray Purcell, at our 125th AGM in Ottawa.

It replaces the older chains that are kept in the archives of the Association. We have retrieved the historic chains of office from our archives and will have them on display throughout the meeting. They're just down here in front of the stage. The first chain of office was presented on February 14, 1967 by Bill Pocklington to the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors to be worn by the President. In memory of his father, Bill assembled every piece of the chain, and it includes his father's compass, magnifying glass, and plumb bob.

I also want to draw your attention to the second historic chain. This chain was donated by the Senate of the AOLS and was first worn by past President Harry Whale. As I mentioned, they're both at the front.

Symbolic of our annual meetings is the original solid brass Standard Measure used to control the accuracy of surveys in Upper Canada. This Standard Measure was deposited in 1851 with the Board of Examiners in Toronto. Engraved on the plaque on which the Standard Measure is kept is the following creed: May the presence of this ancient standard be a continuous measure of our deliberations and achievements, a perpetual symbol of truth, honesty and accuracy.

It is a treasured artifact of our Association, and traditionally signals the commencement of our general meetings. The Standard Measure will be set out at the call of order of each session of our meeting. Our Sergeant-at-Arms for this meeting is Steve Balaban. The responsibility of the Sergeant-at Arms is to maintain the schedule and decorum of the meeting. He has been given the authority to use whatever means may be necessary to achieve its purpose. It is also his duty to present and guard the Standard Measure.

Sergeant-at-Arms, do you have the Standard Measure to present to the meeting? Ladies and gentlemen, please stand while the Sergeant-at-Arms presents the Standard Measure. You may be seated.

Steve is taking on the persona of a North-West Mounted Police officer. So, I've asked Steve to give a description of –

STEVEN BALABAN: Good morning, everyone. When Al Heywood first coerced me into be Sergeant-at-Arms this year, the agreement was that I could be the Wookie from Star Wars, then Blain got involved. Blain said, well, a few years ago when we had Darth Vader there were some complaints because people didn't know who he was, so maybe its better that they can see your face and they know who you are. So, we discussed it a little bit and came up with the idea of an RCMP uniform. And then, there was some discussion about whether we were actually allowed to wear an RCMP uniform, if there were some restrictions on that.

So, Blain called the RCMP and found out that there's no real law or rule against it, but they weren't very supportive at all of the idea of wearing a contemporary RCMP uniform. So, then the discussion came around to this uniform, the North-West Mounted Police, which was the predecessor to the RCMP. So, what is the connection between the RCMP or the North-West Mounted Police and the surveyors? I'm going to tell you.

In 1870 there was a young surveyor by the name of Thomas Scott who was executed at Fort Garry. His crime was, if you read between the lines, ignoring long settled possession of Metis settlement that was there for generations before the government surveyors came along. That execution prompted the Government to send a militia force to Western Canada, to Manitoba in particular at the time, and by 1873 they passed and act in Parliament to officially create the North-West Mounted Police.

And from that point on the police force went further west with the settlement. They keep peace through the west, they kept guard over the expansion of the building of the railway west, the surveying of the International Boundary, and most importantly at the time they were quite worried about the Americans coming north and annexing the Prairie Provinces from Canada. They also oversaw the Klondike gold rush in the late 1800s and kept order there. You actually registered your claim with the North-West Mounted Police at the time.

So, how is it that I'm so knowledgeable about the North-West Mounted Police? Well, I'll tell you, there's a book called *The Wild Ride*, written by Charlie Wilkins. The same Charlie Wilkins who wrote our book telling our stories called *Great Lengths (sic)*. So, that's the connection. As weak as they are, there is a little bit of connection there. But, anyways, have a good meeting, behave yourselves. I am armed with this terribly blunt sword and this whip that does work. It belongs to Al Heywood who, by the way, he doesn't own a horse, but he does own a whip, so you draw your own conclusions.

So, thank you very much. And I've got one request, if you do get drunk please don't go to the registration desk and start talking to the ladies, they don't want to talk to you when you're drunk. So, you can come and find me and then we'll go and find a beer somewhere. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Steve. As with all official meetings, certain rules will apply. This meeting will be conducted in accordance with Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure. Past President, James Statham, is our parliamentarian, and we shall abide by his interpretation of the code should the need arise.

I would like to just review some of the guidelines for the meeting. The business portions of our presentations are being recorded, and in order that the minutes and the proceedings of the meeting can be properly transcribed, I ask that everyone wishing to speak during the course of this meeting please approach a floor microphone and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

After being recognized, please state your name and hometown or affiliation before speaking. The Chair may find it necessary to restrict speakers to one appearance on any subject. All motions presented during the meeting must be in writing and signed legibly by a mover and seconder and forwarded to the Resolutions Committee and the Chair before discussion.

The Resolutions Committee includes the two newly acclaimed Junior Councillors, Anna Aksan and Nancy Grozelle. The chair will determine the method of voting, and this year voting will be done by the raising of hands. I remind you that at this time, only active, licensed registered, and retired members of the Association are entitled to vote. Scrutineers other than members of Council will be assigned if the need arises.

Okay, our business meetings will start with commission reports and updates from Legislation Review Task Force, the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee, York University and Professional Surveyors Canada. At 1:00 we have our keynote address. Our keynote speaker this year is Eric Termuende. Eric is a bestselling author, speaker and entrepreneur and will be talking to us about the evolution of technology, communication, and work.

Following the keynote address we will return to our business meeting for an update on the Ontario Digital Cadastre Corporation and a presentation on Province-Wide Survey Records Index. After coffee in the afternoon we have presentations by Dave Horwood for dealing with the Need for Surveyors as well as an update on Fees for Research. And following that we will have Part 1 of Open Forum.

The Veterans' Dinner is tonight and is open to veterans and their accompanying persons. The Exhibitor's Welcoming Party is also tonight and will be in the Exhibit Hall just on the other side of the partition. I trust all will attend. This year our Hospitality Suite is in the Hard Rock Club, not to be confused with the Hard Rock Café, although it's located right across from the Hard Rock Café. If you were going from here you could go down the escalators on the other side of the hall, and through the doors into, I guess, it's like an arcade area there, and turn right and you'll find the Hard Rock Club. It will be open after the Welcoming Party if you wish to continue conversations.

Thursday is our Educational Day. We will begin with the Plenary Session in this room with presentations from the Beach Task Force as well as Professional Standards Committee. We will continue the morning with Concurrent Sessions in rooms on the 5th floor. Convocation Luncheon where we support our newly commissioned surveyors will be held at noon in this room. And Thursday afternoon we will continue with the second round of Concurrent Sessions.

Thursday evening, we have the President's Dinner and Dance, and I hope to see you all there to show your support for our new President, Dan Dzaldov, and for the recipients of some AOLS Awards. This year we have a great party band for the dance. They're called Saturday Night Superstars and they will be performing music we will all recognize, and it's guaranteed to get you on the dance floor. The Hospitality Suite in the Hard Rock Club will be open again Thursday night following the dance, or Thursday evening during the dance even.

Friday we will complete our business sessions with reports and a second session of Open Forum. The reports were circulated prior to the meeting and available on our website, so we won't be reading verbatim, we will simply present highlights and provide some commentaries and any updates from the time they were written. The meeting will end at noon on Friday.

We've left time for some good discussion, and I urge all of you to contribute to that discussion and provide feedback. Please participate to the fullest. It is your meeting and is only as good as you make it. You can find all the information I just gave you in the three-fold brochure that's been inserted in the back of your name badge holder which is somewhere tucked inside here. Excuse me.

INTRODUCTION OF AOLS COUNCIL:

It is my pleasure now to introduce your current AOLS Council. Please stand as you are introduced and remain standing. President, myself, Russ Hogan. Vice-President Dan Dzaldov. Past President Murray Purcell. Senior Councillors: Al Jeraj, Eric Ansell. Intermediate Councillors Andrew Mantha and Peter Lamb. Junior Councillors Gavin Lawrence and Trevor McNeil. Surveyor-General, Sue MacGregor. Lay Councillors Patricia Meehan, Kathleen Gowanlock, and Miranda Paquette, Peter Meerveld, and our newest, yet probably most experienced, Lay Councillor George Wortman. We also have staff member Blain Martin, Executive Director, and Bill Buck, Registrar. Ladies and gentlemen, this is your 2017 Council.

Excuse me. Again, this year we have a number of sponsors who contributed greatly to help offset the cost of running our meeting. We want to thank those sponsors for their tremendous support.

INTRODUCTION OF AGM 2018 SPONSORS:

Our sponsors this year are:

The Event Sponsor: Arthur J. Gallagher Canada Limited

Platinum sponsors: Protect Your Boundaries, The Connectors Insurance Group, Cansel, and Sokkia

Gold sponsor: Canon Canada

Silver Sponsors: Teranet, Pimarc, PRL Info Systems, Logan Wealth Management, and MicroSurvey Software Incorporated

Meet and Greet sponsors: South Central Regional Group, Hamilton & District Regional Group and Eastern Regional Group

Veterans' Dinner sponsor: Georgian Bay Regional Group

Convocation Lunch sponsor: Land Survey Records Inc.

President's Dinner and Dance: Russ & Vicki Hogan

Coffee break sponsors: North Eastern Regional Group

In total, this sponsorship contributes \$25,000 to the success of our Association. The AOLS wants to thank all sponsors for their generosity.

Yeah, following on a, well, I'm going to call it a tradition because I'm going to carry it on, I remember a couple of years ago, at least, when we were in London, Travis, I think, might have been the first President we had to start this. But, it's certainly something that happens in at least a couple of other Provinces. So, at this time I'd like to welcome all Articling students in attendance this year. And I would ask that the Articling surveyor, if you have an Articling student, please proceed to a microphone and introduce your student.

One or two sentences only. The student can stay at their seat but must stand so that we can see who you are. And I ask the audience to hold your applause until all students have been introduced. Articling surveyors please come and introduce your students.

JASON WILBAND: Jason Wilband, from London. I've got two Articling students here actually, Tom Sterling and Don Holstead, both from London.

BARRY CLARKE: Barry Clarke, AJ Clarke & Associates from Hamilton. We have Nick Muth who's been Articling for us for a couple of years and intends to

write in May. And we think he'll make it through and be a great asset to our company.

RYAN SEGUIN: Hi, Ryan Seguin, from Surveyors on Site in New Liskeard. I have Michael Fitzgerald, a UNB grad from Newfoundland joined last spring. Thanks.

MARTY NISBET: Good morning, I'm Marty Nisbet, from Monteith & Sutherland in Sarnia. I have two Articling students. I have Marcin Bielen at our Toronto office, and we have Kosala Gunathillake from our Sarnia office. Congratulations to both gentlemen.

TOM SALB: Good morning, everyone, my name's Tom Salb, I'm with J.D. Barnes in the Ottawa office. Sorry, Milton office. Yeah, I know where I am. Yeah, don't worry. Also, in the Milton office I have an articling student, his name is Aravinda Basnayaka. He will write, I think, I believe, end of May.

DASHA PAGE: Good morning, I'm Dasha Page, Matthews Cameron Heywood, division of J.D. Barnes here in Niagara Falls. Sorry. We have Andrew Handspiker. He's the best, nobody can have him. He is going to be my right hand.

BORYS KUBICKI: Good morning, Borys Kubicki from Tarasick McMillan Kubicki from Mississauga. I've got two articling students, Jack Hang and Mahmoud Dahesh.

ANDY SHELPH: Andy Shelp, Annis O'Sullivan, and I am from Ottawa. And so, I have two articling students, Cody Anderson, who couldn't make it, and Kate Sonier who's back there. And she will write in May and she will be successful, there is no doubt about that. So, Kate, can you stand up and show everybody your yellow thing? There you go, thank you.

BOB HALLIDAY: Bob Halliday from Espanola, Tulloch Geomatics. We have four articling students here. Who knows how they'll do? You're welcome, guys. Mark Mayne is in the Espanola office with me. We have Nick McFadzen in our Sudbury office, Peter Banaszek - I could have that wrong, Peter, sorry - in Parry Sound, and Owen Healey in Huntsville are all attending here today.

GRANT STIDWILL: Grant Stidwill, J.D. Barnes Milton, and I'm articling Yifan Zhang who is the future of our association.

COLIN BOGUE: Colin Bogue, J.D. Barnes Toronto office. I'm here on behalf of Stephane LaPointe who couldn't be here today, and he's articling Surendran Sukumarsath. And he's articling with us and hope to be an OLS. Personally, I have an articling student of four, and I'm the Jose Bautista of articling students, in that I'm 0 for four. Thank you.

DAVE URSO: Dave Urso, Sault Ste. Marie, we have one articling student here, Bill

Webb. Rumour has it he should be up and running by later this year.

GARY VANDERVEEN: Gary Vanderveen with Holding Jones Vanderveen. We have one articling student, Stephen Kosmachuk. He will be here a bit later today.

DAVE KOVACS: Good morning, Dave Kovacs with MTO Thunder Bay. I have one articling student, Tyler Renaud. He's not in attendance here, this meeting, but he intends to write in December - or, sorry, May.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, that's great. Let's give everybody a hand. I wish to thank the surveyors for affording their students an opportunity to attend, and I encourage students to participate in the discussions. Don't be shy, we want to hear from you and we want your input.

Once again, I'm just going to mention there's a bunch of chairs over on this side, so if you folks are getting tired of standing over there just make your way to the opposite side of the room. Also joining us over the course of the meeting are a number of guests representing other provincial associations and organizations. I would like to now introduce our guests. I've asked one representative guest to speak at our closing ceremonies Friday morning, but I do extend an invitation for all of them to take part in our discussions and deliberations over the course of our meetings and provide input as they wish. I am certain that they will prove to be a valuable asset during our meeting.

INTRODUCTION OF ASSOCIATE GUESTS:

I'm going to keep some things simple I'm going to go from west to east so I don't screw anything up. So, from British Columbia, President Brian Brown. From Alberta, President Mike Fretwell. Saskatchewan, President Lee Anderson. From Manitoba, President Kelly Mantik. Quebec, Directeur général et secrétaire Luc St-Pierre. New Brunswick, Jaret Guimond. Nova Scotia, President Ken Cormier. Newfoundland and Labrador, President Robert Goodland. Has Robert made it yet? Not yet.

Representing the Association of Canada Land Surveyors, Vice President Dominique Fecteau. And from Professional Surveyors Canada, Chair Wilson Phillips. And certainly, last but not least, from New York State Association for Professional Surveyors, Patty Brooks. Patty here? Oh, there she is. Did I miss any of our guests? No. Fellow surveyors, your guests for this years' AGM.

TRIBUTE TO DECEASED MEMBERS:

Unfortunately, there are Ontario Land Surveyors who can no longer attend our meetings. I will now read the names of those members who have passed away since our last annual meeting. Please rise and remain standing for a silent tribute.

Today we remember:

George Merton Lowe, number 980, passed July 14, 2015
Kenneth Stephen Bunton, number 1640, passed December 11, 2015
Donald Walton, number 748, passed March 19, 2017
David Bews, number 977, passed March 28, 2017
Nick Verhoef, 1134, passed July 11, 2017
Ron Theyers, number 924, passed July 15, 2017
Lawrence Tomkins, number 967, passed August 20, 2017
Don McGeorge, number 985, passed August 30, 2017
Henriette Verhoef, number 1817, passed October 9, 2017
Henry Gerrits, number 1450, passed October 22, 2017
Ralph Barry, number 1239, October 31, 2017
Bill Ratz, number 726, passed November 5, 2017
Andy MacKenzie, number 1112, passed November 23, 2017
William Arthur Brewer, number 1172, passed November 14, 2017
Jack Young, number 1446, passed December 2, 2017
Fernando De Luca, number 1838, passed December 21, 2017
Robert D. Tomlinson, number 1110, passed January 7, 2018

Does anyone know of another member who passed away since our last annual meeting? William Brewer? I'm sorry, I didn't - Ralph Barry. Are there any others that anybody's aware of? Let us take a moment of silence for our deceased members. Thank you, please be seated.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW COUNCILLORS

This is where we would normally have the report of the Scrutineers. As there was no election this year there was not a need for any Scrutineers. And I will report that. We had great candidates nominated for both Junior Councillors and for Vice President. I am pleased to announce that your 2018 Vice President - almost made you President, Al - Al Jeraj. You're 2018 Junior Councillors are Anna Aksan and Nancy Grozelle. Please join me in congratulating these new members to our team.

I would now invite Vice President Jeraj and new Councillors Anna and Nancy to say a few words if they wish. Al, are you -

AL JERAJ: Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: How about Anna or Nancy? And right now, I can't see anything, so I can't see where they are. Okay, we'll assume they don't have anything to say at this point. We will hear from our President Elect, Dan Dzaldov at the President's Dinner and Dance on Thursday evening. I would like to thank the Nominating Committee, Chaired by Travis Hartwick, for putting forward a solid list of names for our 2018 Council.

Now, minutes of our last meeting. As part of our business we must address the

minutes of the 125th Annual General Meeting. Executive Director Blain Martin, please present the motion regarding the minutes of the 2017 meeting.

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE 2017 MEETING

BLAIN MARTIN: Good morning, everyone. The motion this year is not quite as simple as it usually is, because we made a little mistake in printing the Annual Report. My very own report from last year was inserted incorrectly, and we'll have that replaced for some copies for our records and have it reprinted. The digital copy will be changed and be on our website. The corrected report will be labeled as such, and anyone who wants a corrected version may get one by contacting me.

I'd like to get the motion passed that is a little different than my usual one each year. This is what I propose. Be it resolved that the proceedings of the 2017 Annual Meeting as printed and corrected in the 2017 Corrected Annual Report be received.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, so, that motion is moved by Blain, seconded by Bill Buck. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, I'll call the question. All in favour, please raise your hand. All opposed, please raise your hand. The motion is carried. How are we doing for time? As you're well aware, over the past several years there's been a lot of discussion about the aging demographic of our profession, and there's been considerable efforts to raise awareness of the surveying profession and the career opportunities available.

Although our membership numbers are continuing to decline, I believe the efforts to recruit are paying off. We had 15 new surveyors at Convocation Lunch in 2016. We had 14 new surveyors in 2017. And tomorrow at our Convocation Lunch we will have 17 new surveyors receive their certificates. So, I'm encouraged by the number of new surveyors we have coming in. Also, we currently have, well, about 88 articling students, I believe, somewhere in that range, in our system. I believe the key is for surveyors and survey firms to support their articling students. You will hear more about our demographics, I can assure you that, and the need for surveyors and our recruitment efforts throughout the day.

We've seen a great example of supporting our students earlier as those in attendance were introduced. Another great way is to financially support students who are enrolled in Geomatics Programs through our Educational Foundation. Since 1975, 89 award winners have become Ontario Land Surveyors. Currently, 17 of our articling students are Educational Foundation Award winners. So, yeah, I'd like just to remind you that tonight, with the exhibitors at the Exhibitors' Welcoming Party, it's your opportunity to buy tickets and support the Educational Foundation, and of course with an annual contribution to the Foundation as well.

We have a number of presenters today and I am sure that some will be open to question and answers as time allows. The business portions of our meeting are being recorded in order that the minutes and proceedings of these meeting can be

properly transcribed. And as I mentioned before, anybody wishing to speak, please approach the floor microphone and wait to be recognized.

I want to encourage everyone to participate fully throughout this meeting. Council is very interested in receiving input from the membership, and the agenda is designed to generate discussion about the Association's strategic priorities and other issues facing our profession, and to solicit ideas for the coming year.

What is the future of our profession as our members get older? We are all well aware of the demographics of the Associations, and that 75% of our members are over the age of 50. Will we be able to develop new members quickly enough to continue to service the public's demand and need for surveys? We need to get more secondary school students to pursue a career in surveying, and we need to do it quickly. How do we do this? We need your help in trying to determine or trying to come up with how we go about doing that.

We need to ensure that there is a clearly defined path for students to follow to obtain the education required to become a surveyor, and then we need to make sure that the students in the university Geomatics Programs choose surveying as their profession, more specifically surveying in Ontario as their profession. How do we do this most effectively? We need your ideas.

The demographic of the Association's OLS staff is no different than the demographic of our membership as a whole. They are nearing retirement. In fact, Tim will be retiring this spring, and Bill has indicated his intention to retire at the end of 2018. We need to be ready for these changes in order to ensure that the AOLS office continues to function effectively.

In my travels across the country I've observed that, for the most part, the issues we are facing in Ontario are much the same in other provinces. Discussion at all the President's Forums focused on collaboration. Surveying is a relatively small profession and there are many issues that could be dealt with more effectively as a group nationally, as opposed to individually. How do we go about collaborating with the other Associations and Professional Surveyors Canada? This meeting is designed to get your input. Council, as I said, wants to hear from you. We need to hear from you. Please participate in the discussion and voice your ideas for improvement.

That's my soap box, I guess. Supporting a local charity at our Annual General Meeting by making donations in each speaker's name has become a regular part of our meeting. This year we are supporting Project SHARE, an organization that helps the local community in many ways including a food bank, transportation assistance, and help finding affordable housing. We also have a bin by the registration desk where you can drop off non-perishable food items for the food bank. I know many of you have already donated and I thank you.

I guess we're now in time for Commission reports, so if I could ask Dan, Eric, and Peter to come forward. Yeah, that's you. I don't know what order they've got. Okay, our first Commission Report this morning will be presented by Senior Councillor Eric Ansell. Eric will present an overview on the Outreach and Professional Education Commission.

OUTREACH AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION OVERVIEW:

ERIC ANSELL: Thank you, Russ. So, as you know, Council, a few years ago, formed a number of commissions that grouped a number of like committees together. Those committees had the same goals, the same objectives. And in order to help prevent overlap and duplication, the commissions allow those committees to talk together, get together, and reach their like goals without the duplication.

The Commission that I'm Chair of is the Outreach and Professional Education Commission. No - the big green - oh, yes. For those who forget, four years ago we had fancy little things that didn't work. So, the Outreach and Professional Education Commission has eight committees. Four of those committees, the top four there, AERC, Continuing Education, Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee, and Public Awareness Committee will be giving their own reports during the course of the AGM. So, I'm not really going to speak to those too much, but I will speak to the other ones: the Expanded Profession Task Force, Marketing and Recruitment Task Force, University and Colleges Student Liaison Committee, and Website Maintenance Committee.

So, you can see how they're actually grouped together and make some sense. Don't get worried, I'm not going to read all the lists of people who are on the committees, but I just would like to make recognition of the Chairs of each committee.

So, the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee, the Chair is Mark Tulloch. Continuing Education Committee, Tom Packowski is Chair. Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee, Chris Oyler. Public Awareness Committee, Michael Matthews. So, those four committees will be giving their own reports and I don't think I'll say anything more about them. I'll let you ask the particular Chairs or their representative when the times comes for them to make their own reports.

The Expanded Profession Task Force is chaired by James Ferguson. The Certificate of Registration Task Force has been renamed to the Expanded Profession Task Force. The Task Force convened its first meeting with new members on December 13, 2017 and will meet monthly through 2018. The Task Force has reviewed previous materials from the C of R Task Force with a focus on how C of Rs fit in within the AOLS.

Part of that review included re-examination of the results of the Survey Monkey from the spring and summer of 2016. The Task Force has embarked on a comprehensive value proposition to entice and retain C of R members to the AOLS

with a goal to not only attract C of R members, but to express on why that makes the AOLS stronger.

Marketing and Recruitment Task Force, Andy Shelp as the Chair. This committee has seen little activity this year as marketing has been mainly dealt with through the joint discussions with our sister Associations.

University Task Force, Chester Stanton as Chair. This is a new committee that hasn't really gotten off the ground yet. Part of the push for this committee is from the disappointment on how we're received at York. We only have 50 students in a population of 4,000 students at York, and therefore we're a very small piece of that. Both President Russ Hogan and Executive Director Blain Martin have been pushing for attention this year by meeting with the Dean and with Costas Armenakis and have met with the second-year students. So, this committee will explore continuing discussions with York University and perhaps looking at other possibilities within educating students with the AOLS having some direct contact there.

The University and Colleges Student Liaison Committee, Wikar Bhatti as Chair. This is a committee that's really trying to deal with the students, not the schools, per se. The committee hasn't had a meeting for some time as the Chair was unavailable, but Wikar intends to have an informal 2018 kick-off meeting this week during the AGM. This will allow old and new members to get reacquainted and to review and make recommendations to Council on a revised Terms of Reference.

The Public Awareness Committee has had a few issues come up with what they believe to be fall under UCSLC. A couple of very recent issues are York University students have asked the Association for sponsorship for them to come to this AGM, and the Loyalist College career fair was held early in February. So, these are areas where this committee can provide direct access to the students rather than through the PAC Committee.

Website Maintenance Committee, Ken Wilkinson is the Chair. This committee is taking action on the start of a new website. Don't get too worried, this time the process should be faster than last time as we now have control over the website, and there will not be some of the migration issues that we had at the last iteration. The committee will be meeting shortly after the AGM which will probably be the kickoff for the website redesign.

The Website Committee needs some really technical savvy members to participate on it, and so I encourage anyone with a flare or inclination to websites, in this direction, give Ken Wilkinson a call. Just as a note, the AOLS office has switched over its IT service provider and will be moving the backup of the website to the new server which is going to save the Association some money.

So, that's the eight committees within my commission. I think it's interesting to note that when we eliminate the obvious - and that would be Blain and Maureen - who

between them sit on over 25 Committees within the Association, there are 67 dedicated members who have volunteered their time and expertise to the eight Committees within the Outreach and Professional Education Commission. Thanks.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Eric. We've made a donation in your name to Project SHARE.

ERIC ANSELL: Thank you very much.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, next up we have Dan Dzaldov. And Dan has Professional Standards and Practice Commission. Dan.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND PRACTICE OVERVIEW:

DAN DZALDOV: Good morning. I know it's not meant to be a competition, but my commission has 10 Committees and Task Forces and clearly is the most exciting Commission out of all three. The green arrow. So, my Commissions and Task Force include the Beach Task Force, Complaints Committee, Digital Plan Submission Task Force, the Discipline Committee, Monument Protection Committee, Professional Standards Committee, Province-wide Survey Record Index Task Force, South Central Region SRI Committee, Survey Review Department Committee, and Underground Utilities Committee.

I also will not read all the names, but I'll say right from the beginning just a deep appreciation for everyone for volunteering their time on all these committees. The Beach Task Force is chaired by Andrew Mantha. And I'm not going to say very much about that other than they have reported to Council a couple of times, there's an article in the Quarterly, and they'll be presenting tomorrow morning.

Complaints Committee, Dave Kovacs is the Chair of this Committee, and more or less they meet monthly. A very active committee. This year there were 19 complaints. 14 were from the public and five were from OLSs of which three were referrals from the Registrar. The recent trends are public complaints, and SRD referrals are up. Again, there will be a presentation tomorrow morning. I do have a couple of stats on complaints. I don't know if you can see the numbers there, but the trend was down, and it's gone up a little bit in this past year.

And I can tell you that approximately 75% of the members in the last 17 years have not had any complaints against them, and 142 members have only had one or two complaints. Unfortunately, eight members, 1.6% of the membership, had four or more complaints, eight of which were actually referred to Council or Discipline. While 83% of complaints are made by the public, 68% of the complaints that are referred to Council for discipline were actually made by OLSs.

Digital Plan Submission Task Force is co-chaired by Murray and Jeff, and obviously that deals with digital plan submissions, and Auto-CAD submissions are

also discussed by that Task Force. There will be a presentation on Thursday, I believe, Chaired by Ken and Izaak, and I understand that Four Point Learning will do some training in the future, and Teranet has a booth at the AGM, and there are some legislative changes that are forthcoming due to the changes. Discipline Committee, a lot of people on that Committee. Unfortunately, we need a lot of people on that Committee. Peter Lamb is the Chair and also the Council rep. In 2017 there were two discipline cases, two new discipline cases, and both cases have been published in the Quarterly. A case from 2016 is still ongoing and there's more hearing dates set for April. Hopefully this coming year there will be some mediation training for the members, and we're hoping that will be made available to the general membership as well to sign up.

Monument Protection Committee, Dave Lamont is the Chair, and it's a very active Committee. And with regards to the Ontario Good Roads Association, I believe there's an article that was submitted this year, and I think Bill Harper was due to attend their meetings this week. The Committee has provided input and recommendations to the Legislative Task Force.

Professional Standards Committee is chaired by Bob Halliday. Steering Committee has noted, as well as the resources, and a very busy Committee, and we've had a fair bit of interaction with them this year and learned to really appreciate the process that they go through, and clearly sketches is one of their major issues that we'll be talking about more as the week goes on.

Province-wide Survey Record Index Task Force, Brian Maloney will be talking. This committee became very active late last year, and you can hear some more about that from Brian tomorrow.

South Central Region SRI Committee, there's not much to report, but I do remind everyone in South Central that your respect of the changes that are coming up, you have to maintain your index. And that's probably, as you'll hear from Brian tomorrow, will probably be the first phase of the province-wide. So, we want to make sure that's up to date, and you have to update it anyways.

Survey Review Department, there's more or less a new group and that's chaired by Marvin McNabb. The new Committee held two meetings recently, and there will be a session Thursday afternoon on field notes and SRD reviews. Some stats, there were 46 comprehensive reviews as well as 245 systematic reviews this past year. That compares to 62 comprehensive reviews in 2016, and in 2018 there are 49 comprehensive reviews planned. There were 11 files that were referred to the Registrar last year.

SRD is getting ready for digital submissions by trying to set up a digital filing system for e-plans. Sticker sales were up 1.4% from 2016. And I reviewed the minutes from January and it certainly show a significant work, and new action items by this Committee. They meet next, March 21st.

Gordon McGuire is the Chair of the Underground Utilities Committee. And the Committee has reviewed the Federal bill on underground infrastructure safety and will be providing comments to PSC and sponsor. The Committee continues to collaborate with the Monument Protection Task Force to enhance the protection of boundary evidence.

And on that note, collaboration, that's one of the key points of the Commission reports and the Go-to Meetings that we hold, I think, two or three times a year is actually a great opportunity for the different Chairs to share ideas, and learn what the others are doing, and further develop our wonderful Association. So, that concludes the exciting report.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Dan, for such an exciting report. It's a pleasure to present this small token of appreciation. We made a contribution in your name to Project SHARE.

DAN DZALDOV: Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Our next commission report will be presented by our Intermediate Councillor, Peter Lamb. Peter Lamb is responsible for the Member Services Commission.

MEMBER SERVICES OVERVIEW:

PETER LAMB: Thanks, Russ. And, again, I'm Peter Lamb, I'm Chair of the Member Services Commission. And the Commission comprises the AGM Planning Committee and the Operating Task Force, the Archival and Historical Committee, the Historical Book Task Force, and the Insurance Advisory Committee. These are chaired respectively by Russ Hogan, Al Heywood, Gord Good, Andrea Tieman, and Martin Nisbet.

For the first two groups, the AGM Planning Committee and the Operating Task Force, I'm not planning to speak about them, but just acknowledge all their work in setting up the AGM. Lots of things to think about and that's evident, clearly by everything here for the next couple of days. So, I'm not going to talk directly about those two groups.

For the Archival and Historical Committee, the group has a display set up in the foyer and I encourage you all to take a look at it. The pen may be mightier than the sword, but the theodolite had a very significant role in the First World War in targeting for artillery, and there's a neat little display set up with respect to that. Doug Sutherland has offered a report on the role of survey technicians in our Association, and that will be printed up shortly. The Committee would also like to acknowledge the longstanding work of Des Rasch and Tony Roberts on supporting the Marshville Heritage Display every year. That's in the South Niagara peninsula.

They've been steady supporters of that display that's part of the Marshville Heritage Festival.

The Committee is also looking at hiring a university intern for helping them preserve both documents and other historical relics. This would be a position that's not paid, but it would provide experience to a university student with an interest in historical preservation. Vicky Culbert is pursuing the possibility of having an AOLS booth at the International Plowing Match in Chatham in September.

Now, that's not a sure thing, and having just spoken to Vicky this morning, she's looking for any help from someone local to the area that might be able to assist with supporting that booth. So, I would encourage anyone from the Chatham area or surrounding, to speak to Vicky at the historical exhibit out in the foyer today. Apparently 140,000 attendees are expected at that event, and so that's great exposure for our Association.

The Yates Database is a database of the biographies of all our members, and that's being improved by Gord and Penny to make some enhancements. And it's something that's ongoing and is a resource, they've learned, for people even doing genealogical research from overseas apparently. So, it's something that they want to maintain and improve.

Another thing I should mention is, speaking of members' biographies, we have a number of photographs from the London AGM of members that were taken at the conference hall. You may recall there was a photographer set up. And a number of those photographs haven't been claimed, and they are also with Vicky at the historical exhibit. So, I would encourage you, if anybody hasn't picked up a portrait photograph from the London AGM, please talk to Vicky and she's got them all with her.

The Historical Book Task Force is chaired by Andrea Tieman, and she has reported that the books are on sale at this AGM. And if we do have the exhibit at the Plowing Match, it will be promoted there as well. This Task Force continues to assist in getting speaking engagements for Charlie Wilkins lined up to promote the book. They've also pursued some applications for awards for the book. And there's a work through the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee for reaching out to educational organizations with the book to promote the historical aspects of our Association as well.

There's also the possibility that Charlie Wilkins will be doing a talk at the Gibson House Historical Museum in Toronto. I don't have anything to report from the Insurance Advisory. We've got another 15 minutes if Marty Nisbet is around and would like to bring anything forward on the Insurance Advisory Committee. He's welcome to do so. No? Okay, and that's all I have for the Commission. Thanks.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Peter, job well done. Small token of our appreciation,

we've made a donation in your name to Project SHARE. Okay, before we break for coffee - yeah, we're running a little bit early which is just fine with me. But, before we break for coffee I have a few announcements.

First thing is there's a light switch over here on the wall, actually on both sides. So, if you're going to stand by the wall, stay away from the light switch. It's that very colorful keypad over there.

Okay, since 1975, our Education Foundation has awarded \$450,000 to 420 students. Did you know that all the proceeds from the draw at the Exhibitors' Welcoming Party held this evening will be directed to the Foundation? So, please buy tickets.

You will notice that this year there are no printed event tickets. The events that you registered for are printed on the back of your name badge. So, if you don't remember what you registered for, you can pull out your name badge and it's listed there. You'll also notice that there is a QR code printed on your name badge. So, for each event, staff will be at the door to scan the QR code. If you aren't eligible to enter, lights will flash, sirens will sound.

So, anyways, just remember that the reason for this is because it's just a lot of labour to deal with tickets and everything else, and with technology today let's see if we can do things a little bit more efficiently. So, it saved a lot of time and headaches for the staff. So, just remember to bring your name badge to any of the events that you're going to.

We've printed a new directory and it's available at the Registration Desk. It's an important book to all members and their crews, so we're not charging for it. Please pick up a copy but limit yourself to 10 at this point. We want to make sure that everybody has the ability to get at least one. If you need more than 10 copies, Blain says just contact the Association office next week and they'll send out as many as you want.

Right after our break we have reports from the Legislation and Registration Task Force, the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee, as well as updates from York University and Professional Surveyors Canada. Vendor presentations will take place in the draped area outside the hallway just on the other side of the Registration Desk. Please see the schedule posted by the presentation area for presentation times.

Coffee is next door in the Exhibit Hall, and our next presentation will start at 10:30, so please be in your seats and settled before that. What have we got here? Great. So, enjoy your coffee and please be back here in 40 minutes.

-- After Coffee Break

-- Upon resuming

RUSS HOGAN: You're right, Murray, it works. I had the privilege of being presented last night with the first - well, the first President to be presented with the President's cowbell. Our past President, Murray Purcell, himself, has presented this to me, and I will be passing it on to the next incoming President. It works a hell of a lot better than the gavel to get your attention.

UNKNOWN MALE: More cowbell.

RUSS HOGAN: More cowbell. Okay, welcome back everyone. Just a quick reminder to turn off your cell phones in case you had them turned on. We've got a pretty packed morning leading up to lunch, and we have our Keynote speaker starting at 1:00 today, so going to try to keep everything on schedule as best I can here.

First up for this session is Eric Ansell, Chair of the Legislation and Regulation Task Force. Welcome, Eric.

LEGISLATION AND REGULATION TASK FORCE PRESENTATION

ERIC ANSELL: Good morning, again. So, if I go over time, Russ, you'll hit the cowbell? So, I am Chair of the Legislation and Regulation Task Force. The Task Force has nine members, and I think maybe I'll just let you know who we have. We have Ophir Dzalov, Chris Musclow, Brian Maloney, James Dorland, Penny Anderson, Russ Hogan, Wikar Bhatti, and Blain Martin.

So, when we were forming the Task Force we wanted to get a pretty good mix between private and government surveyors because legislation requires input from both people. And so, with the group we have, certainly Brian has some good connections with his previous life with MNRF. We have Wikar who's with MNRF right now. So, Wikar will kind of be our contact with Legislative Council as we go through. And of course, Russ with his past life as MTO certainly has good government contacts as well.

And of course, I must admit that we have some pretty good backup and keeping us in control from Penny who is our Recording Officer at all our meetings. So, I thank Penny for being there to do the minutes for us because I'm a terrible minute taker, and if it was left up to me we wouldn't get anything done; or we wouldn't know what we got done, let's put it that way.

So, a little bit of history, the Task Force was struck in the fall of 2016, and again, composed of both government and private sector. The initial focus was to review and make recommendations in regard to regulations under the Surveyor's Act. In particular, O. Reg. 1026, O. Reg. 525/91 which is monuments, and O. Reg. 216/10 which is performance standards.

Back then in 2016, Council directed the Task Force to make recommendations for

changes. To identify any risks associated with our current legislation, assist Council with responses to legislative council as any amendments are being introduced, to create and maintain a record of all proposed changes, and to make recommendations on the principles of an ethics-based regulation approach rather than restrictive.

After the Strategic Planning session of March of 2017, the Task Force was given a very clear mandate and direction which came out of the session's recommendations. So, I think most people are familiar with the placemat that comes out of our strategic planning which has it nicely listed there what our objectives are, what our missions are and everything. And you'll see that the legislative and regulation changes are part of the key priorities. So, we got our directions from there. It's also part of the 2017 deliveries, so we again get our direction from the strategic planning.

So, we had three key priorities and action plans, and again, those really are what was driving the Committee to move forward and to get these things done. The first one was to confirm Task Force Terms of Reference, and of course to now include recommendations on the principles of an ethics-based regulation approach. So, that was our first task, we got that done. We did write a new Terms of Reference and it did get approved at Council's July 2017 meeting.

The second priority was to meet and initiate proposed changes to the legislation. Sounds pretty obvious, but of course you actually strike something and say what you have to do, you don't get it done unless it's written down. So, at that time all members were tasked with reviewing the various regulations and making appropriate comments and suggestions on those changes. These initial proposals were reviewed at one of our earlier meetings.

We then invited all Committees to propose whatever changes were particular to their own Committees. These were just recently collected in January of this year and we will continue to review and discuss those proposals. So, I want to make it clear that every Committee within the Association was asked to contribute to our Task Force in recognizing what changes they thought were necessary in our legislation and our regulations.

And the third priority was to initiate jurisdictional benchmarking. So, one of the very first things we did was to divvy up across the country and actually outside the country as well. And we went to all our sister organizations, asked them for their feedback on their regulations, and then help us recognize any gaps that we may have in ours, and what good things they had in theirs. And so, the benchmarking worked really well.

The one thing I will comment on; it appeared to me anyway that I think a lot of the other jurisdictions based a lot of their legislation and regulation on Ontario's regulations. So, I think we were maybe the leader in getting things out and they just

built on ours.

We had six key deliverables for 2017. And of course, these are tied to the priorities and the action plan. The Task Force has completed the deliverables but will continue to refine and develop the six throughout 2018 and then make recommendations to Council.

I don't think I need to go through all of those deliverables, just to say that we have done it. The easiest one was number six where we were tasked to meet every six weeks, and we accomplished that. We have met on a regular basis, every six weeks except for the one in August when it's so hard to get people together during the summer months because everybody likes to take holidays.

So, as you can see, the scope of the Committee is pretty extensive. And as I had mentioned, our prime direction is a result of the strategic planning. It must be noted that legislation changes do not come quickly. We will not be making legislative changes in 2018. We will continue to suggest amendments, work on what we need to look at in both legislation and regulation. And we will continue to do a lot of good work, and that work is not wasted even though it takes a long time to get to where we want to be with the recommendations for changes. We will continue to meet on our six-week cycle which will keep us on track and aware of where we are and what we want to accomplish.

As I mentioned, we have engaged all other Committees and Task Forces and have sought their input and suggestions into what legislation or regulation changes are particular to their areas. Just a few of the suggested changes, and I think some of these are important, are a review of complaints to discipline process. Sometimes this is an onerous task and maybe it needs to be better improved in legislation and regulation.

There is a need to allow the Complaints Committee to have more options on what can come out of a complaint rather than simply referring to discipline. Right now, in our legislation, the Complaints Committee is pretty much handtied by what they can and can't do, so this would improve what they might be able to mandate to someone who's going through a complaints process rather than going through the discipline procedure, which is not a nice way to go.

You will hear more about this later in the week, but the issue of sketches needs to be investigated. So, not only do we need to look at those sketches, but then we'll need to look at what legislation or regulations need to be incorporated to make those changes. This all ties into the examination of O. Reg. 216/10 which is the performance standards, which need quite a bit of review and changing.

One of the considerations that we've been asked to address is whether the requirement to show coordinates on a plan is still appropos. I've heard from almost everyone that we should not be showing the coordinates on a plan, but because it's

in regulation now, we can't do anything. So, that's one of the changes that I think you'll see coming forward, which actually address the point that these regulation changes and legislation changes aren't there to make life harder for everybody, we're actually there to try to make things easier and make our work better, and to keep everyone on an even keel.

The matter of whether licensing the expanded profession or not needs to be reinvestigated with the concept of having a value proposition for Certificate of Registration members. I personally think this is most important because I think the C of Rs give our association a very strong base, and I think they really need to be looked at in both legislation and regulation to give them that proposition value.

Fees mediation within the Surveyor's Act might require changes. Many other jurisdictions do not have any fees mediation, and it simply goes through a complaints process. So, that's another area we need to look at.

Monumentation requirements need to be revisited. The Monumentation Protection Task Force will be asked for additional comments and rationale. Even though we've asked all the other Committees for their comments, we're going to back to those Committees now that they've given us some information and actually ask for particulars now on how they think the wording should be or what the rationale should be.

Because as we move forward with any changes, not only do we have to have the rationale to convince all of us that that's a good way to go with the changes, but we have to convince Legislative Council with the government that these changes are necessary and help to protect the public. So, these are just a few of the items to be addressed by the Legislation and Regulation Task Force.

So, it's important to stress that the intent of this Task Force was not to make things more difficult or restrictive, but rather to look at the legislation with a lens of how we make things more effective, and more efficient. Our goal was and is to make legislative changes that are a win for everyone. As we move forward with any suggested legislative changes, participation is important to improve the system. So, all of us will have to participate in those changes to approve and make recommendations on those.

Of course, as I said, the legislative changes don't come easy and it will have to work with MNRF and the Ontario's Legislative Council over the next year or so to have any changes done. Any changes will be brought forward to the membership for review and approval. So, I don't think I'm going to take any questions at this time, but certainly at the Open Forum, if you have questions about legislation, I'll be there. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Eric. We've already presented you with your contribution certificate. You only get one. Okay, in a few minutes Chris Oyler is

going to get up and make a presentation as Chair of the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee, but first I'd ask that Executive Director Blain Martin provide an update on the state of our demographics as this demonstrates the vital importance of the next two topics. And I'll tell you, you stand up here and you look out and you get a pretty good idea of the demographics.

BLAIN MARTIN: That's true, Russ, you do look out and get a pretty good idea of the demographics, but I'm going to show you the numbers. Where's my little clicker? So, I want to start by just reminding people what it takes to become an Ontario Land Surveyor, for a kid that grows up in Ontario.

First of all, they have to take the right courses in secondary school. Hopefully, they find out about the career there from the guidance counselor. Then they have to go to university, preferably York these days. Then they have to do their articling, get evaluated before that.

We all know this, but I just wanted to remind you of this process because the next two presenters are going to talk about secondary schools and York. I'd really like you to pay attention to both of them because those two presentations are really important for the recruitment of our members in the future. The first presentation is by Chris Oyler, he's Chair of the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee, as Russ said, and it's all about secondary schools.

The next presentation is by Sunil Bisnath. He's a professor at York; or as Andy Mantha likes to point out, the Lassonde School of Engineering. As many of you know, Sunil was also an Erindale graduate like a lot of us are. But, I'm all about demographics. So, this was a slide that I prepared; these are the demographics I presented at the South Central Regional Group in 2010. And people looked at these numbers, it was the first time that anybody had really seen the age of surveyors.

People looked at these numbers and said, oh, Blain, "You're brand new to this Executive Director role, this sounds like it's a lot of doom and gloom because it looks like everybody's getting old." And I didn't really present it as being doom and gloom, but I could see what they were saying. At that time, 2010 - what is that - 26% - I can't quite see that monitor - of our members were over 60, and 26%. And only 5 members were over 80.

So, we jump forward to today, and I've done this every year. At that time, 2010, there were 639 members. You can see the red circle. We currently sit at 504, that's the other red circle, who are 38% over 60, 10% over 70. We have 12 members now who are over 80. Okay, so, that's where we are. We are all getting old. As Russ said, we look out and we see us. Yeah, yeah, I mean, I've got a lot of hair left.

So, what are the other factors that impact us? I put on this chart at the top our CPD cycle. So, our first cycle was from 2013 to 2015. At the end of that first cycle we went from 559 members, that's the green circle, to 508 members.

As Dave Horwood pointed out to me yesterday, we didn't really drop 51 members, we dropped 66 because we added 15 new members that year. So, we dropped 66 members at the end of our first cycle.

Over the last couple of years, 2016, 2017, I've gotten up and given you these demographics and said, we're okay. I'm really concerned about 2018 when we have 48 members over 70 and we've got the end of the CPD cycle coming at the end of the year. So, we really need to recruit some new members. The bad news is the age of them, the good news is the number of articling students. We saw that presentation earlier. The number of articling students has really gone up, and that's due to a lot to the work that the Committees do.

It's fabulous to see 88 articling students now, and 17 new surveyors. And in terms of evaluated students, back in 2010 we evaluated 28, in 2017 we did 71. We've only had one AERC meeting, so that sits at 15, but that's one out of four meetings. So, those numbers are going up. There's a bit of a problem with it, in that a lot of them don't finish, so I would urge the surveyors who are articling those students to really work at getting them completed.

So, the secondary school presentation, Chris is Chair of that, he really has two focuses, SHSM, and he'll tell you what that is, and dealing with guidance counselors. Why I wanted to get up is we really need your help. We need people to sign-up. Chris has a table outside. We need people to sign up to go to school boards across Ontario. I saw my friend, Adam Kasprzak, here this morning. I want him to sign up with Chris so that he can do some meeting with school boards in the Renfrew area.

We want to go all across Ontario to school boards. There are 90 school boards, and that seems to me a lot more effective than going out to the 1,000 high schools. We do need to get those kids interested in the career. We're not alone in that, lots of other professions are doing exactly the same thing. And then, I want you to listen to Sunil, he also has a table in the hall, York has a table, and really find out how we can help York. So, Chris, I'll turn it over to you.

GEOMATICS RECRUITMENT AND LIAISON COMMITTEE PRESENTATION

CHRIS OYLER: Good morning, everyone, thank you for letting me speak, Blain. As Blain mentioned, I recently took over the Chair of the Geomatics Recruitment Liaison Committee earlier this year. And essentially what our mandate for the GRLC is to encourage and assist primary and secondary school students to select a geomatics land surveying career path, and to encourage such students to seek membership in the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors.

That is our guiding principle, and the people with - the green button - that are doing this work on your behalf are listed there. We have Hugh Goebelle who's our past

Chair, Maureen Mountjoy, Amar Loai, Jean Tong, who is not a member of the AOLS but works for ESRI, Richard Emode, Chris Fox, Costas Armenakis, sorry, guys, trip on the name - from York University, Peter Johnson from the University of Waterloo, Oussama El-Chanti, Nigel Day, and Grant Lee, who is our consultant.

We meet monthly, we take the summers off like the rest of everybody. And what we wanted to tell you today is why you should care. Essentially, we're spending your money, so you should care. Our budget was \$12,500 for 2018, and that goes to various initiatives on your behalf to get the surveying profession out there in the mainstream. What we've done in years past is come up with a tactical plan and budget. This year our tactical plan has been eight years in the making.

It's a pretty bold statement to say, but I believe that the work that the GRLC is doing, the framework that is being laid, is arguably the most important initiative that has been undertaken by the AOLS. I received my commission in 2010, I saw Blain's presentation back then, and I was kind of inspired because I could see the train wreck coming in slow motion that we've seen to this point, and I wanted to do something about it.

So, over the past eight years we tried various things, and I think what we kind of narrowed it down, to this, a couple of different initiatives that really is starting to gain some serious traction. First being the SHSM. Briefly, I spoke about it last year at the AGM when I presented the animated video that we presented and prepared that's on the front page of our website, is to engage students and parents, teachers to be interested into the SHSM, Surveying Certification Program.

For those of you that don't know what the SHSM stands for, it's the Specialist High Skills Major Program that's provincially run. They have special SHSMs for various industries including construction, which the Surveying Certification Program falls under. Our target is high school students and teachers by supporting schools where the SHSM Construction Program is being taught.

The second item that we're focusing on is the outreach to Ontario high school counselors, which Blain spoke about. So, we're trying to build on the success of the SHSM course that was offered at the Richmond Green Secondary School by coming up with a manual to help school teachers from across the province put up some more programs. And we've developed, with John Negru and Chris Tucker, a manual for teachers to teach the course.

And I want to introduce you to Chris Tucker who's here with us today. He's the Technology and Education Curriculum Consultant and SHSM Board Lead for the York Region District School Board in Newmarket.

I felt that he is most adept to maybe giving a brief overview of what the program is, and why it's important, and how he sees it being introduced province-wide, and that's essentially what we're doing. So, Chris, can you come up for a second?

CHRIS TUCKER: Thanks, Chris. So, yeah, I'm the Curriculum Consultant for the Technological Education for the York Region District School Board. I'm also an architect by profession, but please don't hold that against me. So, the SHSM programs allow students to specialize the grade 11 and grade 12 years into an area of study that they're interested in. And it partners their course work with out of the classroom experiences that are relevant to industry.

So, Chris mentioned there's a wide variety of sectors. The Ministry of Education has recently changed policy, and while we have a certification identified in construction, the Ministry has now made a math related activity applicable to all students in SHSM, which has drastically increased the scope of students that you will potentially be able to access, okay. Statistically there are about 10,000 students participating in SHSM in fields that will directly relate to land surveying.

Okay, so, the ask of your membership is to connect with your local high schools, to volunteer some time, to go in and work with students, to talk to them about what is land surveying in the contemporary environment, what is the equipment that you're utilizing. Just brag about your profession. I was a guidance counselor and students do not know about land surveying unless they have a family member who is a land surveyor.

Alright, guidance counselors and educators don't generally understand what it is either because we don't come from that background, for the most part. So, we need your help in order to be able to work with our teachers and our school boards in order to do that. As the SHSM Board lead, I meet regularly with my counterparts from all across the province. The Ministry of Education is very excited about the work that AOLS has been doing around promoting your profession, and they tote it as the 'poster child' of what they want other affiliations and organizations to do.

To promote the work skills, the labour market data, and all those key elements that students are crying out, for relevance in their educations. And you guys have a need in terms of membership, so it's a match made in heaven, okay. So, I'm going to be here until about 1:00 today, I'll be at the AOLS booth. So, if you have any questions about any details around an SHSM program, what is it, how can you interface with the high school or the school board, I'm happy to field those. Just to belay any fears, we will manage the students; you don't have to do that. All you need to do is come out and do what you normally do at such a high professional level. Thank you.

CHRIS OYLER: Thank you, Chris. So, students, when they complete the SHSM program, get a certificate of completion from the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors.

That gets attached to their school record. The GRLC has come up with the pilot program. We've met with the Toronto District Catholic School Board, and we're really excited to present this to you today.

Essentially, it's a pilot program of the Richmond Green, and they've agreed to run the pilot program for the AOLS this May. They've agreed to cover all the cost including equipment rentals, location, all the logistics. And what we've learned through this dialogue is that the GRLC is - that the key to the success of this program is to target the guidance counselors, which leads into our second focus.

We're receiving more and more email from school boards looking for presentations. So, our goal is to represent this challenge by pairing members to go out and speak to the school board. So, what we're asking you to do is to sign up, we will pair you with a school board in your local area. You go out and give a 20-minute presentation. And what we found is the trickledown effect from that engagement is far more valuable than any other initiative that we've undertaken. We tried to reach out to individual high schools, people are transient, they move.

This way we're getting the most bang for our buck. As earlier indicated, we are a small group, understaffed, not a lot of resources, but we're going to have a big impact. We have a presentation kit that we've prepared to help in this regard. It's available to all members. So, don't fear, you're not going in there blind. You don't have to come up with the materials and content on your own.

In 2017, we did a lot of research, outreach. Maureen has been involved heavily with working with Chris Tucker to facilitate workshops for the SHSM program, served on a panel to discuss about renewed math strategy. And we dealt new promotional materials, animated video, trade show rollup and handouts, all the things that are needed to kind of facilitate what we're trying to achieve. Take our kids to work day, Reach bulletin.

We also staffed three exhibits. One was at the Ontario Secondary School Counselor Association, the second one was at the Science Teachers Association of Ontario, and the Ontario Association of Geographic Environmental Education Conference, plus the GIS day events. So, it's that simple. We're an aging demographic, but we can change that, and with your help, we will. So, thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Chris. It's a pleasure to present a small token of our appreciation. We've made a donation in your name to Project SHARE.

CHRIS OYLER: Great, thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Next up, Sunil, providing an update on Geomatics programs, I guess I'll call it, at York.

YORK UNIVERSITY PRESENTATION:

SUNIL BISNATH: Morning, everyone. Everyone's pretty quiet. I think the hangovers from last night are starting to bite. Sorry I didn't join you. I was just

saying to Blain, Russ gave me my first summer surveying job, and we were trying to remember the date. It was '91, I think it was. Long time ago. So, it's great to see so many of you. Sorry we don't meet more often. Blain has given me 15 minutes, probably less, so I'll go quickly.

So, what I wanted to do was, in a way, introduce the York programs. Many of you know about the Geomatics programs at York, but I wanted to put it in some context, what we have to deal with at the university. And then, the second part of the talk is about how we can better interface with the Association and all of you. I can use this to move forward? Okay.

Right, so the context. We're a small program in a very big seat, to give you a sense. So, York's the third largest university in Canada if you didn't know that. We have about 52,000 undergraduate and graduate students. 52,000 is a large number. So, while we're not the largest university in the country, our Keele Campus in North York has the most people coming in and out of any campus in the country. So, it's the largest single campus.

We used to have about 1,000 buses that rolled in every day - city buses. They were replaced by a subway line, but the campus is so big we have two subway stops. To give you a sense: 7,000 faculty members, 11 faculties, over 200 individual programs and 5,000 courses. So, when university recruiters go to high schools, going back to Chris' talk, what does a York University recruiter say when they go to your local high school? How do they present 200 plus programs and 5,000 courses? They can't.

I've seen some of these presentations; it's just blips of program names. So, it's a very difficult thing to do. So, within that context is this new Lassonde School of Engineering. If you don't know of Pierre Lassonde, he's a mining engineer and donated a substantial amount of money to York to help found the school, 2011. So, this is one of the challenges, York University was never known for science or engineering. Even though our science is quite strong-- engineering's really new.

Some of the faculties at York have tens of thousands of students, so they could be universities on their own. So, there's over 3,500 students in this new school, so it's grown incredibly quickly. This is our new hallmark building that people spent a lot of money on; 130 faculty, four departments, 20 programs, and 300 courses. So, you get a sense of how small engineering is within the context of the whole university.

Within that, faculty is this department with a strange name, Earth and Space Science and Engineering, ESSE. And this program is about 45 years old. 300 undergrads, 100 grad students, 23 professors, and the programs include a geomatics engineering program that we've had running for a number of years now, and a new geomatics science stream, so B.Sc., as well. So, what's the point here? The point is, we have a really huge university, and we have these small programs.

So, unlike for those of you who were with me at Erindale, this isn't a standalone program. The university is way too big to have just a handful of professors be a department or a program. So, this is the context we have to work in. So, some of the things you might see; you might say, why do they do it that way. Because this is the structure we have to work with. So, the Geomatics Engineering Program was one of the founding programs in 2001, so again, not that old.

At this point we're the only Geomatics Engineering Program in the province and only one of a few Geomatics Engineering Programs in Canada. There's seven of us, and there are 23 specialized geomatics courses. So, go back to that first slide and compare it to this one and this is where we're at. So, some updates, the Engineering Program's been accredited by the CEAB, we've gone through three accreditations. Accredited by the AOLS. And something that's relatively new is CBEP's Level 2 accreditation, which means that students, upon graduation from the Engineering Program, can be licensed as a P. Eng., OLS, CLS. So, all the bases are covered.

Something that's new, 17/18, so we're in the first year of it, is we re-oriented one of our existing Bachelor of Science programs to introduce this geomatics science stream. Because what we were seeing, and we see this in a lot of other areas in the engineering faculty, is that, a lot of the graduates don't need to be professional engineers to do their job. If you're a computer science graduate and you're going to be coding, you don't need necessarily a P.Eng. So, we do have groups like that. A number of applied science groups.

So, the entrance requirements are different. So, this goes back to the number of students who would have the required courses in high school to get into the program, so that really enlarges that catchment. And the course requirements are different, so you're away from a lot more of the coding and the hardware courses that the engineering students will take. But, students have the option.

So, our overall philosophy was put in this diagram, and you'll see it in the poster outside. And these are the three main themes. And because of the nature of the program, and the department, and the faculty, and the university, there's a huge research component. And it's not something that we talk too much about at, you know, an AOLS conference, but it's the driver, because that's the modus operandi of the university, is doing that research, not just the training. So, that's something else I wanted, you know, to try to connect with all of you.

So, in terms of the Geomatics Engineering grad, there are options for them. To become a practitioner, they can become a developer, whether it's hardware or software, or spatial analysts on the geospatial side. For the B.Sc. graduate, similar, but the developer component's not particularly a strong option. So, in terms of number of students - and we have this issue, too - small program, relatively new, unknown in the university, not really well-known in the province, hopefully by now well-known in this audience.

So, here are our total number of undergraduates, the B. Eng. about 55, the fourth year numbers are larger because students tend to take a little more than four years to finish, as some of you may know who are in the audience. And our brand-new B. Sc. program, so the numbers, we're just in our first year of that so that's why the numbers there are so low. So, a total of a little over 60 students, and our target in the next few years is to get that total number up to 100. And that's our initial target.

I also included the grad student numbers, the Master's and PhD's. And you'll see there's about 30 of them. So, half as many grad students as undergrads, which was rather unusual. It's quite a research-intensive group. And that's just because geomatics touches on so many of our lives. It's not uncommon for me to be meeting with people from car companies for autonomous vehicles. I've worked with GPS or GNSS myself. So, the work that's done, the core work, the fundamental work can be applied in so many different ways, and that's what we see with the graduates.

One of the biggest differences for me from the Erindale program to York is, at Erindale, pretty much - I was one of the few people in my class whose dad or uncle wasn't a surveyor, and everybody was going into the surveyor profession. The students now have so many more options, so we have to compete within that arena as well. So, Blain alluded to this, and we had a nice conversation the other day about the success of articling students with an undergrad degree.

I was surprised to hear from Blain that only about 50% of candidates complete their articling successfully. But, in terms of students who have a geomatics degree from Canada, that number's over 70, 80%. Still punching the numbers. It's much higher. And not only is the success rate a lot higher, but the completion time is much shorter because when they go to the AERC they have basically all the courses they need, so that saves them about a half a year. So, much higher success rate, much shorter articling time, these are good reasons to get the degree.

And, of course, I have to say get the degree from York. I suppose I should say that. So, last couple of the slides, there's still a lot of work to do because we're a small group and we've dealt with so many changes at the university. There's lots of modernization to the curriculum that we want to do and a lot that we have done. Some in partnership with the Association. So, blended course delivery, that means normal in-class delivery of lectures and labs, and also online so people can listen to the lectures livestreamed or they can listen to the recorded lectures.

Some of you may have done that. And we've done that for a number of our more senior technical courses. I've listed a number of them here. So, also working with the Association for non-degree students, because universities are built on a static model. A student finishes high school, they come do a three or four-year degree, they graduate. But, what if you're coming from another country and you want to get your credentials recognized, you want to do competency-based assessments as we do here?

So, a path for these non-degree students, who just want to come, and take a basket of courses, and to allow that to happen. So, talk with the Association, that, yeah, there's an understanding in our faculty, and the administrators know how to enroll the students for those particular courses. We've created an Industrial Advisory Board to help us with this renewal, and there are new courses and more efficiencies that we're planning, but they take a long time to implement.

Outreach. So, we're doing something similar. We're trying to recruit more students and compete within the environment that we have. Every year we have a career day that's quite successful, and we're one of the few programs that have a career day, where industry people are coming in to interview people for summer jobs, for permanent jobs. We look really good. We just need more students for you people to hire.

GIS day, we have a number of donations that have come in, one from PCI Geomatics, the software company, remote- sensing company, and we've started a lecture series from that. A former faculty member who went to work for Microsoft, Vincent Tao, has just made a sizable donation for geomatics and entrepreneurship. And we want and need to do more of these things so that people know who we are and what we do.

So, collaborations. And we've talked about some of these collaborations with the Association. There's been a longstanding connection in terms of AOLS awards that you all have supported at the undergrad level. Geomatics picnic has previously been held at York a few times. The Bridging Program for foreign trained professionals to get them into the profession, however we can help with that. We have a relatively new co-op program throughout the whole engineering faculty. So to have your companies in our database so students can come and spend a summer term with you, spend an entire year with you so you can kick the tires and decide whether or not to hire them.

These programs work and they're fantastic. We've, this year, had members of the AOLS come into introductory geomatics courses, and the feedback's been terrific, and mentorship of some of those students. So, there's been a lot of collaboration, we need to do more. So, last slide, challenges. Well, geomatics is always a challenge because people say, what's that? But that's changed. It's actually changed a fair bit since I asked, 'What's that?', 30 years ago, 25 years ago.

And of course, our challenge for York, oh, you have engineering at York, you guys do this stuff at York. Because the school is so big, nobody knows what anybody does. Recruiting and growing that population. High school recruiting as Chris has been talking about, college recruiting, and there's been a lot of changes in the college system, and then within our own school. Engineering students enter Lassonde in general engineering in the first year, and then we all fight over them to see which program they'll go into second year. So, there's recruiting actually internally in the school.

We have a lot of great industrial partnerships, but we need to do more. For example, with this relatively new co-op program; articling of students, industrial mentorship, and partnerships, donations, helping with the branding, and the marketing of the program. And it's a win/win. So, with that, I'll end. I don't know how many minutes I took.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Sunil. We have a small token of appreciation. We've made a donation in your name to Project SHARE.

SUNIL BISNATH: Alright, thanks.

RUSS HOGAN: Now, it's my pleasure to welcome Wilson Phillips, Chair of Professional Surveyors Canada to say a few words. And anybody who knows or has ever met Wilson will be able to tell you he's not a man of few words, but I'm sure that he will do his best to keep us on track here. Welcome.

PROFESSIONAL SURVEYORS CANADA PRESENTATION

WILSON PHILLIPS: Morning, everybody. When I was taking a flight down here, I was trying to edit out all the things that I could talk to you about that Professional Surveyors Canada's been working on for the last couple of years. Some of you might have seen my presentation two years ago in London, when we had such a great time with Travis and partied pretty good. And then in Ottawa last year. So, I've edited down somewhat and there's a couple main points that I want to get to today, and I want to give you a chance to ask questions, if you have questions.

So, PSC does a lot of things for a lot of groups, but we try and edit it down into manageable bite-size things and focus on basically three areas. We try and report quarterly. Sometimes we're a little bit late with our quarterly reports, but every quarter you're getting a report of what we've done the quarter before and sort of where we're going in the future. And we meet fairly regularly. So, the Committees meet very often, and the Board meets at least once a month. So, there's constantly stuff going on.

We've released a number of position papers, especially with regard to underground infrastructure, and specifically to legislation like S-229, C-46, new pending legislation. And we use those position papers to directly advocate to government. So, in the case of BC, our fellow there, his name is Jordan Litke, he went to see a couple of MPs and talk to them about S-229, got some positive feedback from Elizabeth May and some other people. These are good things that are being done on your behalf across Canada, and it is a mechanism with which you can have a conversation at a human level about things that really affect the public. So, this is really important because governments really want to hear what affects the public and what legislative changes we could do to make things better, but they don't know. So, they rely on the professions to come to them and say, hey, how could we make this a little bit better for the public. So, that's what we try and do,

and that's why the position papers are so important. But, having that conversation, it was interesting listening to the speakers just now about all the challenges across Canada, and having those conversations, and how you recruit people. It's about what you say and how you say it. It's not just about what you say.

You could have the most important message in the world, and if you're not talking on the right wavelength, it doesn't matter. It really doesn't. We really need to know whether we're fishing in a small ocean, as you were saying, or you're a small fish in a big ocean. So, it matters how you go about that. So, we've put, especially in the last year, a lot of legal research and effort into that. And I'm very thankful to the group that we have. We have members from across Canada and some have been really toting, lifting a heavy load. Especially in Alberta, BC, Manitoba, Nova Scotia have been doing a lot to help surveyors across Canada and I'm very proud to serve with them.

So, part of what we do is marketing. I just want to talk about that. I'm going to go into that much bigger. We obviously have the Professional Liability Insurance Program, you guys are insured under the same thing. Most surveyors in the rest of Canada are insured under that program, which is a very successful program. It's run just the same thing as Arthur J. Gallagher here. So, then there's the big picture which was the PSurv initiative which is still ongoing. And I have to tell you provide services in French - en francais - for Dominic back there.

In 2016, 2017 we had a reactionary thing to a lot of legislation, specifically related to underground infrastructure mapping. And this was a huge thing. S-229 was a big push. It's being put on hold right now because of the C-69 that's pending right now, and I'll go into that in a little bit. But, that was a big portion of it. We've consulted with Canadian Standards Association, Open Geospatial Corporation, we've joined them, and we're actively involved in the Canadian Common Ground Alliance with regard to underground infrastructure mapping.

So, one of the main position papers that we had for S-229 had these three main points. Why are there these three main points? I've spoken about this once before. All underground infrastructure should be buried deeper than the ground disturbance standard. You would not believe what gets buried - well, you know. But, when you have the conversation with a Minister or a Senator and you say, "You know, they can bury it to whatever depth they want." They go, "What? What are you talking about?"

"I'm going to bury that fiber optic cable, a foot deep, right on the property line." "You're not serious, are you?" "Yes." You need to have those conversations. They care. They really want their 911 service to work. They don't want you to damage their lines, right? But, you need to have the conversation on a level that puts it at a human-interest level. Nobody cares about a wire in the ground, but they care about whether they pick up their phone, and their 911 doesn't work.

Most of the strikes, 90% of the strikes, that occur in your fair province here - and you can get these from the statistics, occur on utility hitting utility. It's not even you hitting them, its utility hitting utility. They don't even know where their own stuff is; let alone the next guy because they have no way to communicate. You and I all communicate the same way. I can pick any two surveyors out of here and you can have a conversation with plans because you use a universal registry. You talk to each other by communicating information to each other by sharing that plan.

And there's a mechanism with which you can have that conversation and have an informed, intelligent conversation. That doesn't exist in Canada. It does exist in other countries, and we need to advance that. So, this position paper has been revised. We just hired a consultant out of Ontario here, a legal firm, that has helped us improve on our position paper which will then be used going forward for your Association, for your members, to have a conversation with your local MP, or your local, you know, legislator of what needs to happen.

So, a number of years ago, this is in 2016, I told you about a marketing thing that we had done. And these were banner ads that we'd run online and different places, CBC, BBC, trying to hit a certain demographic. We work with a company called Acart in Ottawa to help us formulate a way to speak to the public, to government, and to our own members. So, when we ran these, we were more trying to figure out whether they were effective, and who would actually come to the website, because at that time our website really sucked, right?

But, people did come to the website and they lingered, right. They weren't just bots, because we tried to filter out the bots. But, part of this process was trying to learn, for us and for the company, who's going to click and what's going to work. This is very important when you're talking about a small fish in a big pond. There's not a ton of people that are going to come to the PSC website. They're not. But, when they do come to the PSC website, if they're a legislator or a person that's interested in a particular topic, whether it's underground infrastructure mapping, you have an interested party.

And so, that narrative has to be really, really good. You need to be talking the way that they need to hear it, right? And so, we work with a marketing company to try and do that. When you're a small fish in a big pond, you better have the language right. So, we've been working on that diligently. Very, very diligently. So, we remade the website. As some of you remember, the old website, it was not as good, I would say. The new website is better, and it's being improved continually.

One of the things that, like, it has more of a professional feel to it. One of the things that's in these compartmentalized things is if you see a banner ad now, if we run a banner ad, you'll be clicked through to that message that you're talking about. So, if we're doing a banner ad on, say, why you should hire a surveyor to protect your investment in homes, like, right now you go there, there's a home buyer beware

section, it has all these things.

Like the Laurentian University incident there, the guy in Nova Scotia, you know, a couple in Ontario here, where these are CBC news articles about “Hey, if you would have hire a surveyor,” right? But, you need to have that conversation. The interesting thing was when it happened in Nova Scotia, Kevin Brown was the President at the time, and he actually got on CBC and he was talking about, you know, you should get surveys done, you know, title insurance isn't covering you. So, it's one of those things.

So, on this portion of it, these will become more animated. There will be more videos, and more digestible stuff for media. So, in other words, stuff you could rip from media. And let's say CBC's covering the Laurentian University here and that incident comes up, they need to have a media kit that your Association, your local surveyor, or Professional Surveyors Canada use to comment on that in a common narrative. Because you're talking sound bites, right?

So, this is just a little cartoon. If you're making a pitch and you're a small fish in a big pond, but you want to talk to an interested party that's going to buy your pitch, whether it's legislative, or media, or new students, you need to be talking at the right time with the right language. So, I'll wrap up. I'm just going to go through a few more things.

So, the road ahead, the underground infrastructure mapping initiative is a big one that we push. Bill S-229 was a big impetus for us to start having that conversation, and we got a lot of feedback from government. A lot, and it was all positive. It was absolutely all positive. So, in the future, C-69, which is going to replace the NEB Act or is angling to replace the NEB Act, would affect regulation. And really that's where we're going to live, is in regulation. So, we will have a position paper coming out on how those regulations should reflect the most benefit to the public.

They will probably be strongly supported by the last three items that I just spoke to you about, of having it mapped, having it surveyed, if you're registering something against, have everything registered against somebody's title. So, right now the marketing company and the Committees are working on short animated videos that will be posted on the PSC website, and it can be used by each Association to explain positions on underground infrastructure mapping, on new students, on title insurance, everything like that.

So, it's in a format that people will digest. So, there'll be media kits for each topic, and those will be provided to each Association. PSurv, provincial associations are still discussing that, and we hope to make progress on that this year. So, any questions that I could field from you?

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you. Hold on, Wilson, on behalf of the Association we present to you.

WILSON PHILLIPS: Thanks.

RUSS HOGAN: Yeah, so, Wilson's here for the duration of our meeting, so please, if you have any questions, you know, come and talk to Wilson. I don't know a surveyor who has more passion or energy for our profession than Wilson. So, appreciate very much, you coming up and having a talk with us, Wilson. And I would encourage all our members to support Professional Surveyors Canada. They do a lot of great work. Thanks.

INTRODUCTION OF 2018 EXHIBITORS

Once again, we have a very impressive list of exhibitors. Exhibitors are a very important part of our meeting and we thank them all for taking a few days out of their busy schedule to join us. Wow! Look at them all. They're a vital component of our AGM, in demonstrating the latest technology and support services for our members. And I ask Ron Berg of our AGM Task Force to now bring them up.

RON BERG: Okay, it looks like Russ had a couple sentences to say there about them, but we, on behalf of the membership and the AOLS, I just want to express our appreciation for the tremendous support we get from the vendors. We have quite a number of them this year and we want to give them all a very short opportunity to introduce themselves and say a little bit. And we'll just have them come up one by one. Going to be here for probably another half hour, but we want to acknowledge these folks and hear a little bit from them. So, Cam, lead it off for me.

CAM GALBRAITH: Morning, Cam Galbraith from Sokkia. I won't surprise you by letting you know we have some instruments for your perusal at our booth. But, thank you for having us once again. I think more importantly I can say, please come and meet our team today. We've brought our mass data group, myself, a lowly salesman, our other territory manager, our field support survey specialist, David, is here. He does all our training and field support.

We also have a service ballot this year, our service manager will be attending tomorrow, so please come in and fill it out. And we have some big upcoming news on our newest network rollover we'd love to share with you. So, I thank you very much.

MATT BOURGEOIS: Good morning, Matt Bourgeois here from T2 Utility Engineers. I'm here along with Josh Cowan from our Whitby office and Mike Johnson from our Burlington office. Please stop by our booth. We provide utility engineering services, subservice utility engineering, utility coordination, CCTV investigation. So, if any of you have any issues with underground utilities on your project, stop by our booth and Mike, Josh, or myself can figure things out for you. Thanks and have a great day.

CHRIS KAMARIANAKIS: Good morning, everyone, Chris from Protect Your Boundaries. How is everyone? Holding alright? 30 minutes to lunch, you'll make it. A big thank you to the Association for putting on another successful event. I'm here just to remind you all of our conference that's coming up in exactly 28 days, the LandPRO Conference. Please pick up a brochure at the registration desk if you haven't already.

Those of you who don't know about it - most of you already do - those of you who don't know about it, it's a full day event in Vaughan you can attend in person or by webcast. Eight speakers, two incredible professional panels in one day of phenomenal learning, wisdom, and insights. Please come pick up a brochure. Again, we'd love to see you there and, again, discount code is going to be on the brochure as well. Thank you, again, for having us here today and enjoy the rest of the conference.

DON EDGAR: Hello, Don Edgar from Leica Geosystems, it's great to see you all. I'd like to invite you tomorrow at 10:00 to come into our vendors' presentation to see the world's first initial integrated tilt rover. This has eliminated the need to look at the bubble. If you've mounted it on an ATV you'll get the correct reading to the ground now. So, you can measure under cars, you can measure building corners. It's certainly going to revolutionize things. Going to turn things over to my colleague, Derek, and he's going to have some things tomorrow on the Pegasus Backpack and a few things. But, great to see you all.

DEREK DEBLOIS: Hello, everyone. Like Don said, I'm from Leica as well. I'm the Reality Capture manager for Eastern Canada. And Reality Capture, essentially, is making an as-built copy of your site so you can do your surveying on the computer. So, there's a few instruments to do that with, and this is the latest scanner, BLK360. I also have a P50 with me at the booth that can scan up to over a kilometer. And I actually scanned yesterday the United States from Canada.

So, I have that data to show you guys. Come see me at the booth. Also, I have the Pegasus Backpack and Pegasus Two to show you guys for the mobile side of Reality Capture. So, looking forward to discussing with you. Thank you.

TYLER KOU: Good morning, everyone, my name is Tyler from Chida Polaris Trading and Consulting Inc. Our company's first time attending this conference. I'm very glad to be here. Our company, Chida Polaris Trading and Consulting Inc., is Canadian owned, Canadian private company, employee owned. So, this company has three categories of business. The first part is geosystem including total station, GPS, UAV, and we also have LiDAR from Airborne LiDAR, mobile LiDAR, terrestrial LiDAR, and navigation LiDAR.

So, the second part of our business is called smart instrumentation. I bring some more stuff here. One of these is good for use of home. I know the land surveyors, majority of time you are going outside in the field, but this one is already integrated

with eyehole and can also can control using your Wi-Fi or Internet. So, you can control your home light or small appliance, you know, without going to the home. So, we are ready in the booth, if you want to see the demo we could show you.

The third part of our business is for the data collection. We provide UAV and LiDAR data collection for the field. Once again, tomorrow, we're going to have a presentation at 4:00 PM. I wish you could come there to have a look at our product line. Thank you very much and have a great show.

PAUL FRANCIS: Good morning, my name's Paul Francis, I'm with Northway Photomap Remote Sensing. I've been a land surveyor for 28 years, I've exhibited here for 33 years, I think you should all know what we do. If you don't, please stop by our booth and we'll have a little discussion. Have a great lunch, thank you.

GEORGE CATCHPOLE: Wow, it's great to be here. I missed last year. I had major heart surgery, but I'm all charged up again and ready to go. I'm George from the Drafting Clinic and have always enjoyed working with everybody and watching everybody mature well. Anyways, we're showing our wide-format solutions, standards, plotters, print-faster, print-smart, print-cheaper. Anyways, come and see us, I'll tell you some stories.

SUSAN KASUMBA: Morning, folks, I'm Susan with Airborne Imaging, the LiDAR mapping company. I also missed last year, I had surgery on my rotator cuff and I'm still healing, but I'm back this year. This is our sixth year doing the show. Airborne Imaging is Canada's largest Airborne LiDAR provider. We have six scanners flying from twin engine fixed-wing aircraft. If you pop by the booth I have some information about our 3,500 square kilometers of LiDAR library data that we have in the GTA area.

We're going to be adding another 1,000 this spring once the last of the snow melts. We also flew OMAFRA's LiDAR project, 35,000 square kilometers. That data is starting to be available on Land Information Ontario. So, if you want to pop by I can show you the project area, you can see if maybe some of the projects that you guys are working on are within OMAFRA's project area. And if you have any questions about LiDAR, I'm happy to answer. Thanks very much.

DAVID PRANGNELL: Hi, everyone, I'm David Prangnell, I'm with MicroSurvey Software. Real quick introduction, this is Brian Sloman, he's also with me here. We've traveled from British Columbia. Brian is our development manager, so he oversees all the new features that go into our software. I think most of you are familiar with what we do so I'm not going to talk your ear off about it. We are hosting an informational session at the vendor's training area tomorrow afternoon, 3:00 after the Convocation Lunch. We're going to be going over what's new in 2017, 2018, and the newer additions of our software, specifically CAD and STAR*NET.

I also want to take that opportunity that if people have ideas or they want to talk about our software, Brian's a great source for information for that because he does oversee what goes into it. So, thank you very much, have a great AGM, and we're really happy to be here again this year.

SEBASTIEN LONG: Hello, everyone, my name is Sebastien Long. I'm representing here the company, Microdrones. So, as the name says, we are a drone manufacturer, or UAV, commonly named. Microdrone has been developing drones since 2005, and I'm here today to show you how accurate and reliable our platform could be. Since we're a manufacturer we also do a lot of R&D, and we've developed a very, very interesting mapping solution for Canada here.

So, if you're interested at learning how to integrate drones into your businesses or already doing work with drones and would like to upgrade your current platform, just let me know. We have a booth here. Thank you very much.

SCOTT PATERSON: Good morning, everyone, my name is Scott Paterson from Tulloch Mapping. I'm out of Ottawa, Ontario. Everybody knows where that beautiful city is. I'm representing our mapping group in Ottawa, as I said. We provide high accuracy mobile LiDAR for engineering grade applications. If you'd like to learn a little bit more about it, I'll be at the booth the next two days and tonight, so stop by and chat.

Most of our applications are oriented towards highway work, railway work, corridor type applications and trying to keep our surveyors off the road and safe. We also do a lot of municipal work for sewers, and water mains, et cetera. So, anything linear, mobile LiDAR does a great job. Our team's been working with LiDAR since 1998 and with mobile LiDAR since 2004, so we've got a wealth of experience if you want to drop by and talk to us. Thank you and have a good day.

MIKE MCMILLAN: Hello, everyone, my name's Mike McMillan, my company's Horizon Measurement Solutions. I started this company three years ago and I'm proud to say last year we surpassed \$1 million in sales. And for us, it's great, and I want to thank everybody in here for that because if it wasn't for you guys we wouldn't be able to do it. So, I'm humbled, I thank you, really appreciate it. Today at 3:00 we're going to be talking about drones and how to apply drones specifically to your business, small survey businesses, large survey business, where to use them, and where not to use them. So, 3:00 today, if you guys could come by it'd be great. Thank you.

CLIFF SHEEHAN: Hi, everybody, nice to see you. My name's Cliff Sheehan with Phoenix Measurement Solutions and we're here promoting Carlson products, robots, Altus by Septentrio, and of course our SitePro line of all the accessories. And I guess the most exciting thing for me right now is this is 10 years.

And kind of a little joke, my accountant said to me the other day, if you can start a business when the recession starts and you have all your hair after 10 years, you're

doing alright. So, that's about it. Anyway, I hope to see everybody. Come on by and we've got some pretty cool deals to celebrate 10 years. Thanks.

GARY ROSEN: Hello, my name's Gary Rosen, I'm the Regional Sales Director for Carlson Software for Canada and very happy to be here. This is my fifth Ontario AGM and my 25th AGM as an exhibitor. So, been thrilled to travel the country and meet all kinds of great people. So, that's my favourite part of my job. If you use Carlson, please stop by, say hello. If you don't use Carlson and have questions, stop by. And if you want to chat about surveying or Carlson, that would be great. If you want to talk about anything else, that would be fine as well.

I am from the States, so people find that out, and they say, so, what's going on down there. So, if you want to talk about that, I'm happy to do that, too. But, have a great conference, and thanks again for the invite.

MURRAY HUNT: Hello, my name is Murray Hunt, I'm with the Canadian UAV Solutions. We're a UAV service provider, we don't sell the drones, we operate them. And our theory is that rather than you have to learn how to fly them and understand rules and regulations, we do all that for you. We're fully certified, Transport Canada insured, everything you need. The only thing you need to know is our phone number and you're good. Thank you.

ANDREW HALL: Hi, everyone, my name is Andrew Hall, I'm the General Manager of Tekmet. So, I had this big, long speech about the iron bars, so how much time do you have? Anyway, thanks for all the business. Thanks for the opportunity of being here. We have a gift today for tonight's welcoming party. So, Tekmet donated a block of SSIBs as part of the package. I hope you've got room in the trunk, okay, so for tonight. No, we'll deliver, okay. So, guys, we also have a house gift for you, you know, for the family and things like that. So, enjoy the show, thanks for everything, bye for now.

ERIC TIMOSHENKO: Hello, everyone, my name's Eric Timoshenko representing Urban X. We work out of Mississauga. We offer utility mapping and subsurface utility engineering services to surveyors. We have several great long-term clients here, of course we'd like to get more. And so, please come and see us at our booth. Thanks a lot.

AMANDA GRAFF: Hello, my name is Amanda Graff. I'm with a company called multiVIEW Locates. We're a utility locating company based in Ontario. We've been in business for 30 years. We also have offices in Kitchener, London, and Ottawa. We do traditional utility locating as well as ground penetrating radar, vacuum excavations, sewer inspections, and concrete scanning.

We work with surveyors to provide subsurface data of what lies beneath their project site, and we also integrate data to produce CAD and GIS maps. And we're booth number 19 if you have any questions. Thank you.

JOHN SINGH: Good morning, everyone, my name is John Singh and I'm with Teranet. I look after a product called GeoWarehouse which many of you already use. Keep in mind we have a training session for GeoWarehouse for up-to-date title data, parcel registers, plan images at 2:00 PM in the Great Hall outside here. If anyone has any questions, please feel free to contact me. We're just behind this wall here, booth number seven. And I'd like to introduce my partner here from Service Ontario, Wanda.

WANDA GRIFFIN: Good morning, everyone, I'm Wanda Griffin, I'm the Deputy Director of Titles with the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services. I'm here today on the request of the Examiner of Surveys, Ken Wilkinson. I'm sitting at a booth with Teranet. I'm here to answer any questions you might have about electronic plan submission. And for those of you who read the e-blast and have their materials to apply for the Ministry authorization part of it, happy to accept your application and review it. Thank you.

ADAM TYLER: Good morning, everybody, my name is Adam Tyler, I work with GeoShack Canada and I am a geo-positioning sales specialist. So, that could cover a range of total stations, GNSS, laser scanners, UAVs. Basically, I'm a portal for more information for you. We like to say we specialize in value driven solutions, so beyond just capturing a point, but more of a field-to-office workflow. So, if you have any questions please stop by, I'd be happy to talk. Thank you.

BRIAN HALL: Good morning, everyone, my name is Brian Hall. Today I'm representing UKKO, an Ag Business and Crop. My background is actually in farming, and agriculture, and consulting, but that's not what I'm here for. But, I would ask you, during lunch time, to give thanks to our Canadian farmers. So, Ag Business and Crop, we're a small business located in Palmerston, and we've been coming to this conference for several years. My cohort has, Jean-Francois Dionne.

And we're pleased to participate in some of the projects and articles of the Association and that. In fact, JF's not here, he'll be here later because he's off helping the Grand River solve an ice-jam problem with one of our solutions. So, we are distributors for SenseFly, for a fixed wing and rotary UAV, and we'd be pleased to talk to you about that. We have RTK/PPK solution.

And what we're most proud of though is our small team of specialists. So, Jean-Francois Dionne is our GIS specialist, so he has quite a few years of experience in the field. And I have 30 years of experience in agriculture, so I specialize in that. And we have a technical specialist. So, we have a full-solution support office located in Palmerston, and we also do a training program. In fact, our training program last week, we were actually training some folks with Transport Canada. And all our units are Transport Canada compliant. If you're not sure what that is and you're interested, stop by our booth. And it's a pleasure to be here and enjoy the conference.

PAT HILLS: Hi, everyone. Wow, it's a lot of surveyors out there. I'm Pat Hills from Cansel, it's nice to see everyone again. I've got Scott Kimura in our booth this week from SolidCAD, which is the Autodesk side of our business, Ken Foster from the wide format side, and of course our geospatial team anxious to show you the SX10 scanning robotic total station from Trimble, the first scanner truly built for surveyors with a survey workflow.

Hockey players out there, meet us tomorrow in the lobby at ten to four and we'll have a bus take us to the rink. You know, we lost Bob Tomlinson this year, and everyone who knows Bob, has a story about Bob. And he played with us a bunch of times, and the last time he played was a few years ago, three years ago in Toronto, and I laced up his skates for him. And in the spirit of Bob Tomlinson I'm going to ask all the hockey players to put your skates on and your equipment on in your hotel room and meet us in the lobby. He actually did that once. So, see you soon.

JULIE BROUGH: Good morning, I'm Julie Brough from Logan Wealth Management. First of all, I'd just like to say how happy both Kimberly and I are to be back this year. We had a great time here last year, and so far, we're having a really great time again this year. Logan Wealth Management is a boutique investment firm that builds customized portfolios for each of our clients. We're dealing primarily with higher net worth families.

We've built a great relationship with some of the land surveyors over the years and we've really enjoyed that. And I'd just like to put out there that part of what we believe in as a company is that it's important for investors to be educated to what's happening in the industry to understand what's happening. So, if anybody has questions, just drop by, ask how something works, how something should work. We're happy to give you unbiased information, no strings attached, and just do what we can to support you and all your successes as investors. Hope you have a great conference and hopefully we'll chat later on. Thanks.

MARK SAMPSON: Hi, everyone, Mark Sampson. I'm the insurance guy from Gallagher. I'm not exhibiting, but I saw an opportunity there was a free microphone, so I thought I'd just come up and say hi to everyone. No, we're the event sponsor for your AGM. We've been the event sponsor for the last many, many years, so we're very pleased about that. The number one question that I've been getting this year is, Mark, are you giving out any cheques this year. And unfortunately, no, I'm not.

Sorry, sorry. I know you guys keep on having claims, so unfortunately, we can't give out any checks. But, I'm just sitting outside the Exhibit Hall here if you have any questions about retirement, or selling your practice, or any general insurance questions. I'm happy to answer them, or if you need to call me directly and we talk at a later time where it's more private, happy to do that as well. So, have a great conference, we'll see you later. Bye.

NEIL ORMEROD: Good morning, my name is Neil Ormerod, this is my second AGM. My first one was in 1976 as a student from Erindale College. Some of you might be looking at me now and wondering how did he manage to do that? But, I am a survey instructor at the Centre of Geographic Sciences in Lawrencetown, Nova Scotia. And I believe that there is a shortage of qualified technologists and technicians across Canada.

We believe that we have the best program in Canada for survey engineering technologists. And if you'd like me to prove that to you, I would like to see you at 1:00 at the Exhibitors display area and we will prove why we have the best program in Canada. Thank you very much for your time.

GORDON GOOD: Good morning, my name's Gordon Good, and I am the Chair of your Committee called the Archival and Historical Committee. We're just outside the doors and the staff has put a lot of work into the display, so I hope you will drop around and take a look at it. We meet once a month, usually, and at 1043. And during that meeting we are blessed by having Blain drop in and have a bite of lunch with us.

But, the last couple of times, Blain has had a very perplexed look on his face. So, you see, Blain, it's like this, a herd of buffalo can only move as fast as the slowest, and when a herd is hunted, it is the slowest and the weakest ones at the back that are killed. The natural selection is good for the herd as a whole because the general speed and health of the whole group keeps improving by regular killings of the weakest. In much the same way the human brain can only operate as fast as its slowest brain cells. Excessive intake of alcohol, as we all know, kills brain cells, but naturally it attacks the slowest and the weakest.

In this way, regular consumption of beer eliminates the weaker brain cells, making the brain faster and a more efficient machine. That's why, Blain, you always feel smarter after a few beers. Have a good meeting, everyone.

RON BERG: Alright, great job. We almost made it at noon, and as long as Mr. Hogan doesn't talk too much longer you'll have lunch in no time. So, I can say that, he's my former boss, so I can rip him a little.

RUSS HOGAN: Yeah, yeah. Okay, I would like to thank all the exhibitors for joining us at our AGM. A special thank you to the returning exhibitors, and a very warm welcome to exhibitors who are new this year. I encourage everybody to spend time and visit with our exhibitors, and of course tonight at the Exhibitors' Welcoming Party.

Refreshments will be available in the Exhibit Hall throughout the course of the meeting. Lunch today will be available in the Exhibit Hall, and there's also an eating area in the Exhibit Hall. So, take some time and have some conversations during lunch.

Our Keynote Speaker Session will begin immediately after lunch at 1:00, please be back in the room prior to 1:00. Vendor Sessions will be held, as a number have mentioned, out in the draped area just down the hallway here. Drop by for a 45 minute session, and I believe there's a sign up or the presentation schedule is posted out in that area as well. So, that's it, thank you very much, enjoy your lunch and we'll see you back here at 1:00.

--Upon Resuming

KEYNOTE SPEAKER'S ADDRESS:

RUSS HOGAN: So, anyways, I think we're up and running now and welcome back. Just a quick reminder to turn your phones off. \$100 for any device that makes any sort of sound. At this time I am very pleased to introduce the Keynote Session speaker, Eric Termuende. Termuende, I should say. Eric is here today to talk about the evolution of technology, communication, and work. A bestselling author, speaker, and entrepreneur, Eric is cofounder of Now! Innovations and has been featured in Forbes, Inc., Thrive Global, Huffington Post, and many others.

In 2015 Eric was recognized as one of the top 100 emerging innovators under 35, globally, by American Express and is a former Canadian G20 YEA delegate representing Canada in Sidney in 2014. Eric is currently signed by the National Speakers Bureau and travels the world talking about the future of work and multiple generations in the workplace. In 2016 Eric spoke at the TEDxBCIT in Vancouver giving his presentation entitled, Bigger Than Work.

His new bestselling book, Rethink Work, is now available on Amazon and in bookstores across Canada. Please welcome to the stage Eric Termuende.

--The Proceedings Opened with a video presentation

ERIC TERMUENDE (video narration): No longer taking steps, but leaps forward. The world is more noisy than it has ever been before, and technology's evolving fast. How are we telling stories not just to attract people, but the right people? How do we articulate our culture, find purpose in the work we do, and deal with Millennials? We hear about authenticity, transparency, culture, and fit, but what does it mean as the world that we live in changes so fast?

ERIC TERMUENDE: The conversation about the future of work is bigger than just Millennials and varying generations and spans wider than technology. It's about people, belonging, community, and creating a life each of us can enjoy living to the work that we do.

Perfect, thank you so much for having me. Absolutely great to be back here in Niagara Falls talking about something that I'm incredibly passionate about, and that

is the future of our workplace; that is building community that is attracting and retaining talent. Now that work is bigger than anything it's ever been before, it's not this transactional 9:00 to 5:00 experience. It's more all-encompassing than it's ever been.

When I look at this room, when I look at the engagement, when I look at the Exhibitor's Hall just across that platform there, it's incredible just to see the engagement, to see how lively everyone is, and to see how much bigger this association, this career, and this profession is than just that transactional experience. Quick show of hands, how many people are here for something more than just a paycheck, right, in this career? It took a second, but we managed to get some participation there.

How many people here feel like they belong, feel like they're part of a real community here? Like they've got some friends here, right? And I think that this is so important when we talk about the future of work, because what we've got here is so exemplary of a community, right. And I think that we need to be talking about that a little bit more. So, over the next 45, 50 minutes, what I want to talk to you about is the evolution of technology, the importance of community, and this, I would say ambiguous, conversation around culture, all framed around people.

We heard Russ and Blain in the group talk this morning about high school, about post-secondary school and how we can attract people to this group. I think the number was about 382 of the 500 members are here this week in Niagara. That is absolutely incredible and a real testament to what you as a community have built for yourselves and for your organization around you. And I think that we can really carry this on.

What I want to talk about first is the evolution of the workplace, the evolution of work. I was reading a book just last week that said about 300 years ago 98% of the workforce was involved in some capacity with agriculture, with harvesting or with food in some capacity or another. Now, today, fast forward, about 2% of the global population is involved with the harvesting or the creation of food, yet we're producing more food than we ever have before.

And when we look at the evolution of technology since then, just in 300 years, it's incredible to see what we can accomplish. I mean, take a look in the Exhibitor's Hall, what we saw just before lunch up at the stage here. The speed that we're changing the technology that we have access to is unprecedented. The Internet as we know it today is just at its infancy. We're seeing about eight billion connected devices right now, and by 2020 that number will hit about 50. So, we're seeing this exponential increase in technology.

Now, the question is, is how has the way that we communicate, the way that we interact, and the way that we associate ourselves with the people around us changed in that time. And I think we're going to find some interesting things because when

we look at the beginning of work, I often point to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. And when we look at the hierarchy of needs just 300 years ago, at the base of the hierarchy are the things that we need to survive, ultimately.

We have biological and physical needs; so food, shelter, water, that's it. If we've got those three things we can survive. Shortly after that, or right above it, becomes our safety needs. If we're feeling safe, we can be a little bit better. We're a little bit better off, we can be a little bit more efficient and effective. And shortly after that, but still incredibly important, is this sense of belonging, and love needs. And unfortunately, I'm a little bit negative about where we're at today because I believe as a society we've actually peaked in our sense of belonging with the people around us.

Now, again, we rewind about 300 years ago, think about how far we transported ourselves. We wouldn't be coming from Thunder Bay to Niagara Falls for an annual meeting, that's for sure. We wouldn't be coming from, likely, even Toronto to Niagara Falls. Our communities or tribes who we associated ourselves with were a lot smaller. We might have had 10 or 20 great friends. And now we look at social media, our rolodex, our email, our client list, whatever that might be, those numbers are in the thousands, right?

And I look at the number of, especially in the States, at how often we're using this technology, how often we're on these devices. Now, on average we check our phones 85 times a day. This is incredible stuff. I looked at a major American study, we're spending between three and a half and four hours a day on our cell phones. In the corporate world that's 10 hours a day in front of a screen. I think this is really interesting because when they asked people how many times they check their phone on a daily basis, they said about half that. They said about 40.

And the reason is, is because it's so habitual now, we'll just check and we don't even know it anymore. We don't even realize how much we're utilizing this technology. And it's incredible because I was looking at a Harvard Business Review study that came out in October, just in 2017 and it said that 40% of corporate America is now feeling alone. I thought that was pretty fascinating. As a result, there are real health implications because of this, too. The health implications of being alone are the equivalent, according to this Harvard Business Review study, of smoking 15 cigarettes a day.

And that's incredible stuff because we attribute this technology - now, I'm primarily talking the way that we communicate, not the similar technology that we're talking about across the room. When we use this technology to communicate, we like to think that we're more efficient, we're more productive, we're more effective. But then, I've come to realize that we can be living in a society today where we can go the whole day without interacting with anyone.

You know, I was walking through Pearson Airport, I was looking at the fast food joints, as you know, you go from gate, to gate, to gate all the way out to baggage claim, and the fast food joints have the screens that you don't even have to interact with the person at the fast food counter for 30 seconds for, right? You can go home and open, like, Uber Eats or some sort of food delivery and you just wait for your food to land on the doorstep and open it up from there. You can even get groceries and things delivered now to the point where you can just date, pretty much, while you're lying on the couch and swiping left to right on some sort of online dating profile.

This is real, and this is the advancement of technology which we often attribute to be really positive. And it is. But I also believe that the way that we actually have this sense of belonging and the sense of community, the importance of events like this and bringing our teams together, is greater now than it's ever been before. Because in many cases we don't actually have that human component of work, like we used to. That's where the opportunity is.

I think the opportunity is to create the sense of belonging. And when we look at news articles, whether it be the Globe and Mail, the Financial Post, CNN, ABC, whatever it might be, we often hear about these grossly generalized statistics about generations, about sexes, about ethnicities that allow us, or at least invite us, to consider that there are supreme generalizations of people that may be right, but perhaps when we're looking at the Land Surveying Association or just land surveying as a career, this doesn't apply to us.

Doesn't apply to necessarily Millennials, or males, or females, or aboriginals, or caucasians. What we need to be looking at is understanding who we are both as people and as organizations, and really harvesting a sense of belonging so that we can spread that into our community so that we can get people in high school, so that we can get people in post-secondary school, so we can get people who are mid-career and looking for a transition into our organizations. Not because it's something to do, because it's a community to belong in, and something we feel we can have impact or we can make a difference. And hey, you know what, maybe we can make a paycheck along the way as well.

When we look at the beginning of work 300 years ago, we get to what I call the legacy of work. You know, this is that "Mad Men" era, check in, check out; literally punch the clock. And in some cases, this still exists. And there's nothing wrong with that. This is just how it was, especially because of technology and the inability to work outside of these office hours. When we look at the legacy of work in our lives, our work day was really, was quite structured, right?

We slept, we prepped for work on average, statistically I think it's a 24-minute commute to work. We obviously get ready, prepare our lunches, shower, you know, get dressed, everything else. And then we work, we've got lunch, we've got our transit time, we go home. And from there, you know, we'll go to our kid's soccer

practice, watch the news, read our book, Netflix, whatever that might be. We've got a pretty structured day Monday to Friday, 9:00 to 5:00, right? And this is, you know, rewind 50, 60 years ago.

What I've come to notice though is in about from the 2000 and .com era, what we're looking at is this change in technology, and a vast difference in how we communicate, and in turn how we're working. So, this picture really exemplifies that.

From 2005 to 2013 - now, before anyone thinks this is, like, a One Direction concert or, like, a Justin Bieber concert or anything like that, this is actually at Saint Peter's Square to see the Pope.

And we often attribute this next generation to be digitally native, totally tech-savvy, but dependent, addicted to this technology. And while I think we can generalize to say that -- I mean, the analogy that I would kind of say is, like, smoking is an older generation thing and that younger people don't do it, and it's not really right in either case. I mean, we might sway one direction or the other, but we can't really limit technology to anyone. I mean, I'm seeing cell phones on tables and seeing cell phones in hands, it's truly changed the way that we live from 2005 to 2013. The same picture.

I was speaking for an agriculture meeting in Mississauga in December, and the gentleman before me was speaking, he said, we actually work less than we ever have before. And the funny thing about his chart is that it ended at the year 2000. And I'm thinking here, I'm thinking back, Googling on my phone using LTE service in the back of the room, what was the technology in the year 2000. And if anyone remembers - I'm sure most of us do and many of us had one - it was a PalmPilot that came out in 1998.

And what was fascinating about that to me is I Googled what was the memory or the capacity of a PalmPilot. And Google immediately, as I'm sitting in the back of the room thinking the irony of the situation, said that it was a 512 kilobyte memory on the PalmPilot. Now, the iPhone X or the Samsung, the new S9 I believe is coming out soon, they just announced it, but the capacity on these things is about 524 gigabytes. Now, again, real-time I'm texting my brother who can help me with the math, I was like, how many times bigger is 524 gigabytes than 512 kilobytes.

The number that he sent back - and I asked him to check again - was 1 million 48 thousand times the memory, the capacity. Now, when I look at the Apollo 11 space shuttle, 1969, that space shuttle had two 68 kilobyte computers. An iPhone 5 has 250 thousand times the space that these computers that took a shuttle to the moon did, and we're saying that we're working less and have more limitations than we had before. It's not really true, right.

And I think that when we look at technology today, we look at how it's changing our lives and how we're communicating, it's unprecedented. The iPhone came out 11 years ago this year. We talked about Facebook, LinkedIn, any of the social medias didn't exist, for all intents and purposes about 10, 11 years ago, yet how we communicate even via email, Slack if we've got that, has changed fundamentally in that time. I think as a result how we work, why we work, and when we work, has too.

Now, when we talk about the future of work, I think the future of work, this whole conversation around the future of work is really interesting because we were almost promised that the future of work meant that we could delegate, we could hand things off, robots, artificial intelligence, machine learning, whatever that might be would all but completely do our jobs for us. We could work a four-day work week; we could work less. We could pretty much just mail it in to the Bahamas and watch things get done for us while that's the case.

And unfortunately, that's not the reality of where we're at. It might be one day, but it's not here today. Because today, we can work from more places, more times of the day, on more devices than we ever could before. And so, we look at this technology, it's incredible even in 2016 how much information was transferred across the web. A Cisco study came out and they said that we'd entered the Zettabyte Era.

Now, a zettabyte is a thousand, thousand, thousand, thousand, thousand megabytes. If someone's taking a picture of the slide, feel free, both three megabytes per picture. So, the amount of information that was transferred across the web in 2016 alone was the equivalent of 250 billion DVDs. Incredible stuff. I just bought concert tickets the other day - we can talk about concerts in technology in a minute - but they offered to send a hard copy of the CD as well. I don't even know what to do with it, you know, I just said send it to a friend.

You know, we don't even talk in terms of DVDs anymore, yet the technology and how fast it evolved from VHS, to Blu-ray, to DVD, now to Netflix, online streaming, whatever that might be, there's no hard copy of the material that we download anymore, which is incredible stuff. And so, when we talk about work/life balance, which I think we've been talking about for quite some time now, work/life balance implies there's kind of an equilibrium. There's work and there's life. And I think we're at a point now where technology allows us to do so much more work from so many more places that they're integrated.

That it's not just about work and life anymore, it's about life and work's a part of it. Now, there are going to be organizations in here, Exhibitors across the hall who will say, no, we've got a 9:00 to 5:00 and after that our employees are encouraged to go home and spend time with their families. I say, fantastic, tell that story, attract those people because there are going to be other organizations in here that are going to be far more digital that would expect a reply maybe at 6:30 in the morning and, you

know, maybe a call at 8:30 at night, or maybe some weekend time and opportunities. To them I say, great.

Because we'll talk about it soon, but a universal best culture doesn't exist, even when it comes to land surveying, even when it comes to the association and the membership here. One culture that works for you and your people is exactly the story that we should be telling, instead of trying to fit this mold that is the Google mold, or the Facebook mold, the kegs and the Ping-Pong tables. These work for the people that enjoy it and doesn't at all and totally falls flat for those it doesn't.

So, when we look at this evolution of technology we look at the traditional structure of a day, technology allows us to work, again, more places, more times of the day, using more devices than we ever have before. And this is where the opportunity lies for us as organizations who are trying to attract and retain talent, to differentiate who we are. This is the opportunity to realize that the things that make us different when it comes to the war on talent are the things that are actually our competitive advantage.

Because I've worked with FPAC, Forest Products Association, worked with the BC government, in apparel, worked in construction, worked in financial institutions, they're all fighting the same thing. Forestry is 60 thousand people short by 2020. Mining in just British Columbia, 22 thousand people short. Apparel just in British Columbia alone, 75 hundred people short. All asking the same questions, how do we now attract this millennial, this high school student, this person who doesn't understand the work that we do and the impact that we have in order to make them realize that now we've got this fulfilling career where you can make an impact; you can and do make a difference, and you can be a part of this community?

Well, we look at Instagram and we look at these pictures, we look at social media, and I think it's a funny conversation that we're having right now because people like to think that grass is always greener on the other side. We've got this beautiful, articulate marketing document that talks about the perks, that talks about the traits, that talks about the benefits of working at this company, that talk about what the company does but not at all about the lifestyle as a result of the company. I think that's where the opportunity is.

Because when we look at this technology, when we look at the speed and rate that things are changing in the palm of our hands, I wonder, in a work that's increasingly connected, are we connecting more and more? Or really are we connecting less and less? And I really want us to consider that when we're moving forward and when we're looking to attract people. I mean, I was speaking in Los Angeles last year and Kobe Bryant was right before me, and he had just finished his incredible career, 20 years in the NBA. And the question that he was asked that really stuck out to me is, Kobe, "What was going through your head when you were taking that last shot?"

He had scored 60 points in his last game and, you know, the person who was

interviewing him wanted to know what was going through your head. And his response took me by surprise. But, he said, his response was, “Damn, that’s a lot of cell phones.” Because if you think about it, the people that were watching him are no longer watching, they’re filming, right. They’ve all got their cameras, they’re all taking a look at this, and nobody’s watching anymore.

And I’ve come to find that this is so relatable in most of the things we do. Going back to the concert example, how many people have been to a concert and seen the six rows in front of them not watching the concert, but recording the concert? How many people have recorded that concert themselves and then realized you never watched the video after and you missed the concert in the first place, right? I actually think that when we’re looking at the news and we look at how we’re absorbing or understanding information, I’ve noticed - I’ll use myself as an example - I’ve noticed significant decline in the depth of knowledge that I have. And it’s something I’m working on every day.

Because if I go to Financial Post, then Globe and Mail, then CBC, then CNN, then not Fox, then ABC, then BNN, and I keep looking at this news, then Facebook, then Instagram, then all the social medias, great, I find myself going back to the first one 10 minutes later and it’s got a whole new set of information. I’ve read 150 headlines and I don’t understand a thing about what’s going on, right? Because I’ve come to realize that in many cases, we don’t look at information to understand it, we look at information to relay it.

We all want to be the storytellers, we all want to be the person that has that information, and we all want to lead this conversation. Now, how does this apply back to what we’re talking about? Well, I think that what happens is, we get and recite such catchy, wordy headlines that grab people, and we fail to articulate what the true experience is. Again, I’ll say that perks attract talent, but experience keeps them. We’re living in a day in an age where upwards of 80% in the next five years of information that will be absorbed will be through video.

And the potential of this video in terms of storytelling, in terms of using our people as examples and understanding the life that they live is incredible. And this is where the opportunity lies. Because when we look at the now of work, the now of work is a blend between this future of work, artificial intelligence, all the technology that we see across the room, all the ways that we can communicate differently via Slack, via different groups in the field at the time from the office. I mean, it’s real time, it’s so fast and we take it for granted, that we don’t even really consider it anymore.

But, the beauty that I see in the Land Surveying Association, in your organizations, is you’ve got such a harmony of technology, and that legacy piece. That piece where tradition is important, where history is important, where the Great Lengths book outside, this stuff is incredibly important. And while we might not be trying to attract the people that spend 10 hours a day on the screen, three and a half hours a day on the cell phone, 12 years of their lives just looking at cat videos on YouTube,

we're not looking at those people. And truthfully, we don't need to worry about it.

Because while the scope of people may narrow, the quality of people will get much, much, much deeper. How do we understand that? We take our A players, or our people that really exemplify who are companies are and tell their story. And, no, it's not about hiring a \$50,000 media company. I'm talking, like, back of the phone, iPhone videos that talk about a day in the life of. Because I don't think we need to be talking exclusively about a job description anymore. What I'd like to see more of is a life description as a result of the job.

What time do you get to work? How long is your commute? How often do you meet with your superior? What does your office look like? Are you in the field primarily? Is it open-office concept? Is it cubicle? How many overtime hours do you work? How many times have you left the province, or the country in the past few years? What are all these things that will differentiate our organizations from the next so that when people are looking not just to build a career, but to build a life, that that opportunity might be right in front of them?

And if it's not, well, you don't want somebody who's going to be applying for that opportunity and leave 10 months later. The analogy that I heard from one of our engineering clients is that they watch a Toyota drive into their garage - Toyota meaning a junior or a recent hire, mid-career transition, doesn't matter - they watch a Toyota drive into their garage, they spend eight, ten months tuning them up, and watch a Ferrari drive out 10 months later.

And the reason for this, the reason why this happens, and we talk about tenure, and attrition, even with the people that are training is, I don't think we're telling the right story. I mean, you might find someone that leaves one company that's in this room, that might never actually have been a fit for that company in the first place. Maybe it was somebody else that was in this room that they were supposed to be a part of all along. Maybe the person that left that other company should have been part of your company, and I don't know if we're telling that story enough.

Because it's not just about what we do, I think it's about how we do it. Why we do it, and who we do it with. And so, we talk about the now work, we talk about this evolution of technology, we talk about the future of communication, truthfully this will impact everyone. And it already has, it already does. It's everyone in this room and it's everyone that's not. And so, when I talk about the future of work, yes, there's going to be incredible technological advancements.

We don't know it's coming, and I promise it's going to be incredible. But I think when we're looking to build and maintain powerful organizations, it starts and ends with people. What we can do with the right people on board is truly incredible. So, when we talk about communication and how we're really looking to connect with our people, I think the best advice is that, in order to speed up, in many cases we actually need to slow down.

We need to see the lights in people's eyes. We need to understand where they're coming from. We need to make sure that in a world where you can, in some cases, go a full day without interacting with people, that there is opportunity to really connect, right? Because I think that people don't change from generation to generation; but the world around us certainly does. So, when we talk about people, we talk about this next generation, I'm often asked to speak a little bit about Millennials.

Now, as soon as I say Millennials, eyes glaze over. It's like, no, we've heard this before. Not again. And so, I'm going to come at it from a slightly different angle. I'm going to come at it from hopefully a fresh perspective that nobody's heard before. And what I want to start by saying that this conversation isn't new. And I don't mean new in that you've heard it a hundred times before. I mean, it's not new in terms of, like, the Time cover new, right.

And the new Time cover's coming. I'm not sure what it's going to be, but we've got Gen X, Gen Y, Gen Z, so I'm assuming it's, like, the battery generation. Maybe, like, A, AA, AAA. I don't know what they're called next, but it's coming. But, it's not new, okay. So, this quote that I want to share with you, the children now have luxury. They have bad manners, contempt for authority. They show disrespect for elders, and love chatter in the place of exercise.

Anyone want to throw a hand up and let me know who this is? I hear mumbles, but I'm not sure. It's Socrates. Right, so, you know, a couple thousand years older than anyone here. I've got one more for you. This one's a little bit more wordy; so buckle-up for this one.

Today, suddenly, because all the peoples of the world are part of one electronically based intercommunicating network, young people everywhere share a kind of experience that none of the elders ever had or will have. Conversely, the older generation will never see repeated in the lives of young people their own unprecedented experience of sequentially emerging change. This break between generations is wholly new, planetary and universal.

So, it might be a little bit tougher. The point is, Margaret Mead said this in 1969, right. We're talking the same time that those two 68 kilobyte computers went to the moon. And I think here, what I'm trying to get across is that, in no stage of the human experience will we understand our younger brothers, and cousins, and nephews, and nieces, and everything else. It's going to be different. And what I believe, again, is that people don't change from generation to generation, but the world around them certainly does.

I mean, when we grew up in the back of cars, we read books, or we had our parents talk and sing songs with us. Now, when my younger brother grew up he had a Gameboy, as many of our kids or friends did. My younger cousin had, like, this PlayStation. The one after that had the screen on the back of the headrest where

they could watch stuff, or the fold down. And now, they're doing, like, 4G, LTE Mario Kart Racing somewhere down the QEW against someone who's driving 120 kilometers right beside them.

And the world has changed significantly. Now, even when we talk about movies and DVDs, we go from, like, VHS which was around for a while, and then we get to, like, DVD and Blu-ray, and then that happened, that was fast. I still see some of my friends with DVD collections and not even a DVD player. I wonder, you know, how they even get to watch these things. So, when we talk about this generational conversation I think it's kind of funny because what I've come to realize is that these generations are kind of glorified clubs a little bit.

Because when we look at this connected generation we'll see that, you know, 85% of the workforce could actually be this millennial type individual. We've got the Gen Zed or Gen Zers who are already now entering the workforce, you know, roughly two years ago. We've got these Gen Xers who think they're, you know, digitally savvy, you know, digitally native, you know, really hip and in, and they're of like Millennials, too. And then we've got this, like, Millennial generation, they're, like, narcissistic, job-hopping, not loyal, basement-dwelling Xbox-playing, Netflix-watching, you know, people that live in their parent's basements, right?

Or, they're those people who don't put their work down; who don't take holidays; who burn-out because they're going so hard. And there's nothing really in the middle. And I kind of think, like, you know, is there really any difference between these groups? Now, I even like to wonder how are we defining these generations? I'm just going to throw it out there, what year, what was the time span, what year was a Millennial born? No right answers, no wrong answers, can I just have a couple of people, like, what do you think? '83 until '96, '99.

Can I just have a couple more numbers thrown out? 2000. When did they start then? '85, yeah. I mean, interesting. So, we're hearing '80s to 2000-ish, right. And my point around this whole generational conversation is that how can we so broadly generalize and stereotype a generation that we can't really define? I went back to my trusty source, Wikipedia, and I Googled what year was a Millennial born, and it had about nine or ten different sources. MetLife, PwC, Deloitte, whatever that might be, because each group will define it a little bit different.

And the time span that this ranged was from 1977 to the year 2010. I'm thinking that's half of the Canadian population, right. Like, how do possibly generalize that many people? When I talk about a Millennial I'm talking roughly - and again, just for consistency purposes - 1980 to 1995. And if that's the case, in Canada alone we're talking seven and a half million people, 21% of the Canadian population. Now, just like any generation, you're going to see the people that are working hard, you're going to see the people that are really lazy and don't really care all that much; you're going to see the people who kind of fit somewhere in the middle. And so, when I look at this generational conversation, I get that there are

differences in people that were born 70 years ago versus today. I get that there are differences in the Woodstock generation versus Seattle grunge scene, versus Harry Potter, versus whatever the negative thing is now, pick one. And what I'm trying to say is that these are kind of inaccurate, inefficient ways to group people, right? And so, when we look at how this has come to be, I think this is actually really importing - is anyone familiar with Moore's law? I'm sure a lot of people in tech here are.

But, Moore's law basically states that every 18 months the sophistication of technology doubles as the price halves. So, if anyone's seen a memory card, or a thumb disk, or a USB drive in the last 10 years you get it because I've seen a microSD that's smaller than my thumbnail that's got 256 gigabytes on it. You know, one of those SanDisk that we used to put in the digital camera that we don't have anymore, one terabyte big. You know, Google just gives us 15 gigabytes, here take it and then we'll go from there.

And so, what Moore's law is saying is that every 18 months, the sophistication of technology doubles as its price halves. Now, I was taking this and I was trying to apply this to this generational conversation, and I think I made a connection. Because when I was exploring this I discovered something called the knowledge doubling curve. And the knowledge doubling curve is a Buckminster Fuller and Systems theory that says, before 1900, okay, the amount of information that we as people had access to, doubled every 100 years.

Okay, so, from 1700 to 1800 the amount of information that we as humans knew, doubled. Didn't mean we were twice as smart as individuals, we as humans, but we knew double. From 1700 to 1800 it doubled, from 1800 to 1900 it doubled. And then, after 1900 it doubled at a halved rate, okay. So, from 1900 to 1950, the amount of information that we had access to doubled. From 1950 to '75 it doubled again. From '75 to '88 it doubled again, to '93 it doubled again, to the point in 2016 where IBM said that the amount of information that we as people have access to doubles every 13 months. Crazy.

And so, when I'm thinking about this, the knowledge doubling curve, and then I'm thinking about generations which are roughly 15-year cohorts. We've got Traditionalists, Boomers, Gen X, Gen Y, Gen Z, Millennials, I think we can change this. Because what these generational cohorts don't take into consideration is how fast the world around us is moving. I think it's actually a little bit outdated. So, my theory, and we've got to pay close attention to this one, if there's one minute that I want you to really get it's this one.

If the world around us is changing at this exponential rate, okay, Moore's law, IBM, like, we have so much accessibility to information and it's changing so fast, my theory is that the timespan a generation occupies should actually shrink, at an inverse rate to the amount of information that's increasing. We've got it here. I'll say it one more time. If the world around us, if the technology and the amount of information that we know - we talk about going from VHS to Netflix, we talk about

going from a book in the back of a car to 3G, 4G, 5G, LTE, how fast that's changed - my theory is that a timespan a generation occupies should actually shrink at the same but an inverse rate.

And if that's the case, a Millennial might only be a two-year cohort, a Gen Zer might only be a one-year cohort because the world around us is changing so fast. But, what doesn't change is, again, who we are as people. We talk about Maslow's hierarchy of needs, we need this belonging, we need this respect, we need this acknowledgement, we need this appreciation. And what I'm saying is that it's just changed. It's not that we need any more or less of it. That used to be a double pat on the back saying, great job, Eric, and now it might be a one-line text or an email, great job, Eric.

Or, we need to talk, and immediately I think, I'm getting canned-- when really it's just like, we need to talk about the next event that we're hosting and we'd like your help planning it, right. And so, technology has really changed the depth that we communicate. And so, when we're trying to attract Millennials, Gen Z, high school students, what I really want to stress is that it's not about trying to appeal to this demographic, so much as it is about appealing to the individual.

So, a good friend of mine, David Allison, he's produced some incredible research that he called value graphics. And over the past two years he's done 60 thousand surveys across Canada and the United States, which is statistically relevant to represent both countries. And what he found is that if you took, let's just say, every Baby Boomer in this room, they would have 13% of their values, wants, needs, and expectations correlated, right, in terms of what they value after work, what they like to do on the weekends, what really makes them tick. Now, if you took certain variables like creativity, like anti-materialism, like the willingness to move, and you use these as our focal point - so, what I'm talking about basically is the lifestyle that we've got as a result of the job, specifically in land surveying - that we could actually group people with 700% more effectiveness.

Or, we could align people to 89% of their values, wants, needs, and expectations if we took that value component like creativity. So, if people identify themselves to be creative in this room and grouped them together, what we would find is that a lot of their other values align, too. Whereas if we just took males, or we just took females, or we just took people between 50 and 75, or 35 and 50, the commonality between those people would be far less than if we talked about who they are. So, what I'd like to offer is that perhaps, it's not what we are that we're trying to attract, perhaps we're not trying to attract Millennials, or Gen Z, or males or females-- what we're trying to attract is a value set. And while we might often be talking about what we do in terms of the work that we're doing, I think what we need to be talking more about is why, how, and who we're doing it with. Because the research shows that if we're starting to tell stories based on people that are in our organizations, the effectiveness in attracting like-minded, like-valued people, but also having that relatability component is far greater than it ever has been before.

And so, when we look at a job description today, what I'm seeing a lot of is that the job description is primarily a skills and requirements checklist, right? Do you have this education, do you have these skills, do you have this many years' experience, do you have these requirements? Yep, yep, yep, yep, yep. Are you a good communicated, motivated team player who's driven to succeed? Yep, yep, yep, yep, yep. Well, come on in for an interview and let's have a chat, right.

What I'd like to see instead is, again, more of a lifestyle description that will actually vet people out that don't want that experience, that will differentiate our organizations from the next, because we understand that our differentiators will be our competitive advantage. So, what happens in this process is it shifts from a requirements checklist to a value proposition document. And by no means am I suggesting that we cater to or accommodate to anyone, right? It's not about how do we put a smile on these Millennials' faces, how do we make sure that we're this and that to everything?

Because what I've found is, that when we try and be everything to everyone, we become nothing to anyone, right? And so, it's not about trying to have the components that Google, or Facebook, or Netflix, or whatever the tech giants in the Silicon Valley have. I mean, if that's what our people are really aligned with, maybe that's the case, but the more we can understand our people in the environment that we created for them, the better the opportunity is, right?

But, what I would challenge you in not doing - and this happened to me. One of my friends went to Thailand - is just putting a postcard on as a job description. And the example here is that one of my friends went to Thailand last year and I got a postcard in the mail. I'm living in Vancouver and I got it in February, so of course I'm looking outside, it's pouring rain, and it has been for three or four months. And I'm looking at this postcard, you know, envy, jealousy, and I'm just thinking, oh, you know, I wish I was there. Thinking the grass is greener, wherever we're not, essentially.

But, she came back and we had a conversation and I said, you know, how was the trip? And she said, well, you know, it wasn't that great. It rained 10 of the 12 days. My friend that I was traveling with, rolled her ankle, and when we were taking the bus into Koh Phangan we had a flat tire about a kilometer out which was, you know, far enough to be a pain, but not too far to not walk in. I mean, they were almost there, right?

So, they hobbled into the hotel which was then overbooked, and then they went to the hostel and then they realized there were 16 beds in a, you know, very small room, and of course it smelled bad. And it wasn't the experience that they had signed up for. And I have come to realize that all of our dissatisfaction comes from not fulfilled expectations, right? But, what I'm seeing in this postcard, what I saw from that trip is just the 2% of how incredible it could be, or how incredible it was promised to be, and not what the real experience was.

And what I've come to realize is that this postcard is our dating profiles, our social media accounts, our job descriptions. It's everything we want people to think we are. It's almost this façade of the best version of ourselves. And if we can strip this postcard and start talking about the real experiences, the good, the bad, and the ugly, and what it takes to be successful in the job, including the things that actually make us have to work hard, including some of the conflicts that we're working through, including some of the difficulties in terms of, perhaps the site that you're working on today, or that time, or for the next little while, these things are important, because expectations are managed and disappointment is not realized.

I think that's important because then we can have this sense of belonging proactively. And the opportunity here is pretty incredible. But then, of course being in Canada, living in Vancouver and looking at this glorification of entrepreneurship, and looking at, you know, whether it be Niagara, Toronto, or wherever we are in the province, or even in the country, I'm seeing these group fitness classes are going up like crazy. You know, whether it's cycling, Zumba, yoga, dance, pick something, they're doing extremely well right now.

And so is this idea, or glamorization, if that's even the word I can use-- of entrepreneurship. Now, when I looked at the 2014 US Census, the idea of entrepreneurship was at a 20-year high. The population or the portion of startups in the US economy was actually at a 20-year low in terms of them being successful. Now, when I look at these group classes, they're going up like crazy. And I'm trying to think, is there even a connection between the two of them. And what I've come to realize, again, using my experiences as a case study, is that when I'm going to these group classes, it's the only time in the day, the only time in the day where I take my phone, turn it off, and put it in the locker for an hour.

Right? And for that hour there's nothing that's distracting, there's nothing that's taking my mind away from the experience that I've got with the people that are there. Now, when I look at the start-up community, when I look at entrepreneurship, and realizing what entrepreneurship isn't, what it is, sexy as the idea of entrepreneurship, what is that then? And to me, that was the ability to work with people to solve problems, to get our hands dirty, to be heard, to actually get these problems fixed together.

And so, what I've come to realize about this fitness side of things, is that I'm almost going so far as suggesting, that the fitness component of this is a by-product, the feeling of connection and the experience that we got with people. Now, I don't know if anyone's watched a movie with their husband, or wife, or daughters, or friends, or girlfriends, or boyfriends, and the other person is on a cell phone. I mean, a movie watching is supposed to be a personal experience, right. It's just you and the TV and whoever's there. But then, when I see a funny part that's happening and I'm laughing to myself and the person beside me missed it, like, you missed it.

And I'm realizing that this experience isn't really with another person at all, right?

And so, when we've got this opportunity to be innovative and entrepreneurial, or just to solve problems amongst our teams, it might mean stripping technology for an hour. It might mean closing off the Wi-Fi or you're sitting in a room that doesn't actually have connectivity so that we can solve problems, so that we can replicate this idea of connectivity and belonging. That we can actually slowdown in order to create this better sense of community, which I think is so important.

And so, we've talked a lot about values, experiences, and feelings, and I think that if we start to incorporate these in our job descriptions and start using these in the stories that we're telling and the videos that we're using to attract not just the next generation but a certain group of people that value the lifestyle that we as a group have, the opportunities, they're endless. And so, when we talk about culture, the last thing that I really want to touch on is best culture.

And there are going to be companies in this room that are on those best managed companies, best places to work, top cultures, you know, whatever that might be. And for those who are, first of all, I congratulate you, that is a really big accomplishment, especially in a Province such as this. Now, what I will say though is that a universal best culture doesn't exist. Inc. magazine, Fortune magazine, they always do their top lists, and last year Google was featured as the number one company in the United States, and number two was Wegmans grocery chain, similar to Safeway, right.

And what I've come to realize is that a best culture for me might be a toxic culture for you; might be an okay culture for someone over here, and a universal best culture doesn't exist because many of the people that work at Google wouldn't necessarily want to work at Wegmans. Many of the people that work at Wegmans wouldn't necessarily want to work at Google. And so, what I've come to realize is that a universal best culture is one where the stated and the realized experiences are the same.

So, we talk a lot about mission, vision, values, but I think we should instead be talking about is mission, vision, people, right? Because if we can align the value and the mission of the organization with the mission and the values of the people, and we make it to those lists, now we need to understand why we're there. What separates us from somebody else who's on that list, what is the experience, what is the life that people get to live as a result of the job that they've got? And if we know that, then we're not catering to anyone because they'll find us.

They know what sort of experience that we've got and they know what there is to offer. And we know that when we're trying to be everything to everyone, we'll be nothing to anyone. So, the more intentional we can be about that culture, about our people, about alignment and making sure that we can have that sense of belonging through and through, the better. And so, we talk about another evolution that's taking place. The evolution from the beginning of work to even past the future of work, which is right now. And now is wherever we're going to be at in the future of

the next five, ten years.

There will be imminent technological advances that we can't even possibly predict right now. The organizations that will do best are the ones that really hone in on their people; that are intentional about that culture, that attract and retain not just people, but the right people based on the experiences that you've got. And I believe that when we talk about Millennials, we know that it's not a conversation that we really need to be having anymore. When we're talking about re-humanizing work, the potential of bringing it back to our people whether they're in the field, or in the office, is incredibly great.

We know that people are, in my opinion, the answer to any of the problems that we've got moving forward as long as we're intentional enough about that. And we know that technology's changing faster and faster. The one thing that I'll leave you with though, is a line that we've all heard before, and that's to create the world that you want to be a part of. And what I've realized is that this statement is primarily made for, like, triple bottom line, charitable, non-profit organizations who are looking to build schools, or hospitals, or whatever that might be, or just significant macro change.

What I've recognized in the last little while, today aside, is that in the meetings that we've got in the typical span of our day, you know, our days might only be eight to ten people big. Our world, the people that we actually converse with, that we have deep conversations with might only be eight to ten people. And so, if we want to create the world that we want to be a part of, it starts with us taking that action, and when we talk about this from an organizational perspective, to create the organization that you want to be part of.

And if we can really articulate what that looks like based on who the people are, the environment that we've created, and the work and the impact that we do as results, that story really starts to emerge, and so does the differentiator from other organizations from other industries and other sectors. And I think that's when we can start to not only attract people but retain them for the right reasons. So, when we talk about the future of work, I think the future of work really comes down to people. We have an equal opportunity here, it is incredibly optimistic and everything else, well I think it falls into technology and making sure that we can utilize it to the best of our abilities. Thank you very much.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, thank you, Eric. That's a great message for our membership.

ERIC TERMUENDE: Questions or no?

RUSS HOGAN: Absolutely. Does anybody have questions for Eric?

ERIC TERMUENDE: I'll stick around after, too, if anyone wants to speak outside. Sure.

UNKNOWN MALE: Well, maybe it's a question, but you were talking about knowledge being exponential growth and that, right, but the problem I have with that concept is that I notice more and more than knowledge, it's basically crap. If you filter out the fake news, the cat videos, all this stuff that's just thrown at us every day, it's not so much the problem is that we're being inundated with new stuff we have to learn, it's just that we have to - it's exhausting filtering out nonsense.

And it's just, like, one big train of it. And I think that that's actually part of the problems we're having with technology, not so much embracing it, as it is what do you embrace?

ERIC TERMUENDE: Yeah. Yeah, no, I mean, a quick comment in response, I would say that instead of knowledge it's just information, right. Every minute on YouTube, 400 hours of content is uploaded. I always say, like, I wonder why my stuff's not seen. Well, I guess I don't have to worry about that anymore. Every minute 158 million emails are sent. You know, those numbers are increasing daily.

Now, what that means, in my opinion, is that when we put out these job descriptions, or these stories of our companies, so many people are so good at, you know, the copyright, or you're using the graphic design, the infographics, whatever it might be. You can dress something up infinitely, and it can look really appealing. And that's what I mean by saying that the perks might attract talent, or the document, or this-- whatever the pitch is, but it's the experience that keeps them.

And so, if we can use our people - like, for example, if I were to shoot a 180 second video of you or one of your employees and say, this is the life that Andrew's able to live as a result of the job, and then you end up sharing that on your personal channel because you're an employee that's now felt engaged, now that's felt acknowledged, now that's felt appreciated, and the company's taken some time to tell your story, now you might have 1,000 friends on Facebook that all of a sudden now get to see the life that you're able to live that you've never been able to tell them. And you might see three people that emerge out of the woodwork that want a similar experience.

And they know that it's not just about what you do, but it's about how you do it, and how you feel while you're doing it, and the life that you're able to live. So, yeah, the world is getting busier, noisier, and by no means is it always useful information.

But, what I'm trying to say is if we can use stories, if we can use people, if we can be relatable in the content that we're pushing out, my assumption is that we might not get 100 people or 1,000 people that want to take that job or might want to join forces, but even if we get three, that's three more that we didn't get that have already self-vetted themselves from that opportunity that we might not have had before.

RUSS HOGAN: Any more questions for Eric? Alright. No? Okay, Eric, thank you. Certainly, something for us to think about as we consider how we go about

recruiting talent, whether it's a company hiring staff, or in our case as well an organization looking to recruit young people into our profession. So, I do have something here for you Eric, as well.

It's a pleasure to present a small token of our appreciation. We've made a contribution in your name to Project SHARE. It's a local organization that assists individuals living in poverty in the Niagara area.

ERIC TERMUENDE: Thank you very much.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you.

ERIC TERMUENDE: Thanks.

ONTARIO DIGITAL CADASTRE CORPORATION PRESENTATION

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, our next presenters are Bruce Baker and Brian Maloney. Okay, Bruce - or I should say Brian. Brian's going to provide an update on the province-wide survey records index, but first Bruce would like to give us a brief synopsis on the fate of the Ontario Digital Cadastre Corporation.

BRUCE BAKER: Thank you. Fellow members and guests, the Ontario Digital Cadastre Corporation started as an idea 10 years ago. We knew at that time that there were only two ways to create a digital cadastre. You can start from scratch or find a partner with an existing cadastre. We have successfully partnered with MPAC on several initiatives over the past six years.

And last year at this time at the annual meeting in Ottawa, MPAC had decided to form a joint venture with ODCC, First Base Solutions, which within ODCC would maintain their parcel mapping and have access to their MPAC cadastre. Unfortunately, MPAC was not able to extract itself from the renewal of the Ontario Parcel Agreement, and the joint venture was abandoned.

For the past 10 years many people have been involved with the ODCC, and without their input and volunteered time ODCC would not have succeeded. And I just want to acknowledge those people. So, as I mention your name, if you're here, please stand and be recognized. Izaak de Rijcke, Crystal Cranch, Julia Meldrum Smith, David Brubacher, Gavin Lawrence, Terry Dietz, Jeff Buisman, Barry Clarke, Andrew Mantha, Mike Power, Brian Maloney, Blain Martin, and my secretary at AGM Surveyors, Gwyn Dinell.

Those people worked hard for 10 years to take it to the success that we enjoyed last year. Now, the joint venture may have been abandoned, however MPAC has offered the Association access to their cadastre, and this leads to Brian's presentation. I just want to conclude by saying that the ODCC and its sister co-op are well along the journey of being dissolved. And when that is all said and done we

will be presenting the Association with a check between \$65,000 and \$70,000 which is the profits that we have sitting in our bank account. Brian.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Bruce. And I'd like to thank you for all the efforts you put in. You were there for the full 10 years and led this thing, and very much appreciate your efforts.

BRUCE BAKER: Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: And as with others we've given a donation in your name to Project SHARE.

BRUCE BAKER: Thank you.

PROVINCIAL SURVEY RECORDS INDEX PRESENTATION

BRIAN MALONEY: Were you successful in getting that presentation up? Here we go. Okay, so I'm here with a different hat on to talk about the Provincial Survey Records Index. This has been something that's been ongoing for quite a long time. I think it dates back about four or five years, unfortunately. And so, I'm going to bring you up to date with where we're at, and I'm hoping at the end of the day you'll see that we're actually finally on the right track here.

And I'm pushing the big green button and nothing's happening. How do I make this thing move? I'm doing it. There, it finally worked. Okay. Task Force members, so we've had a number of folks here that have been assisting and putting in a fair bit of work, and I'm not going to read all the names, they're there in alphabetical order, but they've been involved for the past, as I say, three or four years now, and in some cases some have just joined more recently. All bringing a different skill-set to the mix and a quite useful group to work with.

See, I'm going to throw this thing. I think you need new batteries in this baby. Anyways, this is a reminder in terms of the vision. I'm not going to spend a lot of time, I'm not going to read this. This is the same vision we've had for the last four years. I can tell you we've kind of bounced along in terms of what our expectations were, but at the end of the day it's about survey records. So, it's not about the plans, it's not about the documents, it's about an index.

So, it really is only an index that we're interested in putting together. I think the other key piece here is we're talking about one online source that you can go to, to do your research. And so, that's been our goal. And we're looking at a tabular and a spatial system obviously to bring us into the modern world. Not the tabular stuff that we're currently living with in many cases. And obviously we're looking to put this up and improve it over time.

So, in terms of where we're at, and Bruce had a good kind of preliminary set of

statements here, we had been on hold for about the last year. We actually had issued a request for information back in 2016, fairly detailed set of requirements in terms of what we were looking at. And you may recall that we, excuse me, did a couple of online surveys with the membership to get a sense of what they were willing to pay and how we could move forward.

We came to the conclusion that if we didn't have some assistance in terms of the parcel mapping, that there was no way we could actually implement that. It looked like ODCC was going to be able to provide that for us, and so we decided to just go on hold until we saw the outcome of that. So, hence the lack of progress for about a year where we actually didn't move anything forward. Unfortunately, ODCC, as Bruce mentioned, was not able to proceed and is being wound down, so at the end of the day we weren't going to get it there.

The silver lining is that MPAC felt pretty badly, I think, about the way things had worked out. They were pretty genuine, I believe, in working with us. They didn't want to see the profession, the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors looking like they were just being used in order to move forward and get a better deal with Teranet in terms of renewing the Ontario Parcel. And hence they came back to us and said, we want to maintain the relationship, we're going to make you an offer in terms of the Provincial Survey Records Index.

There's a good fit there. We've got some technology that we can bring to bear, we've got some data to bear, and we think that will kind of make us whole, if you will. And so, that's really what's happened and why we're in the position that we're in now. So, I'm going to give you a little bit of an update in terms of what the offer looks like.

So, MPAC has made an offer to actually develop the application at no charge to the Association. So, based on RFI, we know that that was a pretty expensive undertaking, certainly well into the six figures, to put up a system that we were looking for in place. So, that's a great win for us. They're also offering to host that application for the first year at no cost to the Association. So, again, very, very beneficial for us.

They're building it on their property line application, and the good news for us is it's a fairly robust platform that has a lot of spatial technology and database technology built in, and a lot of it fits pretty well with what our requirements were. They already do, in fact, have a bunch of data stored, as you can appreciate, based on parcel mapping from an evaluation perspective. So, we're able to leverage an awful lot of that, which means the maintenance costs in the long term are actually going to be substantially less than what we would have had to pay if somebody was developing technology on their own.

So, they're prepared to meet the bulk of the requirements that we had in our request for information that was issued back in 2016 in terms of accessibility on for

surveyors and their staff, some of the administrative tools we were looking for, et cetera. And so, I think it does fit very well with us.

We have actually proposed a five-year term to work with them. I think I skipped a slide here. I did. Okay, so, they're going to provide access to their data, so which includes parcel mapping and a variety of other layers that they have access to. Which includes things like orthophotography, Google, et cetera.

And so, it becomes a very good research tool, I think, for surveyors to use, not only beyond actually finding survey records, but actually seeing a bunch of other information that's available. It includes iLOOKABOUT and Google Street View as well, built into the application. And so, when you're trying to, whether it's prepare a quote for a survey, or research in general, I think it will be a very beneficial tool that brings it all to one place.

We are looking at, clearly there is involvement with Teranet, and MPAC has that relationship. And obviously our concern is if the relationship between MPAC and Teranet were to end, where does that leave us. They are prepared to address that. The property line application that we're building on top of is currently used by about 50,000 users, so it's a robust technology that's been well tested. We know we're going to have a solution that actually works.

So, we proposed an initial term of five years with the potential for extensions. We're looking at initial training to be provided with the rollout, so that will be part of our no cost, kind of offering. And we're looking for one-time data support as we actually move forward with implementing and loading data. And I'll get into a little bit more about that.

So, we have a signed letter of intent from MPAC. And for those of you that recall us talking about that last year with ODCC may go, so what? I think the good news is I don't think we're going to have anybody interfering in this, and so I'm confident that we actually will move forward. And I think the confidence is so much there that in fact iLOOKABOUT, who is one of MPAC's technology providers has in fact already started work and moving this thing forward.

We have put together a preliminary statement of work which really deals with functionality and the data that's going to be provided. That is yet to be finalized. And in fact, tomorrow afternoon we have a Concurrent Session that I'm hoping many of you will attend where we can talk about what that looks like, and get some feedback, and then take that back to the Task Force so we can actually finalize that and move forward.

So, the solution is, as I mentioned earlier, it's an index only. So, we're not going to host any actual survey records, although it's certainly anticipated that we will be connected to other services that can fulfill record requests. So, as you're well aware, there are a couple of repositories, there's three repositories or four repositories out

there that exist today, and we're looking to connect this through to them such that we can flow a request to them once you determine what record you actually-what particular survey return you want to get a hold of.

It does allow spatial and tabular searches. It really is designed primarily as a spatial engine and its spatial searches, but we're going to make sure that it does have the ability to do tabular searches. And even in a spatial world, it has tabular searches to go about it. That actually, is a blessing, and it's a challenge for us. The blessing is that the searches are very robust, and that once a record is actually georeferenced and entered into the database appropriately, it is really easy to use and will stand the test of time.

The down side is there is effort in terms of georeferencing those records, as folks that have been involved in that game know. And so, that's something we have yet to work on in terms of how much effort that is going to take to move forward. There will be an automated process that allows records to be loaded. And we have had some members that have already tested that. And we're likely looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of a 40 to 60% success rate.

Obviously, it could be higher if you had very standardized data, but the fact is most of us don't, and we know that there's been some sloppiness in the creation of the metadata. And if the metadata is not strong enough, clearly, then we have challenges in terms of linking it. So, then there will have to be a manual process that's used to actually make that linkage over a period of time.

As I mentioned earlier, they are providing multiple layers, so we've got everything from parcel fabric to street level stuff. We also have a number of other datasets, and during the concurrent session I want to talk to you about what those are and what perhaps other ones we should put in there. As I mentioned, it does allow searching by address, legal description, assessment roll number, parcel identification number if you know it, or spatial like a polygon.

We do maintain search history, and this is really at an individual user level, so that if you go back in you can see the searches you've previously done. So, if you stopped something as you were working on it and you want to come back. It can generate reports. I'll show you a couple of screen captures of the existing property line application which won't be exactly what we've got, but it's a good approximation. You can actually have up to six windows showing different data at one point in time in the application.

And it will interact with existing providers. And those things have yet to be worked out. So, we had conversations a couple of years ago with the existing providers, folks like LSR or the Ottawa Registry, and we need to now finalize that and move forward and determine how we actually connect, whether it's some type of application program interface or something less intrusive. But, we've got to work that out and we hope to.

Obviously administrative tools in terms of changing passwords, generating reports, all of those kinds of things will be part of the solution. I'm glad to say it's hosted on a Canadian Cloud service. We had some concern about our data being hosted in the States. I personally don't share that concern, but nevertheless it is Canadian. We will be limiting the searches to 100 returns, and that's really to stay away from any kind of stealing of data, if you want to call it that, or kind of - what's the word I'm looking for here? - data mining in terms of moving forward.

It also has an era reporting for data improvement. So, if you find something that's georeferenced in the wrong location, there are ways to report that and address that as we move forward. And it also has a set of external links. So, if we want to start to put other resources in it, you know, I threw maybe the AOLS Learning Management System, or other links that folks would like to see as part of it, then, you know, maybe can put the AOLS directory up there if you wanted it or whatever other stuff can go in there. So, we'll be talking about that in the concurrent session as well.

And I've already talked about the automated batch loading and manual correction tool. Here is a screen capture of the current property line. So, this will give you some sense of what the feel is going to look like. As I mentioned, you can have up to six of those little screens. One of them is always the primary screen, and you can easily switch back and forth between them. So, in this case you've got three windows open. One is an orthophoto with the actual parcel data overlaying. It happens to be the AOLS office. There's the street view from iLOOKABOUT down below, and then there's a type of report in terms of, you know, some of the descriptive information around it.

Clearly, we will customize that to deal with the survey, and that's something, again, we want to talk about in the Concurrent Session about what fields of information you believe should show up in that as we move forward. This is just another view; you can turn the ortho on and off. This happens to be a map view. This is actually pulling one of the other layers that's up there, and I think this is actually aggregate location. So, this is the MNRF database on pits.

So, it happens to be there, it may be of some value, maybe not. Doesn't matter, it's already part of the application, so if you use it, you use it, if you don't use it, you don't use it. And here's another sample. This actually is mining claims. So, it happens to be the area I live in, so there are a few mining claims in the area. And so, that gives you a sense of some of the data that's going to be there.

So, from a go forward perspective, we are having a Concurrent Session on tomorrow afternoon. We will be working with those existing providers to determine how we're going to interact with them and make sure that, you know, if you've loaded your data in one of those systems, we want to take advantage of that. We don't want you to have to reload your data. And we'd like to be able to allow you to continue to work with those folks. And if you're commercializing your data, so be

it, that's fine, and, you know, you can carry on doing that business.

We will try to finalize the statement of work over the next likely 60 days, and similarly we're working towards a legal agreement, again, within about 60 days to try to get this finalized, and in place, and move forward. We are hoping to move forward with the South Central Survey Index as the first phase of this. And Council, when I approached them, said, we better get approval from the C of A holders in South Central. So, there will be something going out to those folks to see if we've got approval to proceed.

If we do, we will provide that data across and we will start actually loading and working with that data and then see that as the first set of data that we actually use to make this thing happen. We'd also like to roll this out to willing surveyors. So, we think there's enough benefits in this that surveyors may choose to use this even though there's no regulation requiring you to use it. I'm pretty sure the regulation will be successful once you see the application and actually use it.

But, nevertheless, we'd like to roll it out because we know it will take at least a year, I would guess, maybe a year and a half or two years. I don't know. We'll talk to Eric and Sue about how that will feed in and get completed. We also intend to issue an RFP, and this is to find firms to assist in surveyors loading data. So, this is really for firms that have yet to digitize or index any of their data in digital fashion.

And I've had conversations with a few members that said, yeah, I really don't know where to start with this stuff, I don't want to have to deal with the hassle of this. Is there any way you can have a company that can come in and do it for us? So, we're not looking to set up an exclusive piece of business here, this would just be a list that we will generate of folks that we know that can do this for you. If you choose to avail yourself of them, great, if you don't, so be it, have at it.

But, we're trying to make this as painless as possible for people. Obviously, we'll work with MNR and the Association to get the regulation put in place, and then clearly, we need to deal with a funding by-law. The good news of having the year of no cost maintenance, it does buy us some time to deal with some of that as we move forward. And I think that's it. So, I shall stop there, and I'll entertain any questions you have.

HELMUT GRANDER: Brian, [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: So, Helmut, our plan is still to go forward with mandatory entry and use of the system, it's just we know it's going to take time to get it in place. So, this is really only for the intervening period while we get the regulation put through. So, our plan is still to look for mandatory participation. Because I agree, the index really only works when you've got all the records in it, and until we're at that point in time it's just another research tool that doesn't give you the full answer.

So, our expectation is that this has to be mandatory, it has to be fully loaded over a period of time so that in the future you can go there and do one search and be confident that you've got the records that you're looking for.

HELMUT GRANDER: [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: It's just a time issue.

HELMUT GRANDER: [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: No, no, we're not worried about that. The fact is a regulation process takes time. Having gone through this, it takes time to get into the regulatory agenda and to get that order and council in place. To go through the lawyers, et cetera. It's a process that takes typically at least a year. So, we know there's a delay going to happen there. It's also tied to the legislation committee that Eric presented this morning, and so we know when they move forward with the regulation, I think they would want to deal with more than just the single change. They'd likely bring a series of changes forward.

So, we know there's going to be a delay, we're just trying to be realistic here as we put a rollout plan together.

ROB HARRIS: Yeah, Brian, my name is Rob Harris, and I'm from Trenton. I have a small office, but a lot of records and I don't see anything appealing for my business in this proposal. It's a lot of money and a lot of work for very little return, and my business is fairly profitable right now, and I don't want to burden it with something that's not really going to be a benefit. And that's my choice as a business person and a professional, to run it the way I see fit. And if I'm going to be legislated into doing this, I would strongly, strongly object.

BRIAN MALONEY: Well, and you'll certainly have an opportunity to vote against it. And I know you're not alone from conversations with others, including whoever's clapping back here, but I think there are an awful lot of people that believe there to be value in this. I think it's something that we owe to our future generation of surveyors, to have a good set of records. And I -

ROB HARRIS: If it's voluntary, Brian, it will take off.

BRIAN MALONEY: It won't be - we're going to put it in regulation, is the game.

ROB HARRIS: Well, I really object. This is a business decision and it's not the Association's business to tell the private practitioner how to do the business. This is not a professional thing. And to me, it's all hooked in with digitization and selling records for \$500 a pot. I don't like it. I don't think it's correct, and I don't think you should be forcing small businesses to do it. The best thing about having a small business is you have the choice and skills to try and make it profitable.

BRIAN MALONEY: I hear you, I will not argue with you. Just one clarification though, this is not about selling records, this is about research. This has no commercial side to it whatsoever. This is something that we intend to put as an index in place. So, I hear you.

ROB HARRIS: Reading between the lines, I think it has a lot to do with the records. And once these things are indexed and probably digitized, bigger companies will want to buy them. And I would say that, again, it's a business decision and it's not a thing that should be done by regulation.

BRIAN MALONEY: Okay, thank you.

PAUL WYMAN: Paul Wyman, Kitchener. Two quick questions. One, not having used one of these indexes before, I was wondering when you input into the record index is there a date associated with those records? Also, input as part of the metadata?

BRIAN MALONEY: Yeah.

PAUL WYMAN: Yeah, okay. Second is, then sort of related to that, when I was in private practice, we had the records of some very old surveyors, they're unindexed. We would occasionally go through them when we were really stuck to do research, but very difficult to determine where the surveys-- you could maybe tell the street, but those records don't contain very good information or very easy information to find, about what parcel in particular was being surveyed.

Sometimes there's no plan associated with them, so you don't have that to go on. Will there be some opting out of trying to get these old records into your system? Perhaps a notice that these records are there and if people want to come and go through those old books-- a lot of them are, you know, bound books of field note records, very difficult to scan and extract the information out of. But, they exist. Some of the information is valuable if you can find out its geographic location, and whether or not it applies to you. But, those old records are going to be very difficult to deal with.

BRIAN MALONEY: Yeah, I appreciate that, Paul, and I think we're going to have to use some common sense as we try to roll this out. Our expectation is to try to get certainly the majority of the records in there, because if we don't then you can't rely on the search. We want to get it to the point that you can rely on the search. If you've done the search you can say, I've done the research in terms of other surveyor's records.

And so, if we don't have that, then what we would end up having to do is force them to call you and say, okay, Paul, I need you to review your book of bindings or whatever to find what's there. We're trying to make this as simple as possible, a search to actually ultimately save surveyors time in doing the research.

PAUL WYMAN: Yeah, I'm a big supporter. And, like, this gentleman of the Provincial Survey Records Index, surveyors work in much broader geographic areas than ever before. I remember the days where you worked within your county, within your land registry office purview. We travel all over the Province doing surveys now. It's not sufficient to make inquiries of your local surveyors anymore to find, you know, survey records.

You go out there in the field, you find bars and you find out the surveyors from Hamilton, or London, or Toronto. And so, you know having a provincially-based survey records index, in my opinion, is absolutely essential to doing research in the modern era.

BRIAN MALONEY: Thank you, Paul. Okay.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, so, Brian, thank you. And we've made a donation on your behalf to Project SHARE.

BRIAN MALONEY: Thank you, Russ.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, we're taking another break. 30-minute break. But, before you take off, on your way out, please stop by the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee table outside the door and sign-up to make a visit to a school board. I know a number of surveyors have done that already and we appreciate it, but they need all the help they can get. We'll take 30 minutes. Refreshments are available next door, and we start up again at 3:00.

--30 minute break

--Upon resuming

THE NEED FOR SURVEYORS PRESENTATION

RUSS HOGAN: Welcome back, everybody. Again, just a quick reminder to turn your phones off. We will continue our business session with a presentation by Dave Horwood. Dave Horwood was asked to do a couple of presentations. The first one and the main one is he will be providing some interesting analysis about the number of land surveyors that - well, he's looking into a crystal ball to try to figure out how many surveyors we may need in this province over the next few years. Almost an impossible job to do, but he provides some interesting insights, for sure.

And then, at the end of that I think he will have a bit of a presentation on the results of the last survey we did for fees for survey records. So, please welcome Dave Horwood.

DAVE HORWOOD: Afternoon, everyone. Wanted to start, before I get into the presentation, in just kind of talking a little bit about the journey that this has been. It wasn't intended to be a journey to start off with, but it's been about five years. And

at the time I was on Council and I was still trying - and I'm still trying as to this day - to find out, like, where my designation fits into the broader profession. And we're still working on that.

But, I stumbled across some data from Stats Canada that articulated the survey industry and I said, hey, maybe we've got something here, and then I started to peel away some parts of that onion. And I thought about 40 years ago there's been countless slides about demographics, and we know that we're losing members in the AOLS. But, the question came up in Open Forum, I don't know who said it, but isn't the question we should ask, how many do we need? So, that struck home with me, and I need to find an answer to questions when they start out like that.

And so, over the last four years or so I've been peeling off layers of the onion. I got closer to a result, but I just want to be clear that I won't give you a number today of how many surveyors you need or will need, but I do have more valid indicators as to what the state of the industry is now and where you're likely to go forward. And so, if you want an absolute conclusion, then you can have an hour break and maybe go to the bar or something like that, but otherwise I'll continue with my presentation.

And before we start, like, there's a lot of anecdotal evidence, and I will cover some of that in the presentation, but I want to kind of get a roll call if you guys are willing. And I would ask the question, how many people are going to need to hire a surveyor this year in their firm? So, that's quite a few, yeah. In five years, within five years you expect? So, a bunch more, yeah. So, how many people are going to retire this year? Wow, okay. And how many people are going to retire within five years? I don't know, maybe I will.

Okay, so, yeah, there is ample reason for concern. So, bear with me, I have a lot of data, but hopefully I was able to present it in ways that's compelling. So, we're going to start off now. Brian had a bit of trouble with this, too. So, obviously it wasn't just him. Okay, try again. There we go. So, the number of surveyors in Ontario as we well know, because we've had it at every AGM, has been decreasing over several decades.

There's difficulty to fill government positions. The demographics, and general demographics, and the demographics specifically in the survey industry say that the decline will likely continue. But, how many surveyors do we need? Like, do we have too few, do we have too many, maybe we have enough? How do you right size the profession? What are the inputs, indicators that can help us arrive at that result? So, how to identify that there is a problem. There is a lot of anecdotal evidence of lack of surveyors, that the demand may be exceeding the supply. And we also know we have some challenges attracting new members, although it's been getting better over the last few years.

So, I'm going to bring up Blain's slide, and I embellished it a little bit. So, we've got the membership demographics. So, we've got basically since 2010 to the present,

our average age has gone up a couple of years. So, I'm kind of on the cusp of the average age. The average evaluation time, what we added on, is condition to evaluated students and articling students, how many new surveyors are we getting. So, it looks like we're roughly getting between, like, 10 to 15 per year, new surveyors over approximately the last decade.

But, in some of the deeper statistics, 50% of evaluations or even less than that don't end up going to articling. So, if they get evaluated they don't end up articling. And then, 50% of articles are not commissioned. To give you a comparison, the average age in BC in 2013 was around 51, and the average age in Alberta was about 49. And then, if you take the new surveyors coming in and the numbers, you can get a net loss. So, for example, we've been losing around 30 surveyors per year between 2011 to 2014. Then we lost a bunch in 2016 likely due to the continuing professional development requirements.

And we're coming to the end of another professional development cycle, so that's part of it. But, if you don't dig deeper, we have different types of members. Like, I'm a different member than the cadastral members, there's public sector and private sector. If you get down into the number a little bit more detail - and this is tough because I kind of had to do this on my own - I had some data from 2008 I did for some completely different reason, and then from 2017. And we can do some sort of comparison. So that, in the practicing private cadastral surveyor - these are cadastral surveyors working the private practice under a C of A - has gone from about 400 to about 360. So, a loss of about 38.

So, it's a lot less of a decrease in private cadastral practicing members. The public sector has always have been lockstep to that. A little bit more, but it's been kind of in the same range. And also, in the public sector, the ratio between the public sector and the private sector in cadastral is around 20%, which is coincidentally the public-sector percentage in Ontario, and in Alberta, and BC across all disciplines, across all employment. Quite a few non-practicing cadastral members, so they're cadastral surveyors but they're not working under C of A, so they're not offering cadastral services to the public. And then, guys like me, the non-cadastral. We lost a whack of those.

So, that's where the main decrease has come. So, it's not quite as representative as the last slide, as to this is more representative of the different areas of the cadastral surveyors we've had lost. So, there has been a loss of about 150 surveyors since 2008, but much less loss in some of the other types of memberships. If we look at regional groups and we take that same time slice - this was surprising to me when I did the numbers - is that we've actually increased in South Central, Kawartha - Haliburton, and the North Eastern Region.

Where there's been a real market decrease is in the South West. Okay, granted, as Paul Wyman said, is that the surveyors, their range is much greater now, so it's likely that there's overlapping of ranges. They're not fixed to a particular regional

group. Just kind of get a sort of geographic distribution of surveyors, you look over the entire province, it might be hard to see, but you can see nobody's in the north; right, but, like, north of Thunder Bay or Dryden, in those areas. The open circles are surveyors that were practicing in 2008, and no longer practice, and the dots are where they're practicing today, as in 2017. So, that is a loss of 38 surveyors in private practice.

If you look at metropolitan areas, by the census metropolitan areas, the net loss is much less. So, in the metropolitan areas there's a net loss of five surveyors from the same date range. And then, if you go into the GTA - now, the numbers are slightly different than my previous slide because the CMA, for Toronto and Oshawa, don't line up exactly with the regional groups. But, again, like, between 2008 and 2017 there was a net gain of 15 surveyors. So, there has been a redistribution of the survey environment in addition to the attrition.

So, that kind of gives a picture of as to what the existing landscape is within the profession. Again, it's two time slices, but they should be fairly accurate. Now, the need, the actual need for surveyors is based on demand. So, it largely runs lockstep with economic activity, I would say, predominantly construction. The supply of surveyors is based on demographics, and education, and articling, and that's what we previously went through.

So, you can look at industry statistics from Stats Canada, you can look at it from certain AOLS sources, from the Land Registry, MGS, and Teranet to get different snapshots as to what the state of surveying industry, how active are surveyors. So, for the AOLS, I elected sticker sales and sort of insurable earnings. Stats Canada, I looked at survey revenue by type of service offered in survey and mapping, and then looked at some construction statistics. From MGS and Teranet, I was able to get registered plan and property numbers on a yearly basis, so in those same time ranges.

So, that provides some underlying data that can be used to construct a somewhat of a picture as to the - at least on the private practicing cadastral surveying side. So, the goal ultimately is, again, to provide a measure of the need, because without that need you can't make some sort of projection on how many you have to have.

So, the first think I did is look at the sticker sales. And I have looked at these in the past. I put them back up there, but I found these were misleading and for a number of different reasons. Because the same sticker goes onto a subdivision plan or a condominium as goes onto an SRPR. And so, it isn't a good measure as to the effort that it would take to come in there. Generally speaking though, it can give you kind of a general trend.

The stickers have increased over the last few years, most particularly in 2016 and 2017. So, most of my other numbers I can only go to 2016, and I'll discuss why for that. But, as I said, it's not a good measure of activity because even in SRPRs there

can be many SRPRs on a single sticker, or there could be one per lot. So, as I said, it's not the greatest measure. So, instead, what I did - and this was the dataset that first caught my attention - is that the Stats Canada, as part of the questionnaires, interviews, all different industries - and they have statistics that they keep about the surveying and mapping industry.

And they also divide it, at least for Canada, on the different types of services offered. So, if we look at these different types of service - so, it's separated into geophysical and essentially non-geophysical surveying - they line up reasonably well to the disciplines. So, cadastral would be boundary and property line cadastral surveying and mapping services. We've got topography. They lumped in hydrography, but I don't think there's much hydrography done in Ontario. There's photogrammetry, there's geodetic surveying, and then there's also GIS, which kind of gets into the other category.

But, it lines up reasonably well with those. And what I was able to do, for a fee, Stats Canada, they were able to split this out where it doesn't individually identify firms or individuals. And then, what I did is, I had them further split out cadastral because I wanted to get an idea of what was purely boundary and cadastral surveying, versus what would be more of construction layout.

So, if we look at across Canada, this is a picture of the entire surveying and mapping industry across Canada. So, we look at from 2007 to 2016 - I literally got these numbers from Stats Canada on Friday for 2014 to 2016. You can see that the colors represent different parts of this. So, at the base is sort of the cadastral world. Then we've got what I'm calling engineering survey. Above that we've got topography. Above that we've got geodetic, photogrammetry, and GIS.

I think the big thing I want to point out is that in the past it was a larger portion, the cadastral. As we move into the future it's a smaller portion. The other problem with these statistics, one of the problems, is I can only get 2016 as of 2018. So, I could only go, like, as soon as two years back. It's also masked a lot by stuff in Alberta. So, this is divided out by things, but you see that spike in 2014? A lot of that has to do with oil and gas kind of peaking and then kind of going out. So, Alberta takes up a vast majority of a lot of this stuff. But, it's basically a \$1.5 billion industry.

So, we look at Ontario. Instead, you can see kind of the same trend; it just doesn't have the spike in 2014. So, you go from around \$250 million to about \$350 million in the present. But, as you can see, the cadastral is relatively consistent at around \$150 million. If you divide that, about half of that is boundary surveying, half of that was what I'm calling engineering surveying. You can see that in 2015 and 2016 there was a spike in the layout services, but still flat in the cadastre.

And just to validate that these numbers actually made sense - because I'm sure you've all filled out these questionnaires and wondered what happened to this data - that the line represents estimated revenue based on insurance over, like, the same time period. And that line fits very nicely in between, like, part of topography being

done by cadastral surveying companies, part of it being done outside. So, you can see depending if you take the line or you take the underline, 70% of surveying and mapping services are essentially non-cadastral.

And then at least 30 to 40% of that are being done - they call themselves surveying companies - is being done by firms that don't have a C of A. So, these could be guys like me, or it could be other things. So, there's quite a bit of industry and it's grown quite dramatically. As you can see, all of those things have gotten bigger. So, if we shift over a little bit from the revenue side of things, and looking at activity, like, construction activity. So, these are also Stats Canada numbers and these are more current - these come up to the present - that have total, like, residential value and total value of building permits that are a year to year basis.

See, from the 1960s there's a peak in the late '80s where everybody was building everything, and then there was a dip, and then it came back up again. So, it shows the economic downturns, you can see little down spikes in there, but the value increase is directly related to real estate values, so that's why the curve is up there. So, a better picture is to actually look at units. Now, it's about half of the permits are residential, half of them would be commercial, institutional, or industrial.

So, here you can clearly see a picture - and this was also a surprising stat - is that there's 70,000 units per average in Ontario, and that's across the board. That's since 1960 to the present. So, there's no growth in this but there's a consistent flow. And yes, we had a recession in 1981, we had a recession in 1995, and we had a downturn, that crash, in 2008, 2009. You can clearly see these on there. The other interesting thing here is for apartments. Apparently, they built a lot in the late '60s and early '70s, but it's also been steadily increasing since the year 2000. And if you look at the GTA, it looks quite similar, but there were longer periods of sort of depressed unit building. So again, it's about half of Ontario is in the GTA in dealing with that, and 50% of those units are apartments. So, if you look at the units - and the nice thing about these units is I can separate them both by province and by metropolitan area so that we can get an idea in locally what things are going on. So, if we look at a measure of activity in units per surveyor per year, we can see that on average you're getting about, like, 180 or so units per surveyor per year, residential units.

And that looks fairly flat, although it seems to be increasing towards the later part of this. But, in the GTA it's quite a bit higher, which kind of makes sense, right, because there's more building of dwellings probably in urban areas than outside urban areas. So, that way people were in the 260, 270 range. And so, I wanted to go through that, so that is kind of one metric. So, the other metric that I was looking at, I was on the other side, is registered plans; so, looking at registered plans within the Land Registry offices.

So, as you can see, since 2008 to the present it has been going down, although it seems to be leveling off on the number of plans. But, in this case, it's not like a 50%

ratio, it's only but a quarter of the plans are done in GTA versus Ontario. So, if we look at lots and parks, if we can calculate based on whether there's a subdivision plan, or it's a reference plan, or it's an expropriation plan, a condominium plan, the number of units that it would necessarily create - if you take those units, divide them by the number of surveyors over time, by that same trend you get the inverse relationship.

In this case, the GTA surveyors are doing on the orders of about I might say, what, 100 times, 70 or some odd parts in a plan per surveyor per year. And then outside in Ontario it's much larger. What's interesting is if you combine the two together you get a pretty flat metric of around 400 or so combination of lots and parks in use per surveyor whether you're in the GTA or outside the GTA, across the board.

So, it's a compelling metric. It hasn't been completely vetted as of yet, and something I kind of just discovered, but it's been consistent. Like, it goes up and down with these things. And applying this metric, interestingly enough, you apply this metric to BC and Alberta based on - because I've worked in BC, I've worked in Alberta, I know kind of the number of plans they do per year. I can get the units from the same statistics in there - I can very nearly calculate the surveyors. I can predict the number of surveyors they have in BC and Alberta.

It's a compelling argument. Like I said, it's not solid, yes, surveyors do other things than lots, and parks on plans and residential units, but it seems to have some basis in there. But, as I said, like, a lot of these things are indicators, there's no absolute answer for a lot of these questions. One of the other aspects to this is you can start to look at revenue per surveyor per firm. So, in this particular case, the surveying industry, at least if you're a surveyor, is doing pretty well. So, for example, between 2008 and the present you've gone from making a revenue of about \$450,000 per surveyor to about \$650,000 per surveyor on average.

That's quite significant growth, but that may also be an indicator of a supply and demand challenge. That's why, like, things like anecdotal evidence, and that may also weigh into the equation. Because if there's no supply then obviously the price will go up. Anybody who's tried to buy a house in Toronto will know. So, if we take the numbers away - so, that's probably as far as I can get with the numbers. I got a lot farther than I thought I would get, but there's still some questions.

But, there's still anecdotal evidence of concern in the membership. There's a high average age of membership, higher than both BC and Alberta. We're at about 56; on average they're about around 50. Public sector positions can't be filled. Like, they're having trouble filling public sector positions. And they're single bids, or at least contracts, which means that there probably isn't enough supply to provide that competition. Again, it's all anecdotal, it's nothing solid data, but I've heard rumours of long waiting times to get survey services in certain areas, particularly in the Georgian Bay area, and stuff like that.

And that seems to be supported by the membership demographics. Although general demographics have been captured, they really need to be detailed down to the level I did in those two time slices to really wholly and fully understand attrition. But, if you look at the demographics in absence of that you get a distorted view of what is actually happening in the profession.

The metrics only cover traditional surveying services. The growth appears to be in the non-cadastral sectors, and that's borne out in pretty much everything that I'm seeing there. But, the membership is shedding C of Rs. I suspect a large portion of the 66 members that left in 2015 were probably guys like me. And then, there's also a misrepresentation of land surveyor remuneration in public forums. And this is part of the challenge around attracting new members to the profession.

So, I know that this existed in the past, we talked about it, we went to industry and Stats Canada, and other guys to try to get it corrected, because it always had land surveying salaries being \$50,000, right? If you're a land surveyor you can go to school for five years, you can article, and after about 10 years you can make \$50,000 a year. That's not the truth based on our salary surveys and what we know of the profession.

But, this is what is says right from the job site. This is latest data from Stats Canada. So, the average of all occupations on an annualized hourly rate for all occupations across Canada is around \$30 an hour. For most of engineering-like professions and their relative technologists, it makes sense, right. So, engineers in Canada make \$43 an hour, their technologists make \$34 an hour. But, if you go down to land surveyors, the land surveyors actually are reported to make less than their technologists. And then, in the case of Ontario and Toronto, they're less than the average for the country.

So, \$26 an hour for a land surveyor in Toronto, and the technologists are \$28, which may not be too far out. But, it's not an accurate picture of, and this is what students, if they use the web, they'll go on and find out 'how much can I make if I become a surveyor verses and engineer?', and you'll see this, right? And it's just not true, right, it's not true. So, we have to find some way of doing something about that.

So, ultimately how many surveyors do we need? I think we come back to that question. The decline of practice, practicing cadastral surveyors, and oversight for the public sector, I believe I've shown it can be attributed at least partially to market forces, supply and demand. So, there is an argument that the market may have right sized the profession in the near term or at least over that time period that I looked at. There does seem to be some pressure outside the GTA, especially in the southwest. I haven't done - as I said, I literally got the numbers very close to this presentation. I could expand that to look at numbers across the province, but I haven't done that as of yet, to localize that.

And based on discussions with other members, and to Paul Wyman's point, is that, it might not be germane to the discussion, because surveyors aren't bounded by their regional group anymore. I'm unsure how to size the other members. The public-sector members currently today are approximately 20% of the practicing cadastral members, so 20% of the whole. So, it's like an 80/20 rule in there. What's interesting is you look at numbers from BC and Alberta - and like I said, their membership lists are right on their website, so I was able to look at those - it's 10% in BC and it's 3% in Alberta.

I don't know what the right number is, I know that you likely need oversight of - and then, when I poll public sector, I actually include NGOs like the AOLS, I include, like, not-for-profits and NGOs, and those types of industries. And then, what's the value of the membership to non-practicing and non-cadastral members? Because we lost about 30 non-practicing members, cadastral members, in that time period, but we still have 30 more. They work in engineering companies, they work for other firms, and not necessarily in cadastral surveying, but they could potentially be a pool for information.

And what's the value to non-cadastral members like myself? And that's what we're trying to articulate with the Task Force right now. So, likely difficult with the current membership demographic to maintain current numbers, and we're seeing that. So, if we go to some idea of projected number surveyors, we can look a little bit at a projected number based on the numbers by decade; their projected year of retirement. You can construct a model.

It depends a lot on a number of different factors. I know there's a lot of numbers on here, but it gives you a picture right from 1892 to the present of the number of commissioned land surveyors per decade. You can look at the lifespan in those same periods, and you can look at when they started, and when they retired, and calculate their likely career. And then, what you can do is you can get a total. And if you balance, kind of work with the numbers a little bit - yeah, I fudged a little bit - but, like, I can get very close to the numbers that we got today and also close to the average age that we have today.

So, we're kind of in the 2010 one. Well, I'm slightly more than the number of surveyors we have right now, 539, but average age is 60, 56 is right on. If we were looking at just purely the public sector and private sector cadastral members, like, it's around - if you want to get to around 450, it's really easy numbers. The average career is around 30 years, so you're likely to contribute in three decades, so you probably get 150 members per decade or 15 per year, which is kind of close to what we're generating. We may maintain the members over the long term.

But, there may be a blip at the end of the PD cycle, and there's also many surveyors in the 60 to 69 age range. So, there may be a short-term chasm before you get that back up to that 450 again. So, there may be a short-term pressure, and there likely will be over the next three to five years.

And I wanted to circle back to the initial slide because that's kind of where we started things, and we've seen this slide over and over again. Based on the numbers, it seems okay; at least as of 2016 because that's the best numbers I can get to. So, it gets foggier when you get closer to the present. But, I sense storm clouds looming on the horizon. The cadastral need, the specific cadastral need, appears to be relatively static. So, there is a base in cadastre, it will likely be maintained, but the true growth seems to be in the other disciplines.

And cadastral surveying companies are doing those other things. They're doing GIS, they're doing engineering construction, they're doing photogrammetry, they're doing other stuff. But, that appears to be the growth, not in the cadastral branch itself. And obviously you need better membership metrics to do that near-term analysis, because based on what I have, I'm not close enough to the present to give an idea of when and if that dip will happen.

But, hopefully this has given some insights as to the need, and potentially insights into the profession and its relative health. Do we have any questions? Sure.

UNKNOWN MALE: [Unintelligible]

DAVE HORWOOD: Yeah, the increase in technology, like, my time range is only between 2008 and the present, so for the most part people had total stations. The integration specs came in in 2011, they started using GPS and stuff like that. At least at this time frame it doesn't appear to have a major impact on it, but again, it's really hard to tell. If you did that over a longer period I think you'd see significant impact in versus the '70s, '80s, and '90s, and maybe even in the early 2000's. But, everybody had computers. The iPhone came out in 2007. A lot of the more recent - not to contradict the previous presentation - but, I'm guessing - and the things is, is technology. Take LiDAR or that, yeah, you get a lot of points, but you still have to deal with the points. Yeah, you get a lot of data - I would call it data rather than the information - but you still need to craft that into information, and that's the role of the professional, that's what they do.

I'm not sure that that changes. The number of technicians you may need to do things, the number of other people, perhaps not. Although I didn't put these statistics up, but the surveying firms are growing with employees, like, a lot. So, even though the surveyors are not growing, the number of employees in these organizations are growing. So, hopefully that, that was a rambling answer, sorry about that. But, it's really tough, right, because, yeah, I have impressions, I have some data to back it up, I've cross-validated this data as much as I can, but still it's an incomplete picture and it's not in high focus. Yeah, go ahead.

MARTY NISBET: Hi, Marty Nisbet from Sarnia. I have not a question but a general comment that I think may affect our demographics and particular the second last slide you showed.

My comment is prefaced by coming in last night. When I first drove into the parking lot, my partner and I that came in; Kaz and I came in - the first vehicle we saw was a Lamborghini SUV. I looked at that and I said, I hope to hell that's a surveyor.

We look and, you know, pricing and wage rates have always been a comment that's affected our demographics, affected our ability to hire the best and brightest. My comment is, if we all went to our offices Monday morning and if all of those \$2,000 SRPRs became \$20,000, not \$2,200, not \$2,600, \$20,000, there'd be a whole lot more Lambo's in that parking lot. There'd be a whole lot more young and bright people in this audience, and there'd be a whole lot less gray hair because they'd push us out.

Because if you're going to go to school for five years, you're going to article for three years-- I want to be a doctor, I want to be a dentist, I want to drive a Lambo. I don't want to make \$30,000 - let's say \$60,000 - let's take that \$30 an hour times 2,000. I don't want to make \$60,000 a year. I want to make \$600,000 a year. That will solve all these slides. And there's 350 in this room of 500 in the province, if we all went to our office Monday morning, kicked our rates to \$20,000, who knows what the demos might look like next year.

DAVE HORWOOD: Interesting comment. I'll just put another thing out there for you. So, if you take one of the slides previously shown, if you take sort of the traditional cadastral surveying which would include boundary surveying plus, like, subdivision construction, and construction layout, it's around \$200 million in Ontario. There's 200,000 transfers that happen on a yearly basis in Ontario - land transfers. If you did an SRPR for those lands - some of them are apartments, but if you did an SRPR even at \$1,000, you would double the revenue of Ontario in the surveying and mapping industry.

And so, it's not that hard to raise it, but I think what I'm trying to point out is that if you do the same things that you're doing today, there's no growth there. So, if you're going to potentially do new products and that, it doesn't appear to be growth in doing the same things. And the growth appears to be in these related fields, related to surveying. And quite frankly it probably is better to have a cadastral surveyor who knows where the boundary is doing some of these things. I shouldn't have got into opinions, but that's - ultimately, I'm a surveyor that way. So, yeah, Tony.

TONY: Why are we losing the C of Rs?

DAVE HORWOOD: That's what we're trying to figure out. I've been trying for - so, the question was, is, "Why are we losing the C of Rs?". Right? I think it comes down to value, are they getting value in the profession. And if they don't perceive the value, they'll leave. And we have a Task Force right now where we're trying to articulate that, but I've been trying to articulate the value since I was commissioned in 2003. So, I think it's still an open question. Go into my next presentation, sure.

Yeah, okay, so if there's any more things that you want to ask me, I'll be around in Open Forum. And I have one more thing that I keep forgetting about because this was the big onion. Fees for surveys. This will be relatively short. So, in the fees for surveys, while I was on Council first year we did a survey of the membership looking at what members charge for research. Subsequently, the Association put out another one in 2017 asking a lot of the same questions. It was almost the same questionnaire. So, I just wanted to give you sort of feedback as to what came out of this.

So, if we look at the fees for surveys between 2011 and 2017, which was last year, we got a fairly good response. I don't know what good is. 100% would be great, but 50% in 2011 of the firms that were around; 65% in 2017. About the same number, because there's less firms now than there was in 2011, but there was a bigger response rate. About 50% of firms didn't charge at all for research in 2011. That's down to a third.

The median charge in 2011 was about \$75, and then it ranges in sort of, like, the middle 60% around \$46 to \$100 in range. There are a lot of layers in cases, and this excludes the zeros. And then, if you look at 2017, the median charges about \$100. I could argue over six years it's probably inflation, maybe a little bit more of an inflation. The average charge is a little bit more than that. The first quintile, again, it runs fairly lockstep, but there's not a huge difference between 2011 and 2017, other than the price, and it's gone up modestly since that time.

What's interesting is that no charge has gone down, so most firms, well, a lot more firms are charging. So, most firms are charging for surveys. The other thing though is that there's still special arrangements. So, two thirds of the firms have special arrangements with other firms. So, there's quid pro quo, other locally or more certain firms or whatever. So, that doesn't paint the whole picture. So, if you're not part of that special arrangement, obviously you charge a fee. But, if there are special arrangements then obviously you're not charged, there's some other arrangement as part of that.

So, nothing much really has changed in the last few years. And this report doesn't speculate what should be done on fees for surveys or anything, but this is just reporting back as to the results of the two surveys.

I don't think I have any questions of that because - okay, I think I'm done then. I'm done early.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, David. We've made a donation in your name to Project SHARE.

DAVE HORWOOD: Great, thanks so much.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you very much. Okay, now I'm going to ask Eric Ansell to come up and then along with a few other Councillors as well for Open Forum. But, first, with respect to Eric, Eric's going to give us an update on the constitutional challenge. So, in the meantime can I get, let me see, Murray, and Al, and Sue, and who else is supposed to be up here? Bill.

CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE UPDATE

ERIC ANSELL: Hello, again. So, this is going to be a real quick update. It'll be really quick because I'm sorry to say there's nothing really to report on. I got a little bit more. So, just as a reminder as to what we are talking about when we're talking about the constitutional challenge. There were four basic questions being put before the courts.

These are, in very general terms, one, does the term field notes in the Surveys Act include plans of survey? Two, is the requirement within the Surveys Act for a surveyor to exhibit or give copies of field notes apply to documents which are not personally made by the surveyor? Three, does another OLS who's requesting field notes, is he considered to be a client for the purposes of the fees arbitration by Fees Mediation Committee under the Surveyors Act? And four, so this is where the real question comes into play, is that - I need my glasses back on again - does subsection four under the Surveys Act frustrate Parliament's purpose in the Copyright Act so as to render the former ultra vires the Ontario Legislature?

What that really means is, does the Copyright Act which is Federal and has certain wording in it, does that Act override Ontario and so the certain section of the Surveys Act would actually be outside the powers of the Ontario Legislature to have that in there? So, that's really the very gist of the questions. I can say that nothing has happened this year at all. We're pretty much not doing anything. It's not the Association's place to really push this forward, it's the applicant who has to make all the proper applications to the court to keep things moving along.

There's other things that are happening at the same time. So, that really is the quickest update you'll hear from me. And I know you're applauding because I was quick.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Eric.

BRIAN MALONEY: Can I ask you a question, Eric? Brian Maloney, North Kawartha. Just a quick question, Eric. At what point in time - is there any time limit at which this would reach conclusion? Like, if this guy doesn't move this thing forward for another year, another two years, another five years, another ten years, it will hang over our heads, or at some point in time does it die?

ERIC ANSELL: So, we have asked that question of our legal counsel. His advice is not for us to push this, especially when it's not really costing us anything at this

point in time to sit back. The other part is because it's a constitutional challenge, the AG's office for Ontario pretty much has a lot more to say about a constitutional challenge than the Association does. So, we're kind of waiting for that to happen as well.

UNKNOWN MALE: You didn't answer the question.

ERIC ANSELL: I don't know if there is an answer. We take advice from legal counsel, he is saying don't do anything, don't push it yet. If we were to push it we'd end up in court, and it's going to cost money. Right now, it's not costing us anything.

OPEN FORUM – Part 1

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, thank you, Eric. And now, we're a little bit ahead of time, but I don't think anybody's going to complain about that. We are now going to have part one of Open Forum. We will end this session at 5:00 or earlier. Any unfinished discussion will be the first item of business for part two which will take place Friday morning. Excuse me. I will ask that if you wish to speak, that you please approach the floor microphone, we've got two of them now, and wait to be recognized by the Chair.

After being recognized please make sure you state your name and hometown or affiliation before speaking. The Chair may find it necessary to restrict speakers to one appearance on any subject. All motions presented during the meeting must be in writing and signed legibly by the mover and seconder and forwarded to the Resolutions Committee and Chair before discussion.

The Resolutions Committee includes two newly elected Junior Councillors, Nancy Grozelle and Anna Aksan. OLS staff members Penny and Julia are available to facilitate getting motions or questions printed up and projected on the screen. This is an opportunity to bring ideas forward for open discussion with the membership. The floor is open.

CHRIS OYLER: Chris Oyer from Windsor, Ontario. My question is more just a clarification with regards to field note requests. When I make a field note request to a surveyor I indicate where I'm working, and I want field notes and any un-deposited plans. Several cases I come across field surveyors who are unwilling to provide those plans, rather give me an explanation that if there's an issue come see me, we can sit down, we can talk, we can go over plans one on one.

Whereas my personal opinion is that they should be providing those plans when requested, regardless. The issue of liability has come up and I'm just putting to the Council as where do you guys stand on that issue.

ERIC ANSELL: Eric Ansell, Peterborough. If you remember my short little talk there, one of the questions from the constitutional challenges, does the term field notes include plans? And that's a question we still have to answer because of the

constitutional challenge. If we get that answered, then we're golden. Right now, you're in a flux.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Eric.

CHRIS OYLER: Can I say one follow up to that? Oftentimes the field notes reflect what is done in the field, but it doesn't reflect the ultimate decision as made by the surveyor, and therefore it's my opinion, and I would hope that, you know, the Council would agree with me, that the plan should be released to the surveyor with no fear of liability to the other surveyor, so they can make proper decisions where the boundary should be.

RUSS HOGAN: Personally, I do agree with you.

ANDY SHELPH: Andy Shelp, Ottawa. Two things. The Lambo's mine. The second thing is, so - really. The second thing is that we spend a lot of time in discussion with the AERC, the presentation with Blain with his infamous deterioration of the Association talk, and, you know, David did a wonderful job. We're apparently satisfying the professional side of things, but according to David we need help on the technical side of things because the cadastral side is, you know, flowing along, but there's more engineering stuff, more of this.

So, what we're finding is that we're having a problem filling qualified technical positions. So, years ago there were many college institutions that provided surveying technology. Those have deteriorated over time. Has there been or is there any want of the people or the Association to look at where we are from a technical perspective? Because going forward, well, according to David we're doing more work with the same amount of professional staff, which means that we need qualified technical staff.

According to him, the numbers of the employed, the companies are growing, but are they growing with qualified technical people? Or are they growing with people that are sort of in-house trained? Is there a want or a need to explore how we can get more people involved from the technical aspect? Because going forward, your professionals are going to be your technicians. So, any comments on that? I don't know if David's still here or if it's even ever been considered.

RUSS HOGAN: Well, I guess one of the things that I would point out in a response is the SHSM program that Chris Oyler talked about earlier today. It's probably more geared towards kids that are going to end up in a technical stream as opposed to, you know, an academic or professional stream. It's certainly not restricted to that, but I think getting that program into more secondary schools would certainly help attract more kids into the technical surveying field. So, that's on one hand.

On the other hand, yes, I agree that it's something that we also need to start considering or looking into, is how can we-- we need to get probably certainly more

technical programs in community colleges. I think Murray mentioned to us yesterday at Council something that was -

MURRAY PURCELL: Murray Purcell, Newmarket. I was saying that the Loyalist College Program is actually not in great shape right now in terms of its enrollment as well, so I don't know where we're going to go from there. I agree with you.

RUSS HOGAN: So, yeah, it's been noted by Council that it is something that we've got to start putting an effort towards as well. Can you approach the mic, please?

BORYS KUBICKI: Borys Kubicki from Mississauga. We employ a lot of students from other colleges that are related to surveying. The Mohawk College and from Sheridan College. Their engineering programs have surveying as part of the first-year training, and those either co-op students or graduates, they're happy to join a survey firm. They know something about it, they have good memories from the survey camp, and it's a great head start for the company to have somebody knowledgeable or at least have something to do with surveying.

I find those results excellent for employees, or established students. And I would encourage everybody to look into those engineering colleges to look for either summer students, and usually that develops into long-term relations. Either next summer they can be a junior party chief, or when they graduate they will come to your company looking for work. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you. Helmut?

HELMUT PILLER: Helmut Piller, Toronto. I was going to bring the same subject up. We have a hard time finding field people. Period. All of them, what we have now, we trained in house. Once upon a time in dark ages we had an Association of Survey Technicians and Technologists. Now, this situation, I am reminded of this by the presentation by Eric, that people looking for a home, for somewhere to belong to. And these young people do not belong anywhere, or at least they feel they don't belong.

They are not a surveyor, but they don't have a home. They cannot say, well, I am somebody, I will get training, somebody other than my employer. Perhaps this is something we should be looking at again. Revitalize it, is that the right time? Is that the right period to do it? But, this is just as important as attracting new surveyors into our profession, if not even more because we need more of them than we are. And all the technology, until we get robots - and I dream of the day where I can load the truck up in the morning, they drive out there, run around, and come back home, but that's not going to happen.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Helmut.

BLAIN MARTIN: I wanted to give a response to Andy, and to Helmut, and to Borys. Is the mic on? Now it is. Put it by Dan, eh. You reminded me of Jack Young. I want to respond to the comments about the technical people. We certainly need them as badly as we need the professional people, and I think Council is over that as well. I wanted to remind everybody about one of our exhibitors who represented a college from Nova Scotia today. So, spend some time going around the Exhibit Hall and talk to the person at the college.

And Russ was bang on with the SHSM comment. That really is more of a technical - in fact, Miranda mentioned that in the Council meeting yesterday. It's part of the construction courses in secondary schools, but we need that as well. So, we're really pushing the SHSM. So, great comments from everybody about that.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Blain.

SIMEON MITREV: Hello, Simeon Mitrev from Mississauga. I have a question and a comment more or less about the statistics that David presented here, and this hourly rate for surveyors. You know, apparently there is a big gap between these statistics and this hourly rate that I think you called wrong, and our own Survey Monkey results. So, how do we know which one is wrong and which one is right? And what do we tell all these kids, really, about the salary, their expectations?

Like, do we know a little bit more detail? Like, are these numbers, how do they relate to the years of experience? Let's say a brand-new commissioned surveyor, does he get \$50,000 a year, does he get \$100,000 a year? What is the situation there and how do we know which dataset is right?

RUSS HOGAN: I'm going to get Dave to at least respond in part to that. I think, because he may know where the government came up with their numbers, but I look at those numbers and I have no clue where they came up with them. They're nowhere close to matching the results of the salary surveys we did. And I also wanted to mention that we are getting prepared to do another salary survey in 2018, hopefully in the not too distant future.

We've been talking about that with the other provinces as well, and we're hoping that we will end up doing it across the country. So, we'll get numbers from across the country, it will be separated out, so we'll be able to, you know, identify our own jurisdiction for sure. But, you're right, there's a big disconnect between the numbers that we get from our own internal salary surveys and what the government has put on the website. So, we need to understand where that came from. And I think maybe what we need to do is if it's Stats Canada that's putting up those numbers, maybe we need to go and talk to Stats Canada and ask them about it. Dave, can you -

DAVE HORWOOD: So, a couple of things. One is that one thing that's clearly wrong in the Stats Canada numbers is that a land surveyor, in the description of a land surveyor, is exactly what we would think. You have to go to university, you

have to get a university degree, you have to be a licensed professional. That's the description of that occupation. That occupation across the board, except for in Quebec, is making less than the technologists of that same class, which to me, it just doesn't make any sense whatsoever.

We knew there were problems with this because Rob Martin at MNRF had discovered something similar to that as well. I don't know where they're getting the numbers. To answer the other question, when we did the salary survey, yes, we did split it out between one surveyor firms, multiple surveyor firms, between public sector and private sector, and how many years they've been in the profession. And what we would expect was the case, it was revealed by the statistics.

The longer you were in the profession, the more you made, the larger firm you worked for, the more you made. The only thing that was relatively flat was the public sector was pretty much a single rate across the entire board. But, everything else, it depended on experience and it depended on how large the firm is you were working in. And with the salary study that's proposed, this hopefully will go across the country to do the same thing.

I think, as ourselves we may not be able to convince Stats Canada to do anything, but with the other provinces - because I noticed the same thing in BC, the same thing in Alberta, the same thing in other places, that disconnect.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Dave. So, I'm just going to take this opportunity to ask everybody to please, when we do get the salary survey out to you, please take the time, respond to it, and respond accurately to it because the better information we have for that salary survey the better off we will be. I believe that - and I know that Blain maybe talked a little bit to this-- but we are also going to be doing a salary survey for technicians as well. Is that correct? Did you have more to say?

BLAIN MARTIN: That was exactly what I was going to say.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, so, we will be doing that as well.

DAN DZALDOV: Future President, Dan Dzaldov, Vaughan. I'm just kind of listening to the comments and trying to put it all together with the presentations we've had today. We've talked about recruitment, we had the Keynote speech about personal messages and getting out, you know, the statistics. You get a message out to 100, maybe three will listen and so on and so forth. We talked about salaries, what are the salaries, you know? We all kind of know what our salaries are and if you're a business owner, you know what you're paying your staff.

Take all of that together and we've got a room here of, I guess, close to 400 people. We're the ambassadors. So, we need to all go out and talk to people. Council needs to do a lot, and we try to give you the resources to go out. And, you know, part of that is going to the high schools, with the book, and going to the boards and talking

to them. But, to me, the key point is we need to be out there being ambassadors, and people need to hear the one on one message of why it's - you know, he was talking about, you know, the belonging to a group and things like that, these are all the messages we need to take back.

So, that's kind of my answer. I think that's the most important part. And all the tools, and ways to get there we can help with, but everyone here are the ones that need to help us bring more people into the profession, be it the technicians from the colleges or be it getting people to go to university to study in the programs that will bring them towards our profession. Just my thoughts.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Dan.

GEOFF CLARK: Geoff Clark from Peterborough. Just kind of want to add some of my own personal experience to the whole discussion around recruitment, as well as the loss of the C of R kind of membership lately. So, just a bit of background; I'm in Peterborough and I work in the Office of the Surveyor General and I look after the COSINE database of controlled survey information.

My educational background is Bachelor of Science and Physical Geography at Trent with an emphasis of GIS. And then I did the GIS program at Fleming College, so not a formal engineering background, but coming into this profession a little later in my career. So, just other background, when I was in high school there was really no mention of the AOLS, or land surveying. It's probably changed now with the outreach programs. But, when I was at Fleming as well, there was very little discussion of becoming a land surveyor.

So, I worked at the MNRF for 10 years now, just over three years with the OSG. I had my AERC evaluation in July 2016, and I was lucky I only needed six or so courses after an appeal and some more negotiations. But, my colleague has far more, and he has a Master's. So, I've been working with calculus since then, and I did really well in school, but going back to calculus more than a decade after being out of formal post-secondary education is quite a challenge, especially with a young family and working full time as well.

So, I think, you know, the effort to reach students in high school and university is a really good start, but it's probably not enough to meet the immediate, short-term needs for the Association and for the membership. Perhaps there maybe needs to be an effort to lower some of the barriers for other land professionals that are coming in to get commissioned. Perhaps an alternate system that relies more on vouching for professional experience, a little more focus on professional experience just to meet these short term needs rather than a hard focus on academic credits on a transcript that are from more than a decade ago anyways.

The academic requirements as they stand right now really, I think, makes sense for students in postsecondary education at the time, but it does present a large barrier

for someone approaching the profession, you know, from the outside. Absolutely there are some essential requirements such as survey law, and business law, you know, the things you need to be a professional in Ontario, and ethics, things like that. So, that's just some of my thoughts on that.

Now the other point I wanted to make, which is related to the C of R, so, I originally applied for my academic evaluation for geodetics branch C of Rs - I do geomatics work currently. I've recently decided to try to switch that towards cadastral just because of the perceived lack of value in a C of R, compared to a licensed cadastral registration, and also just to have more perceived career opportunities later down the road to have a full license just with how good the C of R is perceived. It just seems like there's more opportunity to be a licensed member.

So, I just wanted to add kind of my own personal experience to that to maybe spur some discussion. Thanks.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you.

JAIME GELBLOOM: Jaime Gelbloom, Oakville. Back to the salary study, I think - I could be wrong, but Dave would know, the Stats Canada study, I think you sent that study so they'd know who's filling out the form, correct? The Federal government one.

DAVE HORWOOD: No.

JAIME GELBLOOM: It's not? Oh, I was going to say that I suspect that a lot of people are putting down their salary of their business owners, they're not including their dividends and the things like that, so the numbers are quite perverted. And I would also suspect that on the Survey Monkeys that we do within the Association probably are lower than usual because there's a lot of business owners and partners on private firms, he said, that splits 80 and 20 for government versus private.

And whatever that percentage is just with the private, that are part owners, I'm not sure if on those studies they're including the bonuses or the dividends, they're just going by salary. I don't remember in the Survey Monkey if it includes those numbers, so you might want to consider that when you're sending out another Monkey.

RUSS HOGAN: Yeah, and as I recall, and Blain just confirmed it here as well, but the last Survey Monkey we did during the salary study, it was for a total income revenue. Like, so that was supposed to be salaries and everything. Okay, Dave can be very specific.

DAVE HORWOOD: Yeah, no, we spent a long time with members of the Committee to try to articulate the extra money that a business owner would make. So, we tried to articulate not only bonuses but retained earnings and a get a portion

of that into the totals. We state both in the statistics base salary and total compensation. And we reported both of those and both kinds in the Survey Monkey. We're trying to do the same thing because it is very hard to articulate a private business remuneration.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks. Helmut.

HELMUT PILLER: Helmut Piller, Toronto. Jaime, I think if the goal to a high school is to promote the profession, and we drive up in a Lamborghini SUV, that would answer that question.

RUSS HOGAN: Wikar.

WIKAR BHATTI: Hello, Wikar Bhatti, Peterborough. A couple of things just for clarification. I chaired the salary study Task Force or Committee, and so we're sending out two, as Russ and Blain alluded to. We're sending out two salary studies, one for the professional - this will be number three in a third set, and hopefully it will be used to correct all the wrong misinformation that's out there with the Feds. And there's a number of websites out there that we need to correct, but we think we needed a couple years' information to correct them.

And two, we're doing a technical salary study, and that goes to my second point. I also chair the University and Colleges Student Liaison Committee. And we started that up about four years ago, I think, and the biggest change that we tried to start was that in years past we always had a relationship with Erindale and/or Ryerson. We never had a relationship with technical schools like Loyalist, and we've established it and we built it. Jack Gauthier, is he here anywhere? He's on the student - there's Jack. Hello Jack.

He's on the Advisory Committee for Loyalist College. Since we've built that relationship there in the first couple of years, their enrollment doubled. They're producing a lot of really good talent. They have job fairs every year. You need to get on that if you want to hire technical staff, that are up to date with current technology. They're an excellent, excellent source of talent instead of where you get your talent now in terms of robbing each other.

Again, these are young kids coming up. In the days past they graduate in the county of Hastings and they stay in the county of Hastings. Recently they're getting jobs in Windsor, Toronto, Newmarket, you know. Ask the people that have hired them to attest to their quality. And the last thing, with salary study, I implore you, it's coming out next week - no pressure - two weeks, I implore you, all of you, all of you, fill it out, fill it out, fill it out. The numbers do make a difference in recent years.

I was also on our union for the Government of Ontario. I was also on the bargaining team for our last collective agreement, and salary dollars made a tremendous

difference in our new agreement. So, the salary dollars are making a difference on what we're being remunerated, they're making a difference in attracting talent in terms of kids. Because the first thing kids want to know, we're in a society of pitching bling where they want, how much money are you making.

I mean, I've put on shows for bring your grade nine kid to work. The first thing, the only question they care about is, "How much money do you make?". And when they find out their eyes go wild. And the parents come up to me after and say, you know, we never knew about surveying but, wow, can you tell us some more. And so, it's making a difference. So, again, I implore you, fill out the salary survey, C of As have to fill out the technical survey, and have a look at Loyalist College for staff.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Wikar. Steve.

STEVE: Something totally unrelated.

RUSS HOGAN: Can you identify yourself?

STEVE: Handed a credit card here that was found on the floor outside. The signature on the back looks like Dylan Stanly Watson perhaps? Anybody? I'll just hang on to it.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay.

BLAIN MARTIN: Everybody, I wanted to respond to Geoff Clark's comments about the barriers that we raise a little bit. And I think he was really bang on. We do raise some barriers, that's really tough to get into this profession. I'm not trying to second guess AERC of course because we do need the quality there, but boy when I look at the number of years that it takes to become an OLS, it seems like a long time to me.

The other thing that's not the barriers, but once they do get past those barriers and then become articling students, something that really bothers me is that we lose 50% of them. So, they sign their articles with somebody, and 50% of them don't finish. That says to me that they're not maybe getting - maybe some of them are not a fit, but I can't believe that it's 50% of them that are not a fit after they've gone to that extent of signing articles. So, I'm wondering if the surveyors of the articling surveyors are really looking after their students and taking care of their students, and, like Eric talked about, creating the life for the articling students to enter the profession. So, that sort of goes along with Geoff Clark's comments.

RUSS HOGAN: Yes.

RODNEY GEYER: Rodney Geyer, Alliston. Further to the point that has been made about the technicians, just wanted to add that last year I hired two graduates from Loyalist, and for those of us here that have Loyalist grads; I'm sure you'll agree

with me when I tell you that they are excellent staff. And we as professionals, as an association, we really need to get behind that program, really encourage it and build it.

And it's great that the initiatives are being made to increase and maintain the number of OLSs, but if it wasn't for solid technicians, none of us would be here. So, I just want to encourage everybody to really look at the graduates from that program. And I know Borys talked about civil technicians, and that's a great way to go, too, but ideally, we want survey technicians, and Loyalist is a great program. So, would encourage you all to look at that program when you're looking for people. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you. Saša.

SASA KRCDMAR: Good afternoon, Saša Krcmar, Thornhill. I was going to ask about the CPD points, CPD hours, and how all that's allocated. I guess the question I would have, is when CPD came in, was the concept that the member on their own accord, would allocate and do research or education in the line of thinking that he feels, or she feels is important? Or is it what the Association mandates is important? I'll tell you why I ask. Suppose I have a really big interest in blockchain, and I'm going to go take courses, and I'm going to go, let's say, study blockchain because I think it's the future of our profession. And I bet if I mention blockchain in this room, half of the people may have no concept of what that is.

However, if I was to apply to the Association for the hours, that it will be a three-day conference, they'd laugh at me and say, sorry, you can't apply three days' worth of hours towards certain types of things. So, my question, I guess, is CPD hours self-mandated by the member as an ethical member that's learning and wants to educate? Or is it AOLS mandated because, as you know, the AOLS does mandate how many hours for certain events? If that makes sense.

BLAIN MARTIN: Yeah, certainly the number of hours are mandated. If you were to take that course, I don't think it would be questioned. It really is up to the individual professional. Now, if they were courses - I think our new Council, when we were first talking about this, talked about basket-weaving, if we do basket-weaving it's obviously not applicable. But, it really is up to the individual. Now, sometimes the surveyor will send it into the office and we'll send it to the chair of the Committee and say, what do you think about this, and there'll be a little bit of a dialogue. But, if it's going to add to your knowledge, it's going to count, Saša.

RUSS HOGAN: Sue.

SUSAN MACGREGOR: So, I'll add to that, Blain, if you don't mind because I was on the Legislative Task Force when the new reg came into being. So, the intent at that time, for sure, was if you needed to take whatever education you needed to serve your purposes, to serve the public, take it. So, if it was a remedial math course

because you felt you need to boost your mathematics skills, take it, and it counts. I think CEC has continued to try to grow-out offerings of training, but that is more focused on broad-perspective of what the general membership need. So, it's absolutely within your authority and control to take the blockchain training. I think that's great.

SAŠA KRCMAR: So, just a supplemental to that, how come LandPRO only gets five hours and not eight hours? Not to do a plug or anything. Because eight hours of development with Michael Stevenson, and all these others, if the member can choose how many hours he can allocate, he's there all day, he should be able to put eight hours. Correct? That's what Susan is saying, if I'm not mistaken.

BLAIN MARTIN: Are there eight hours of training there?

SAŠA KRCMAR: Yes.

BLAIN MARTIN: So, I think - I'm not sure what happened. I didn't follow that.

SAŠA KRCMAR: It's not a complaint, it's more a just what is the approach. As a member I should be able to put as many hours as I'm at a conference because that's part of the learning. Even at lunchtime when I'm speaking to a lawyer, that's part of the education of why you're at a conference sometimes. So, I'm just suggesting should we be free to put the number of hours down that we wish within any conference that we're at, reasonably speaking, of course. I'm not saying -

RUSS HOGAN: Will you come back and explain blockchain to us?

SAŠA KRCMAR: I have to figure it out myself. And, actually, I was going to suggest that - if I can put down for next year - we should do a good session on blockchain because I think it's going to transform the way all of us operate, but it's so complicated to figure out. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: We still have plenty of time available to us. Does anybody up here want to bring up something?

SUSAN MACGREGOR: I just wanted to thank Geoff. Geoff Clark works in my office, and Dave Dickson, and everybody keep your hands off of him, please. They're two really, really solid technical people that we're trying to get licensed. I think Geoff has raised a very good point, in that, yes, it's very important to get kids out of high school and move through the university program, do their two years articling. That's a seven-year solution. And when we saw hands raised at David's question about how many people are planning on retiring, there was quite a few people in the room.

So, I'm not sure that we have seven years to play around to fill some of the gap. AERC, under the last round of regulation changes, AERC really has full authority to

modify or tailor the educational requirements. They can eliminate field time, they can evaluate academic course requirements. So, I think maybe that's something that needs a little bit more discussion. We don't want to reduce our standards, but at the same time I think we have to really evaluate what's the risk for achieving every single academic requirement.

I have another person in my office, Roger Gross, who is a very, very solid surveyor, he was a very solid surveyor as a technician, and it took him a lot of years to get his licence. And in my opinion, yes, we want to maintain our standards, but I think we also have to provide an opportunity or an opening for technicians who want to upgrade into the profession.

JAIME GELBLOOM: Jaime Gelbloom, Oakville. I'm only doing this because we've got time and I've got material. And Andy took my joke about the Lamborghini. It's something that I see, I don't know, a lot more of but subtly, and maybe this is also for the new surveyors, the younger surveyors, and some of the older surveyors, too. Whether, when I see topos for development, whether it's just housing, single custom homes, or large topos, acres and so on like that, I have to constantly remind the client that I'm certifying the boundary.

And I think it's incumbent all of us to remind each other that if you're putting on a plan, that this is not to be used for a transaction, you cannot rely on the boundary, this was compiled. I have to constantly tell the client that this guy is not certifying the boundary. And I'm really happy to tell them that, too. And in my opinion, it's almost like fraud. You're confusing the client, they don't know. And so, when the gentleman talked about \$20,000 for an SRPR and something like that, this is part of the reason why. Everybody's trying to get a piece of the action and they're trying to find the cut-corners.

And I've seen, as I'm sure a lot of the people that do that kind of work, lots of surveys which they think that it's just a topo, they're showing fabric, and they're giving the CAD plan to the client for design. And if you're not putting on any setbacks, doesn't matter, you're giving them boundary and you are giving them the setbacks when you give the CAD plan. So, I'm really happy to tell my clients and future clients that when people do stuff like that and they don't certify the plan, they don't put a sticker on there - because that's all we have is the fear of the SRD to make sure we're doing the right work, forget about professionalism, you're supposed to do that anyways, but we see this a lot - so, I'm really happy to tell the clients that that surveyor or whoever it is, is lying to you.

And I think it's incumbent upon the surveyors that care to let your clients know that you're certifying the boundary every time and you're setting the required survey monuments, depending on what kind of property it is, every time. And maybe that helps raise our fees, too.

MAJA KRCMAR: My name's Maja, I'm with Krcmar Surveyors in Thornhill. Part of this discussion was about bringing in new students whether they be, professionals as Ontario Land Surveyors or technologists, which we all need to run our CAD departments and run our field departments. My own personal experience with this is that my daughter is now in second year York University doing the Geomatics Engineering Program, and my nephew is in third year - no, he's in fourth year, my apologies - and it's a very, very difficult program.

The kind of math and physics that they do, it's nothing that I did when I went through the Erindale program. And I don't know whether this can change, but we pay for tutors to help to pass the exams and do the labs. So, if we want to bring in new students and have them become Ontario Land Surveyors out of high school, we need to prepare them for the type of computer coding they need to understand, the difficult physics and the chemistry that they have to take.

Even in the science stream that York University offers, they still have to do courses like adjustment calculus, which is such difficult math that requires even the tutors that we've hired who they've taken math at Waterloo, and they don't understand it. So, how is a child who's 19, 18 graduating from high school now, how do they do this? So, it's something to consider. So, we have two streams in high schools. Even in my son's school, I was told some kids are not meant to go to university, some are intended to go to colleges.

So, it may be wise when the school boards are approached to say to the kids, not everyone is meant to go to university, but there is a great demand for technologists, and the salaries are very high, so these are the schools that you can attend. Because not everyone can do those programs at university. And right now, the Geomatics Program at York, I have to say it's very difficult to my daughter, just out of personal experience. A very smart girl, she's really struggling. And she'll pass because she's trying her best, and we're paying for tutors to help her understand, and do everything to help her, but it's very difficult.

So, something to keep in mind. I'm not sure what can be done. But, the two streams are there, kids going to the technology program or kids going to professionals. Thanks for listening.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you.

RICHARD MURRAY: Richard Murray, Essex. One thing we haven't considered, we talked about dividends on income when talking about salary studies, but we haven't looked at the question of benefits that we receive when you own your own company. I mean, when I was doing my pilot training, which cost \$55,000, my company paid that and, you know, that was out of my corporate. And my airplane and all the different things, those were benefits.

If I had to come up with that money to pay for that out of a normal salary, what would I have to have, how much? I haven't given much thought to that, but I'm sure my - I have a friend of mine who had a modest practice making \$60,000/\$70,000 a year to pay himself, took a position with another company almost twice that. He said, I don't have any more money, than I had when I - so, it's a question of how do we scale that out, how do we figure what it's actually worth?

And that's something we need to think about. When you're looking at what you're actually doing, isn't just what you're paying yourself, of the dividends, but the benefits. And if you own your own company, they're numerous. Now, I realize there's other responsibilities, and the government of Canada doesn't like you taking those benefits, but if you're doing pilot training, and to fly your own airplane to go to work, well, what can they do? Nothing. Something to think about.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Richard.

DAVID WYLIE: David Wylie with Ottawa. I have a sort of focus question for Sue. With the retirement cohorts of 2016 from the provincial government, has there been a decrease in the services available through MRNF? And through the little evidence, I've seen some difficulty in getting services, and I'm just wondering if there has been a replacement of retirement staff, or is there still a need within the Ministry to backfill?

SUSAN MACGREGOR: So, I'm assuming you're asking about our professional staff?

DAVID WYLIE: That's correct.

SUSAN MACGREGOR: Yeah. So, we have admittedly struggled very, very much with this question. In the last five years I've run eight competitions for project-level surveyors and was unsuccessful in many of them. And I've run three competitions to replace Eric Ansell, the coordinator, at a management level and have been unsuccessful three times. Not that jobs weren't offered, they were offered, but declined.

I think part of our challenge is - maybe its several things. Could be a lack of understanding of what the job entails because it's actually a very interesting job. I'm challenged on a daily basis to make things work. And I think probably our salaries are not - my impression is our salaries are not competitive with the private sector. There was a 9% increase during the last round of collective bargaining for the project level staff, but it was translated to the management, but there's still inversions and compression, which they're going to address probably by December of this year.

DAVID WYLIE: So, there is realization, perhaps, on the political level that there has to be some sort of change in the, maybe, remuneration to attract additional people?

SUSAN MACGREGOR: So, I've been to visit with the deputy twice and quite openly said that I don't know where the next Surveyor General is coming from unless we address this problem. And he sent me away twice to create a plan, like a succession plan. Because I'm doing two jobs right now, it's really hard to do that third piece of business off the corner of my desk, but within the next six months I'm expected to have a strategy, a multi-pronged strategy, to create a succession plan for OSG.

DAVID WYLIE: Thank you.

SUSAN MACGREGOR: Thanks, David.

COLE RAIKES: Hi, yes, my name's Cole Raikes, articling student out of Barrie. Common theme tonight I'm realizing is getting people to come in, and getting through the articling process, and how we're going to work on getting new students. Going through York, I went the route of going through the AERC, after getting a university degree out of the University of Toronto, and then they sent me to York. I had about 18 classes I took, mostly from York, but some of them were at Ryerson, and I got some approved for online as well.

And I do agree, like, the courses are very hard at York. I'm wondering - of course I got through that with a lot of hard work, but I think a lot of the surveyors here today, they went through, like, a specialized program. I know, like, out of Erindale they had a specialized program, and we don't have any more specialized programs. I just want to ask, like, is the Task Force working, or how/where are we standing on a specialized program? Because I think that might be a more appropriate measure in getting people through the schooling and then going through the articling.

The statistics said that 50% of those articling students don't make it. From my personal view, I find that after getting kind of kicked around going through York University, you make it to the other side, and you basically just went through hell to get the degree, right, and then articling, or many people from my point of view, view the articling process as an easy cakewalk. Which it's not, and I just started to realize that. I've only seen a couple months of articling and it seems like there's an endless mountain of work to work on. And, like, I thrive on that, I take that with a grain of salt, and I know that one day, like, case by case I'll get there.

But, I think a lot of students, they have the feeling, or new articling students have the feeling that they're just going to cakewalk through the articling process. And if they're not made aware of, like, what is actually involved, they're not going to stay in very much longer. Like, they already just went four years through university, these hard courses at York, and it's not even specialized, and then they find that

they've just begun, basically. So, I'm just wondering is a Task Force working on getting a specialized program at York? Because I know we have, like, professors at York that are involved in the Association, so just wondering if that's going to be brought there. Thanks.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, I believe earlier today in one of our Commission Reports, there was a slide there for our University Task Force, or - I can't remember the name of it. But, anyways, we do have a Task Force or a Committee that we're trying to get off the ground to look at what it is that we as an Association require from a university institution. Right, what are our needs? I mean, you know, York is there, it's got Geomatics Engineering, and they do provide a lot of what we require for surveying, and whether it's far more difficult than it needs to be or not, I don't know.

But, the thing we felt we need to do is to be able to articulate what are our requirements, what is it that we need as an Association from a program, from a geomatics program call it, or a survey science program. I think I'd like to go back and get a survey science program going again, myself. But, what is it that we actually need, and then we can sit down, we can talk to York about that and say, okay, here's what we feel we need, can you provide it?

Potentially, you know, if it comes to the point where we feel that, you know, maybe York doesn't suit our needs, whether it's because it's a little bit too focused on the engineering side of things, space sciences type of thing, we could consider going out and establishing a new program. I think we would be wrong to just go off and try to establish a new program without trying to work with a program that's already there, which I'm not even sure that it doesn't really meet our needs. So, I think the first step for us to do is to really be able to establish or articulate what our requirements are, and then compare it to what it is that York is offering.

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: Good afternoon, Bahram Amirnezhad from Richmond Hill. I want to talk about the plan of survey. We know that any plan of survey that goes out of any company, it has to be updated, but right now they're selling the plan from 20 years ago in LSR and Protect Your Boundaries to the public. These are just the records that has to be sold just to the surveyors. And based on the knowledge that I have and the website of the AOLS; you have to update any survey, doesn't matter. You can sell that, doesn't matter, but you have to go to the field actually, you have to survey again, make sure that any fences, new easements, and all of these things. Like, I just wanted to know that is that just in writing, and in status, or it has to be implemented for any company, including LSR?

DAN DZALDOV: I'll try that one. I'm not 100% sure of the question, but I think what you're asking is if you did a survey 20 years ago and someone came to you -

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: No, no, no, no. I ask that they are selling the survey, old survey in the website, in LSR, to the public, and it has to be updated. But, they sell those old plans to the public.

DAN DZALDOV: You're asking is it okay to sell a plan that's 20 years old?

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: Yes.

DAN: I don't think there's a policy that says you can't, but you should be explaining to your client what they're getting, it's not up to date. And I think most of the websites have a disclaimer that actually speaks to that affect.

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: So, my question is, anybody can sell any plans that has - like, for example, I did one plan three years ago, four years ago, and I can put a price on that, sell that on my website?

DAN DZALDOV: I didn't understand, is that a separate question? Are you asking is that okay?

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: Yeah, three years ago I did a survey, right, and then right now I put that on my website and sell it without even doing the update for that. Updating the survey.

DAN DZALDOV: I think I've answered that.

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: But, you can?

DAN DZALDOV: I can give you my opinion, and I think that if you have educated your client enough to understand what they're getting, it's at your discretion if you're willing to release an old survey whether you want to sell it or not to a member of the public. In my opinion, that's okay. We do it.

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: So, it's okay to put the old - like, how the client knows, how can you educate your clients that what is the easement or what is the fence, ties or something? They don't know.

DAN DZALDOV: We're the professionals, so if someone calls you up and asks you the question what the difference is between having an up to date survey and purchasing one online from seven years ago or 70 years ago, what might be missing, what you might suggest they do should you update the Registry Office search at least. These are all things that you should be discussing with the client. You may want to discuss with your client, but I think those are all your own decisions. I don't think there's a right or wrong.

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: Maybe because you have some plans in that website as a person, but I wanted to ask, in our website it says we have to update our plans. Like, that's my question. Like, we have to update the plans according to what you put in the website. I'm talking a broad range. I know that you have some records for sale, too, but just as a legal point, are we allowed to do that or not.

RUSS HOGAN: Yes, as Dan mentioned, that is a decision that you have to make yourself as a professional as to whether or not you can sell a plan that you know, you did a number of years ago.

BILL BUCK: I think what you're confusing is the idea of issuing a plan and calling it a current survey. Yes, if you did a plan three years ago and wanted to issue it as a current survey, then certainly you would have to update it, you know, the search and field examination and so on. But, there's nothing preventing you from providing that survey, selling it as an older survey and advising your client.

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: But, doesn't that mislead the public that we are selling the survey - this is called survey? Like, when you name it survey -

BILL BUCK: Everybody's saying it's up to you to advise your client that it's not up to date. Not reflecting current conditions.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Can you got to the mic on the floor because everyone wants to, and they can't hear you.

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: Oh, this isn't turned on?

UNKNOWN FEMALE: No, we can't hear him.

BILL BUCK: What I'm saying is that our website might - and I don't know which part of the website you're referring to, but I assume it says something about a survey being up to date, current. And yes, if you did a survey two or three years ago and you wanted to issue it as a current up to date survey, you'd have to update it. And that would involve a Registry Office search and a field examination to ensure that there have been no changes, that all the monumentation is there and so on, and then you could issue that as a current survey.

But, there's nothing preventing you from issuing it as it exists, as an older survey, as long as you would advise the client that this survey was done three years ago, it may not reflect current conditions. I mean, there are hundreds of these surveys being sold on the various websites every day, there's nothing preventing it.

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: I'm not satisfied with the answer because you told us - like, I started like that, in order to give the plan to the public I have to update that. I have to go to the field, I have to see if the fence, if the easement, no matter what. Like, because it the public. To the surveyors, yes, because they know, they are professional. You can sell it to them even 40 years ago plan, but to the public; public don't know. They the paper, they think that this is their plan, this is the survey. And you see that, like, real estate transactions.

BILL BUCK: Well, we see it all the time, that old plans are used, yes. No question. But, it's your responsibility to explain to your client, and maybe Al can add to this

because he's familiar with the rules on LSR and the disclaimers that they older surveys.

AL WOROBEK: Yeah, Al Worobec, Barrie. Part of the development of that system. And we hired one of the best intellectual property lawyers in the province at the time, Lou Milrad, spoke here, and they included not only language and disclaimers for relying on the historical plans, but there was also part of the process is the person that purchases that plan online also receives emails clearly re-identifying in plain language, in addition to the agreement of use, the terms of use agreement, that when they click before they even can download it.

And after they've purchased it they also get in very clear, plain language that you have to be very careful on how you rely on this document, it is out of date, it may not show changes. And they also get a link to the surveyor that owns that or have previously prepared that plan so that they can call them instantly if they have any questions or if they feel they need it updated. Hopefully that clarifies that the public protection's built in, before they click and can see that.

BAHRAM AMIRNEZHAD: Yeah, but that's the way to bending law. To me, it has to be updated and there is no way around that. Yeah, I know that the lawyers are very professional to write down the disclaimer and write down something that you get away with that, but for the surveyor standpoint, like, I say that the public has to be protected by doing the right job, by going to the field, and do the updated survey. That's all I'm saying.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, you're noted. Next?

DAVE DIXON: Hi, Dave Dixon, Peterborough. I'm a survey technologist in the Office of the Surveyor General, Geoff's colleague that he alluded to earlier. I just wanted to echo Geoff's frustrations and concerns with the amount of time and effort that we as sort of early mid-career folks who are looking to enter the survey profession, the hurdles that we're expected to climb over. And also state that one of my main disappointments with the application, the assessment process, was the lack of consideration of previous qualifying work experience.

And, you know, having been in my current position for three and a half to four years working in the business of surveying in the Office of Surveyor General, and essentially receiving no credit for the effort that I've put in in my work life. And so, I maybe question if there is any appetite from Council or from the AERC to maybe modify the way that they are doing their assessments, and say, you know, maybe he doesn't have every piece of academic requirement that we would like, but he does do this work on a daily basis and there could maybe be credit applied to that.

RUSS HOGAN: Well, certainly it's been noted a couple of times this afternoon, so we will certainly keep it in mind. Thanks. Okay, one last one, Andy.

ANDY SHELP: Last one, wow. Andy Shelp, Ottawa. Just to speak to the whole AERC thing because I've been on the AERC for a while. When we revamped the process, the process was to not make it easier necessarily, because it was - you know, one young gentleman spoke as how onerous it is - it was actually harder before. So, the attrition rate, we were finding, during the articling process was greater before, than it is since we've revamped it. Our retention rates are much better.

So, the AERC spent a lot of time, Crystal Cranch and Nancy, spent a lot of time analyzing how we could revamp the system. A lot of work went into it and to put the onus back on the articling surveyor. And, you know, believe it, don't believe it, it's not necessarily an easier process because we didn't want to dumb it down, but it's switched away from the old process which was quite onerous. I mean, the field note assignment alone was taking 80 to 100 hours to do, so it was quite onerous. So, that component is gone.

So, I get it, it's hard, but do we want to make it easy? I guess that's part of the question. That was part of the question that we struggled with, with the AERC. Are we dumbing it down, or is the intention to dumb it down, to the point where it's easy? Now, there has been some conversation about university courses and whether they're applicable or not. I'm not sure that the Association has the ability to control what the universities teach.

Yes, we can say these are the requirements for us. The university has its own set of requirements. You want to be an engineer, guess what, you've got to take these hard math courses. You want to be this, you've got to do this. Never understood why we needed to take physics. Okay, great, but you do. And the concept of a university education is not necessarily 100% applicable to any profession. The concept of the university education versus a technical education is abstract thought. It's the critical path, it's the critical thinking, it's to be able to take that seemingly unconnected piece of information and connect it to that seemingly unconnected piece of information in a non-linear path.

So, as much as the university programs are difficult, they did create a foundation for future learning. They do create a foundation for demonstrating that you have the ability to start something that's difficult and finish, you have a capacity for higher learning. Like, if I never, ever, ever have to do another triple integration in my life - if I ever have to do one I'll probably shoot myself. But, the point is I did it. Was it hard? 100% it was hard, but the point was to finish it because it was hard. There are times in our careers when things get hard, nothing's easy and nothing's given to you.

So, the AERC struggled with this for a long time. I personally, being on the Committee for a long time, think that the AERC did a fantastic job in working and liaising with Ryerson, in liaising with York to help set up a program that was meaningful, and still met the university's requirements and the requirements of the Association. Keep in mind that the university is not educating people to become

land surveyors, they are educating geomatics engineers, or geomatics science people. They're not all going to be Ontario Land Surveyors.

They can do all kinds of other things. There are people in this room, C of Rs, who went through a geomatics engineering program who aren't cadastral surveyors. So, the Association dictating what the universities teach, I think, is a non-starter. Where there is a suggestion, where there is a vehicle to provide people who study, gainful employment. What we do is taught after the university program. So, the capacity to start, finish, learn at a high level, then we take you, and we teach you how to survey. That's my thoughts.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Andy. Okay, this has been fantastic. I was really concerned we were going to get, you know, 15 minutes into this, and then nothing. And this has been wonderful. This is what we've been looking for, is conversation. We want to get feedback, as I mentioned. And so, we have part two on Friday, so there's still lots of opportunity to come forward on Friday. Blain, you wanted to -

BLAIN MARTIN: Well, I actually just wanted to echo what Russ said. It's been fantastic having the comments in this Open Forum. The Open Forum really gives Council lots of information for moving forward, so I urge everybody to attend on Friday and to continue with this dialogue. Thanks very much for today though.

RUSS HOGAN: Yes, yes, thanks. Now, before everybody runs, right, sorry, I have a few announcements, but I'll try to get through this really quickly. Veterans' Dinner is tonight, with the reception at 5:30 and dinner at 6:30 in Fallsview Studios A, B, and C on this floor straight through the doors past the washrooms and the Business Center. Exhibitors' Welcoming Party starts at 7:30 in the Exhibitors' Hall. Great opportunity to share some food and some drinks with friends and visit exhibitors and of course to support the Educational Foundation.

The Educational Foundation is also sponsoring the Graduate Student Poster Competition with awards ranging from \$2,000 to \$500 available for 1st to 5th place winners. It's pretty good stuff, I'd say. Geomatics-related research posters will be on display in the pre-function area out here outside the Exhibit Hall. The judging, I guess, is taking place today and awards will be announced on Thursday.

This year, as I mentioned previously, the Hospitality Suite is in the Hard Rock Club, not to be confused with the Hard Rock Café. It will be open at 10:30 until 1:00. Because of the location, please wear your name badge because we have no - wherever mine is - anyways, we have no idea - it's part of a bit of a public space, right, so we want to make sure we have members and people who should be there, in there. Don't forget to stop by the registration desk to pick up your complimentary copies of the AOLS Directory, limit of 10. If you need more, contact the AOLS next week.

Tomorrow we start with the Plenary Session in this room followed by the Concurrent Sessions on the 5th floor. Convocation Lunch will take place in this room with a second round of Concurrent Sessions in the afternoon. There's also a number of Committee meetings Thursday morning, so refer to your itinerary for times and room assignments. There will be an Accompanying Persons' Breakfast at 8:00 in the hotel restaurant, and they have a day trip after that.

Tomorrow night we have the President's Dinner and Dance. Again, that will be in this room. There will be a reception with a cash bar in the hallway starting at 6:00, and dinner will be served at 7:00. Thanks, everyone, it's been a great day. I really appreciate your input. Enjoy the evening and we'll see you tomorrow morning, 8:30. Thanks.

--- Whereupon Day 1 of the conference concluded,
at 5:00 p.m.

Thursday, March 1st, 2018 – Niagara Falls, Ontario

--- Upon resuming, at 8:30 a.m.

RUSS HOGAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, I trust everyone enjoyed themselves last night and I hope nobody's going to fall asleep this morning. And I know there was an awful lot of people at the Exhibitor's welcoming party last night, and I think that was great. Happy to report that the fundraising for the Educational Foundation was quite a success. I don't know, is Maureen in the room? No, okay. I wanted to give Maureen an opportunity to report how successful it was, but I was given the number this morning just in case Maureen wasn't able to make it. And I'm happy to report that we raised \$3,365 last night. Thank you for your generosity. First of all, remember to turn off your cell phones, which I forgot to do. Somebody call Blain quickly. Okay, yes, please turn off your cell phones. Remember there's an automatic \$100 fine going to the Educational Foundation should any electronic device make any sort of a noise. And, oh yes, it says here, ring, ding, sing, tweet, bark, anything. And then, if you answer the phone it's going to double to \$200.

Let me see, I think there may have been somebody's device made some noise yesterday, but unfortunately our Sergeant-at-Arms couldn't quite pinpoint who it was. Or, it may be fortunately for that individual. So, he's keeping an eye out again today. Our Education Day starts with two presentations. The first is a presentation from Andrew Mantha, Chair of the Beach Task Force. Come on up, Andrew.

The Task Force was assembled by Council to investigate the nature of a number of complaints made by the public to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry regarding surveys of beach properties. After that we have a second presentation

from Professional Standards Committee dealing with sketches, and we also have Concurrent Sessions for that. So, first up, Andrew in Beach Task Force.

PLENARY SESSION: BEACH TASK FORCE PRESENTATION

ANDREW MANTHA: Can I just get everybody to just stand up for just a second? Just stand up, stretch yourself out a bit. Everybody up. Okay, and now, could everybody just say, cheese? My wife wants to know how my speech went, so I'm going to be able to tell her, standing ovation. Oh, my signs up there, alright, and I can read it. Awesome. Okay, so, as Russ alluded to, this group was started - basically it's all members from Council whose names are on there.

We were made aware of an issue that's all across Ontario, and I'm going to assume everybody kind of knows where we're going with this because it's a very common question with ownership. And that is, like, who owns the beach, or what's going on with the beach, or, you know, there's an argument over ownership, possession, right to use, everything. So, just to bring it home to Essex County, the photo that you see is a sign that is out in Amherstburg, Ontario, and what we've got is a situation where everyone is saying, hey, this is our private beach.

And I'm going to show you a picture of what they're arguing over in a minute. But, just to get you going on this, the Beach Task Force - there's the list of members there, and I'm also going to say he kind of alluded that he wasn't a member, but he wanted to help us out, and so I'm going to say that Izaak de Rijcke was very gracious in forwarding information that he had and offering his time and insight. So, those names not on there, I'm going to send a shout out to Izaak.

Okay, so, now I get to try the big green button. Oh, that's a point - oh, the big one. Hey, there's that plan. Okay, so, though it looks a little clear on this thing, and hopefully you can see this, the large white area at the bottom of the plan is what everyone's fighting over. And you can see in this case that there really is no private ownership backing onto a beach that you may have been expecting to see. But, in fact, it's the abutting owner to this big blank canvas that's in front of us is the local municipality. So, this one's more or less just to give you an idea of a more extreme example.

Some people say this is an obvious answer, but it may or may not be. You still have to do the same research in these things. And if you're expecting answers on this thing, well, you should have been on our committee because I will just tell you right now, put five surveyors in a room and you get 10 opinions. So, what we decided what we're going to go with, instead - and this is an ongoing committee and there's other issues we're going to be looking at - what we've decided we're going to go with is we're going to kind of try and build on things that we have consensus on.

And by the way, nobody has to do any notes because the next issue of the Quarterly

is going to have a very expanded report from us, and it's going to have things that we talked about like how to weigh evidence and things like that that I'm not even going to get into here. So, everything that you're going to see in these slides and that is going to be in the Quarterly article, so you don't have to worry about noting anything. But, again, you can ask questions at the end, we can zip back and forth.

So anyways, you're more likely to see something like this. Alright, so, you've got a tier of lots, you've got a water's edge that's the only thing marked on the plan, and you have distances off of Erie and you get widths, but there's no monumentation shown. And this is a real registered plan here, this isn't something I just cobbled up. And there's an undulating line which we haven't a clue what that is. Is it high water mark, is it, you know, some vegetation line, is it a contour? Who knows?

Anyways, this is something you'd be more likely to find. The thing that you want to get into is what is that feature at the back of these lots, and how do we define it, and what is it? So, anyways, what we were going for on the Task Force is we're trying to figure out ways that, you know, what evidence is to be considered? And so, we're going to go through evidence. And Eric Ansell said the one thing he didn't like about my report is I put the evidence to be considered in different order. They're in the wrong order. But, you know what, the fact of the matter is you've got to consider everything.

I'm taking a holistic approach here. So, Eric, you can go out and come back in the middle of this thing, I don't care. But, we're going to be flipping back and forth to these pictures here. So, the first thing you want to look at is you've been handed this registered plan and you want to look at the thing. Let's just look at the plan unto itself, alright. Like, the plan is hopefully clear enough that this isn't an issue at all for you. But, you want to look at how it shows property lines. I could be flooding you with examples here, but you guys all know what I'm talking about.

That last plan - how do I go backwards on this thing? Okay, now, you've seen ones where, you see that solid side line? You'll see ones where the lines are stippled out to the water's edge, right. You could see, like, there's nothing here aside from the term, water's edge, on here. You don't see beach, you don't see - like, sometimes you'll see beach, sometimes you'll see private beach, sometimes you'll see little lanes. You know, it could be anything. It could be public beach you can even see there. Boy, if you get that you're off to the races.

Okay, the answer's there. But, so immediately we start with just what we have. And as I said, you should always look at the plan itself. That's your beginning. Eric says go to the Crown Patents, but he's jumping the queue. Alright, so you want to look at the registered plan, alright. How does it show the lines, what does it describe that land between the high water mark and the water's edge? So, is it just a blank space, is it beach?

The first example I showed you, that Registered Plan 736, nothing, it's just nothing.

And the one thing that was interesting was - I get to go back again - if you look at this, this is only actually half the plan. To the right side of the image is this great big chunk of blank space. And when you look at the title on this it's weird, that blank space, it was never developed, it's abstracted under the Lawton Concession, right. But, this blank space at the front is no longer abstracted, it's gone.

So, anyways, we'll start with that. So, you look at the plan, and just looking at the image on the plan, and gives you the first idea of what this meant. Now, I put in the line where the surveyor might first be able to determine the intention of the original sub-divider. That's a little contentious because the intention - like, there's two approaches to this. You can try and figure out what the intention of the subdivider is, but then there's also an argument that intention smintention, the plan should stand unto itself.

This plan was from 1909, I'm not going to go dig this guy up and any of his ancestors if you could conceivably find them, they're not going to give you any insight into this thing. So, hopefully the plan stands unto itself. Actually, a quick show of hands people who've had sort of a situation like this and you have to kind of guess what to do. I'd like to know how common this is. So, I see, you know, a lot of hands all across the room. And so, you can see why we actually constituted a Beach Task Force on this thing.

So, now we get to go to the next one that you'll look at. Alright, so, outside of the actual image, you got to look at the plan, and it's not as common but you may find some notation or something in the margin of the plan, or, well, at least you get the owner's name on it, who developed it, and then you can go back and sort of trace title to see if he did anything with it subsequently. Now, you can also look at, like, the plan itself, does it show any indications of a local access to the beach for non-riparian owners. You will always see those like that.

It could either be a block that, you know, it'll say Block A, Block B. You'll see this little sort of 15-foot wide strip or whatever between the lots leading down to the water's edge. And those are kind of cool because then at least you have an abstract that you can go and follow up title and see, well, did the municipality own it or, you know, maybe it was never transferred. But, it indicates that the people who weren't riparian owners, have been sort of an access for them to this beach.

Of course, you know, you want to check with the local municipality and see what do they think, right? You know, and also, if you see a short road leading up to the water's edge, which you would actually see in - going back again - you can see that there's this little section of road on - you can't read it for me - but it's Essex Boulevard. Right? It actually is on the original plan, it's sort of stifled in that it goes to this back line.

By the way, the back line on this plan doesn't even show water's edge or high water mark, it's just a bearing and distance. Who knows, it could be well away from the

shore. I will tell you that the aerial photos show this huge beach in front of this thing now, so this isn't just some small issue or that it's been eaten back by shore erosion or anything like that. So, by the way, I have mastered this thing. Anybody who told you it's difficult -

Okay, so, we go on to the next one. Here's where, again, I'm jumping the queue as far as Eric's concerned. But, anyways, I'm saying, what's on the beach, is there little fences leading out to the shore, are there signs like mine that I showed you saying, you know, no public use of this beach, it's our private beach? You want to see does the public use this thing. Sometimes you go out and it's a rocky shore, and it's a moot point. Did I just have a stroke? Okay. I told Roy if this talk - my partner, Roy Simone - I just said to him, if I sound like I'm bombing, can you do me a favour, I'll give you this eye sign and you fake an epileptic fit or something or pull the fire alarm or something.

Anyways, work with what you've got, but you also want to see how it applies to the public use. Like, what is physically being done on this beach? Also, has the local municipality demonstrated evidence of maintaining the beach for public beach. I mean, if you see a lifeguard shack out there and everything, that's pretty obvious. But, if they're maintaining the road out to the beach all the time, like, the little strip road leading down to it, right. If they're cleaning the beach and everything.

And of course, not just their evidence, but, you know, a lot of times, like in the situation I'm dealing with, it was the municipality that hired me to find out what's going on with this beach, is it private, is it public? But, you know, you can just ask them because they are an interested party in this whole thing, so obviously their opinion matters. So, here you've looked at the plan, now you're out there looking at field examination, and you're looking at what the owners have done.

Okay, go to the next one. Obviously, we're big on note sharing and things like that, and no man or woman is an island here, so we're not operating in little vacuum tubes. So, you want to talk, maybe find out what other surveyors have done. Have they handled similar problems on this? You know, it's amazing when you're stuck with a thing like this and you look at a couple of lots, riparian lots, and you see somebody's put a registered plan on and he's got a thing going to the water's edge. And then, you look at another plan that just held the original line as true and unalterable along the back of the lot and saying, you know, there you go, that's where it is.

Or, if you get a curved line - and we're not even going to be getting into that one - but how people have produced those lines so that they're giving people frontage. And, you know, we have yet to find any common law kind of principle on there. But, you guys all have a system and you're going different ways. And as you know, if you compare one area of the Province to the other you may find that they're operating different ways.

And by the way, getting back to the root reason we're having this Task Force, is to bring some commonality to our approach in here. So, we haven't quite given you a common answer, but we're giving you common evidence to be considered. And all the surveyors on the panel and every surveyor we've talked to, to get opinions, they all agree that, yeah, research and get the answer. And so, when we leave here and when we get our next Quarterly we should all be at a point where we can all agree, yeah, this is sort of what the least I can do to get my answer.

And what you decide to do is your opinion. And by definition we sell opinions, we don't sell, like - oh, well, unless we're Boundaries Act I guess - Boundaries Act, yeah, but we don't sell hard boundaries. So, anyways, now we get back to Registry office searches here. So, this is actually where Eric, you know, we'll meet up with him because he's down at the Registry office before he's even gone out to the beach. So, anyways, you've got the original abstract. In this case my abstract was from 1909.

First question; is there an abstract for this thing? What did they call it? Right? And getting back to my situation I had with that large chunk of land, there's nothing. If you go to the Teranet mapping, you'll just see - like, it's amazing because the aerial photo shows a beach out there, it shows the lines of the road, there's no pin on it. There's nothing. And the original abstracts, when I go back there and look, again, there was no abstract page created for this thing. So, that's your start.

But, an interesting thing is you should look for the original owner, you know, if he's around on a later plan, you can do that to see if they have any opinion on there. I have yet to be able to ever make use of this one, but we're bringing it up anyways, you know. So, the other thing is you should examine the deeds to the upland or non-riparian owners in the subdivision to see if they make any reference.

Imagine that you look at the original deed, the first ones that were carved-off on these things - and this is the one that would be signed by the subdivider. He's selling these lots. And in some cases, you may actually see you get Lot number 1 on Registered Plan 736 with beach rights. Well, holy cow, there's your answer right there, he's selling off a beach right which implies you've got a beach, which implies that it's privately held by him.

So, you know, don't just go with the original registered plan, the first transfers of the deeds, they're really getting back to the subdividers intention. What was he selling? Right, so, again, we write it isn't enough to look at the original registered plan, you should also review the original deeds to determine what the original land owners actually purchased from the subdivider.

Okay, so, you're looking for - and again, this sort of gets back - in my case I've got a road along there, I would see if there was any original documentation back around 1909 when that registered plan went on the road was transferred to the owners or to the municipality to see if maybe there was some correspondence.

Municipalities are amazing. You know, you can't find something that was left with them two years ago, and other ones you'll find the old grey-haired person behind the counter who knows just where to go downstairs, and they look for some original paper. You never know. Alright, now, Eric is going to truly be happy. If we can just for a moment take this point here and move it right to the - actually, before I even introduced everybody, at the start of this thing Eric wanted this one to be number one.

Says, look at the original patent, were there any Crown reservations in place, were there any exceptions? And for those of you who are unsure about - most of us know this - a reservation is interpreted in the Policy Guide 40301 as meaning that the Crown retains only a right or interest in that portion of land along the water, whereas an exception is interpreted that it's actually retained by the Crown. And those are your Shore Road Allowances and things like that.

But, you know, what did the patent say? You know, did it go to the water's edge, high water mark? I know we've got all this stuff saying that they're one in the same, but you never know what it will say in there. So, if you're going to give an opinion, you have to give an opinion off of all the facts. You know, what's that quote? We can argue our opinions, but we can't argue the facts. So, if you want to be able to offer an opinion - and nothing makes you look less professional than when you offer an opinion and then somebody says, well, what about this, and it's something you didn't even consider.

So, if anything, we want to look like we've actually looked at it. We may disagree with opinions with each other, but at least we can respect the fact that we all looked at the same evidence. Alright, okay, now, this is my personal fav point here. And I'm going to say, like, when you're working on something and you find out something you didn't know before, you go, oh, you know. So, it's almost like watching Jeopardy and hearing the answer to a question and you go, wow, I did not know that.

So, anyways, Izaak brought this one in. You should determine the laws of Ontario at the time that the plan was registered. Now, this was interesting to me. Plans registered between 1940 and 1951 would have been done under the guide of a version of the Beds of Navigable Waters Act that set all original patents to be interpreted as going to the high water mark unless stated otherwise. And it was pretty clear what that was.

And we say here that this is really the only version of the Beds of Navigable Waters Act that had this clarity, and boy our lives would be a lot easier if it all did. So, what I did is I've actually found in our records a plan of subdivision that was water boundaries at that time. So, this one says, you can see, it says, waterline in 1949. Right, high water mark. This one, there's no ambiguity here. The back line of Lots One to Eight is fixed, alright.

And there's a thing at the bottom there even saying, rite of passage available. But, in this case, I think we all agreed as the panel that if you have a situation where between 1949 and 1951, you know, get your little antennas up, look at the boundary and say, you know, that's a fixed line. And it's as true and unalterable as every other line on that subdivision. People may say, oh, do I own out to the water's edge and all that, you don't.

Okay, so, there's your magic numbers for you. And just out of interest here, who didn't know this? Who didn't know this? Am I the only one? I just saw a hand. Like, okay, one, two, three, four, five - ten honest surveyors in this room. Alright, I opened my heart, I showed you my soul, and you just laugh and you go, and that guy's the Chair of this Committee.

Alright, so, now we get into the beach itself, and you get into your erosion. But, we've got to look at the dynamics of the beach. And some cases - and I know this is along the Lake Erie - the difference between high water mark and the water's edge is staggeringly obvious because it's an 80-foot cliff. Alright, but then other times it's so slow and imperceptible, the water raising or lowering. It's almost like you've got a tide there because the difference in the water can make over days, it can go in hundreds of feet and out hundreds of feet.

So, we have to look at the dynamics of the beach. And as we know, if accretion is slow and imperceptible, then the high water mark is wherever the water mark is, or water's edge is defined by the water itself. But, there's lots of case law out there, and we're not going to bury you with case law in this thing. You know all this, where if there's a sudden flood or it washes in, it's no longer slow and imperceptible, therefore it's a completely different situation there.

Also, you always want to look to see if the beach topography has been changed by construction of artificial features or shore protections. And if the municipality went and put a whole - and who built this thing? You know, as we know, if I go and I build a huge [unintelligible] and backfill and everything 100 feet out into the water, well, I've just taken over, say, Crown land. But, if the municipality went and did this, or the guy next to me did that, and my beach happened to go out 100 feet just because the sand's building up against it, well, I didn't do that.

So, you know, when you're riprarian, you're always riprarian it, you know. So, there's all this common law that has to be taken into account. So, anyways, you've got to just look at the beach itself. Okay, now we're getting into more specific things here, but you should always determine whether there's any First Nation interests that have to be considered. Whether there's historical use claims, whether there's treaties.

I know - and of course I'm nowhere near this - but out in eastern Ontario they're working on an Algonquin claim. And, you know, so you can see that. And those of

you who are working out there, you're probably well familiar with this, and those of you who don't have these issues, you know, just keep in the back of your head that it could be an issue. Alright, we should also look at evidence of navigation patterns along the beach. And navigation is Federal concern, but we should always consider where there's evidence of public use.

I mean, there's always the common law principles that if there's a storm people are going to land on the beach. And so, in that respect, you know, whoever owns this beach, it's immaterial. There's always a safety that has to be considered. And this is a separate topic unto itself, if there's no artificial regulation of the waterway in question - you know, and that's more along controlled waterways and stuff like that. So, anyways, getting back to where - I had one more there. Okay, so, I'm going to go back.

Okay, so, we've just gone over the evidence that you want to look at, and I'm sure there's other things I may have missed, but we try to give you a fairly comprehensive list of the evidence. We've also, in the article that will be in the Quarterly, it'll be talking about, you know, how to deal with ambiguities and things like that. I didn't feel the need to get into that because how do you show a slide deck of ambiguities, you know. Don't know how.

Anyways, so, to get back to the original thing here, you're looking at that water's edge. I'm going to do a show of hands. This is a great way to poll members. Who would say - and think of your own area, you don't have to think of my specific area - that these people own to the water's edge? Now -

UNKNOWN MALE: What does Teranet say?

ANDREW MANTHA: That's a good point.

UNKNOWN MALE: [Unintelligible.]

ANDREW MANTHA: Yeah. So, you know, we've got, I'm going to say, a third of the room right off the bat just put their hands up to say they would push this through. Now, who would have a different opinion if this was a big curved thing and you had to produce the lines in such a manner that the riparian owners' sidelines would cross, and therefore a riparian parcel wouldn't be riparian anymore, right? Who would think how to do that? So, show of hands again?

Oh, okay. By the way, we have no right or wrong answer on this, as a committee I'm taking the opportunity to kind of see what the members do. This committee, we're taking the viewpoint that we're just trying to build on a commonality to get a consensus with you people. And it's not my intention, certainly, and it's not the intention of this committee to sit up here and tell you guys what to do. That's Russ' job. You thought you were safe.

And so, anyways, yeah, so, you see there's different approaches on this. Say those people who said, no, I'm going to hold the back line, what if there was little dots continuing from those solid sidelines right to the water's edge? In that case, those same people who had - not the ones who raised their hands before saying they would produce it - the people who said, no, I wouldn't produce it, would you feel comfortable producing that line now? If you could put your hands up.

Yeah, a few more of you are willing to push it through to the water's edge. Yeah, I got some more on the bandwagon. So, we're getting up from a third, now we're hovering around 50% of you are producing the lines out there. So, anyways, as I said, we don't really have answers on this thing. We all have our own separate opinions, and Izaak gave us five opinions of his own. Anyways, so, you know, this basically brings you to date where the Committee is.

Hopefully, you can appreciate the amount of work that goes into coming up with these sort of opinions, and putting decks in here. Other issues, I kind of was making notes about things because this isn't the only. When we say it was a Beach Rights Task Force we're kind of expanding it to how we would deal with, say, Ad Medium Filum.

Now, there's a great example where you would go into the Registry office and you would look online at Teranet and you've got all these properties along a major, semi- major, just a little waterway, and they map it to say, okay, this deed went to the water's edge, there's a reference plan here saying that's a navigable waterway, so Bed of Navigable Waters Act.

But then, they also show the deeds that go out to the middle. So, obviously they're not making a solid opinion on this thing and they're going to rely on us to do this. So, we're going to kind of try to find some guidelines on that. Again, you saw one of the last decks we had, we were talking about controlled waterways and how we would handle those. And of course, we're kind of interactive on this.

We're kind of hoping that if you come across any weird example that you can think of, or a question where you're just sitting there scratching your head or trying to guess, that if you could just scan the plan and send it to me, it sort of adds to this sort of thing. And we can sit there and scratch our heads with you. Anyways, I'm a little early on this, but I always find that if you're early everybody appreciates you even more than if you're running late.

So, here we are, I have got 9:07, I was supposed to be to 9:15. I'll tap out a little early here, Russ. Well, if you want questions I guess we'll take them. Seeing none, I run. Microphone and identify yourselves and do all that weird, wonderful stuff.

STEPHEN HOOK: Stephen Hook from Chatham. First of all, thank you, Andy. My question is, at the end of all of this we, as surveyors, have to report to the client. Are there some set examples that you might be able to give us so we can say, like, it's an

opinion but it comes with an asterisk because it could be challenged? So, I'm curious if in the Quarterly you could say, 'Here's some concluding statements you could make to a client?'

ANDREW MANTHA: Yeah, that's a good idea, actually. Will somebody take notes on that there? Anybody on my Committee, if you take notes on that. Well, one thing, the article that is going to be in the Quarterly is done already, you know, and basically Maureen's got her mitts on it. But, yeah, there's things like that, yeah, we can do. I'll tell you, we really tried to give you as much sort of, you know, this is a common consensus thing as possible. I was really happy to find that thing between 1940 and 1951. But, yeah, we can work on that. Next question?

DOUG: Hi, Russ. Doug from J.D. Barnes. I have a question. What about people protecting their banks? I remember Professor Lambden saying that when people protect their boundary to the water's edge, they have a right to protect their land, so they'll build up there. So, that could be served as evidence, too, right? Do they fix the boundary when they start building a wall?

ANDREW MANTHA: Well, yes and no. The problem is that we're taking the view that the first thing you've got to do is, what are they protecting? They have no idea where the boundary is right off the bat. A lot of times they're just putting it where their contractor says, well, for me to put shore protection here it's going to be \$20,000, if I put it in this location it's \$15,000. The decision has been made. So, you know, they're relying on us to do this.

And a lot of people, you know, as we all know in all construction, one of the great rules of construction is it is easier to ask forgiveness than permission. So, people just go and put things in and say, you know, hopefully nobody ever questions it. And it only becomes an issue when the neighbor says, hey, what's this, or, you know, the local conservation authority, you know, comes into this thing. So, basically your owner, and where we're going with this, is we want to be able to say to the owner, if you are going to build this shore protection or, you know, any sort of protection, you want to be able to say to them that you built it on your property.

Now, as we know, a lot of times you'll see people go right out to the water's edge or extend out into the water's edge and backfill and all that stuff. That's well settled under how we would handle that. They may have to get a Crown land planner sort of thing. But, you're probably thinking more along the lines this guy says, well, I want to protect my high water mark. Like, look at this thing. So, we've got the example I've got. Say that said high water mark and the distances were plus or minus, okay.

So, in that case I would interpret this thing as saying, well, we know at least that you own to the high water mark. And maybe that plan's 90 years old and the high water mark's moved in here, or out here, alright. You get into questions of, you know, we know water boundaries move in and out. High water marks, they're

ambulatory, I gather, as well. Right, you know, if you owned, say, top of bank - I'll say top of bank as to make it a little clearer so we don't have this confusion.

If your plan said you owned to the top of bank, and the bank's gone back 50, 60 feet, well, it's an ambulatory boundary, too, isn't it? You know, so, if people want to build out the bank to the original line, hey, that's a good question.

DOUG: Yeah, that was his question, do they fix it by building that. I'm talking about ancient protection, not new stuff. Sorry, I should have cleared myself. But, ancient where they built it to protect their land, maybe we could use that as evidence perhaps?

ANDREW MANTHA: Well, in this case let's go back to this one again. If you have distances there that are to the decimal foot and they're saying this guy owns here, and say right along the edge of that thing it said, top of bank. Okay, well, we have differences of opinion, but I'm probably thinking that in this case I'd be more leaning to maybe the distances on the plan might overrule the top of bank. But, what if the water's also come in and the distances on the plan extend 60 feet out into the water?

Right, you're not going to go tell the guy, go build your thing out there, off you go. So, you know, this is where we get into opinions. And opinions are great. You know, what's that old thing about opinions and rectums? Everybody's got one, right. But, you know, you want to make sure that your opinion is always based on solid and sound data. So, I don't know if I answered your question or just confused you, but either way it's a success. I did my job.

SUSAN MACGREGOR: Sue MacGregor, Surveyor General, Peterborough. I'll try to answer that question, but there's not a simple answer to that one. Certainly, if you're doing any shore works, you have to do that shore work lawfully, and that means the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act comes into play which requires permitting from the Crown. If you're working on your own property you absolutely have the right to do shore protection if you're staying within your property boundaries, but you also have to do it under the Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act and get proper permits.

So, that would be the advice to your client. If you're splashing into the water, now you're talking about splashing onto Crown land, in which case you have to do a Crown Land Plan, purchase the bed. So, that's basically your answer. Every water circumstance is unique, and if you have any questions my office is always there to help you.

ANDREW MANTHA: Thank you, Sue.

PAUL GOODRIDGE: Good morning, Paul Goodridge from North Bay. A few years ago at a Regional Group meeting in the Northeast, there was a presentation - I

forget who by - but basically they were stating that the government was considering a bill to make all beaches public resources. And whether that meant outright ownership of the beach or simply a rite of passage for the public even if it was private ownership, has that bill gone anywhere? Or do you know of anything?

ANDREW MANTHA: Not that I know of. Until that magic day, comes and makes everything easier we're just taking what we have right now and saying, you know, work with what you've got, give an opinion, and hopefully, you know, when things shake out in the end it's an opinion everyone can work with. I guess, you know, if you think about - everybody when to Erindale who did - and I don't know if they still do this at York - but, remember [unintelligible], you know, where they put a fox in the chicken coop.

And when you come in sometimes with some radical opinion - and I shouldn't even use the term radical, I'll just say an opinion that upsets the whole neighborhood, you got to kind of think of that. You want to think about your opinion before you utter this because you don't want to unsettle longstanding occupation or principles in this. And we kind of alluded it to what we're saying is, you know, talk to other local surveyors, find out what they've been doing in the area.

I mean, if we were going to come up with a hard and fast rule across the Province, we would almost say, don't bother, here's what you do. But, we're saying, you know, you want to work with what people have done in the past, you know, and find out what longstanding practices are. Tim?

TIM HARTLEY: Tim Hartley from Windsor. I found from working down there when we have these problems with beaches and rights-of-ways, to always, like you may have said, look at the original deeds from the developer because a lot of times these were sold with the idea that you had access to this private beach. And it usually comes up in the deed from the original owner.

Because I live in one of those and we had a private park on the Detroit River. And there was about 30 people in the subdivision, we all had rights to use this private park. And then, when market value taxes came in the city said, well, this is worth \$3 million, and so our taxes were going to jump up. And we said, no. We went back and we had the original deeds from the developer that said we all had a right to use this, which made the property valueless. There was no value to the property because it was subject to all these rights of usage.

And so, always important to go back to that original deed and see what the intention was because a lot of times there wasn't air conditioning, you bought a lot, and you went down to the beach and had a drink.

ANDREW MANTHA: Yeah, I know. And I know your parcel there, it's very well landscaped and that. And it sounds like, wow, somebody could just build on there and have this great lot, but no, everybody's got the right to use that. But, like you say, you don't actually own it, you just had the right.

TIM HARTLEY: Right to it, yeah. In this case, the original developer had two deeds to it, and the people on either side have that deed, but it's subject to our rights of passage. And so, it's a valueless piece of land for taxes, but very valuable to the owners of the subdivision. So, when you do have these rights to the beaches, it affects the value of the upland property if they have the rights to the -

ANDREW MANTHA: Yeah, and I didn't mention this, although it's pretty obvious in here. One of the reasons that this is such a contentious issue is that when you have people who are backing onto the water, they are invariably the people with the most money and the most free time to kvetch - is my word of the weekend here - or to raise this issue and that. And unfortunately, they are the ones who are willing to complain to the Ministry and stuff and follow it up.

So, anyways, we're still working on this thing. Like I said, I look forward to reactions from people when they read the Quarterly. I understand there's a couple of articles in the next Quarterly, so, you know, everybody can give their own opinions on this. The Beach Task Force is more or less just a "this is what you should look at right now." Okay, thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Andrew, we've given a donation in your name to Project SHARE.

ANDREW MANTHA: Oh, good deed tonight.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, yeah, lots of interest in that discussion. So, if you have questions for the Task Force, I think everybody's at the meeting here, so, you know, feel free to approach them. The other thing that I'd like to mention is that there is going to be a Four Point Learning. Izaak is putting on a day-long learning session dealing with beach properties. I can't remember the exact title, but it's on April 23rd. So, you know, consider attending that. I'm sure you can find out anything you need to find out about it through going to the website, Four Point Learning website. Okay, next up we have Bob Halliday. But first, Gavin is going to make a bit of an introduction, I think.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thanks, Russ. Good morning, everyone, and thanks Andy, for setting that bar real highly. We're moving -

ANDREW MANTHA: [unintelligible].

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Yeah, but you know what I'll do is I'll have to take it with everybody sitting down because I don't think I'll get that kind of response. Since I don't have a name plaque yet, my name is Gavin Lawrence and I'm the Council rep on the PSC Committee. The sketches issue is a complex one. it's one that has been really polarizing and causes much consternation. Before Bob delivers his presentation, there are three things that I'd like to share with you.

The first thing is that Council is grateful and appreciates the work that Bob and others have been doing on this Committee. We continue to support you and the Committee. So, that's the first thing. The second thing, after some back and forth, Council accepted PSCs recommendation in January. Ever since, Council continues to grapple with this issue, and there remains some doubt. So, maybe I can just leave point number two there.

Lastly, although there are some Survey Monkey results, this is an opportunity for Council to receive some direct input from members. So, please listen to the presentation and provide us with your feedback. So, three things. Firstly, Committee's doing a great job. Secondly, Council, still wrestling with this issue. Thirdly, we'd like your feedback. Thank you very much. I'd like to welcome Bob up to the podium for his presentation.

PLENARY SESSION: POLICY ON SKETCHES

ROBERT HALLIDAY: Thank you for those kind words, Gavin. And as Gavin alluded to, our original intention was to be giving you the final version of what sketches were, what the decisions were that had been made, and how we were going to be going forward. Council would like to reconsider that a little bit, so what I'm going to give you is where we are now. As Andrew said earlier, work in progress. So, take it that way.

I'm sorry if we're disappointing anyone. The Committee has been working very hard to get to this stage, and we thought we had it resolved, but more work has to be done. Big green button. So, the Steering Committee for Professional Standards Committee is Ron Berg and Norm Taurins, Ted Williams, Dave Raithby, Jack Keat, Council Rep Gavin Lawrence, Bill Buck, Tim Hartley, Blain Martin, and myself, as Chair.

Just before we go into sketches themselves, just a little bit about what we have been working on. Obviously, sketches was our primary focus, well, for the past two years, but in addition to that other issues came up that needed to be looked at. So, we had some input into digital plans when comments were requested by the government last spring. The Committee took that on, as well. We had another issue that was raised by one of the regional groups in regards to what content is allowed to go on plans going into the Registry office.

And then, we have an ongoing maintenance and updating function keeping the Practice Manual that's available on the AOLS website as current as we can. So, as new relevant legislation comes into play, or regulations change, or web links change, all of that needs to get done. And I'd like to recognize all of the hard work that Jack Keat has done keeping that as a useful document for us.

So, some of the basic premises that the Committee considered, in our minds surveys and how we portray those results to our client are two different parts of the same

overall process. If we think in terms of a general project, the project has a research component, it usually has but not always, has a field component, and then it has a presentation reporting component. And what we have to do to do a survey is already out there. We know what we have to do, as I've already alluded to, the research and everything, and then the field work, and then the assessment.

So, to the Committee, the issue then is, how do we communicate our findings to our client? And so, that can take many formats. It can come in just a simple letter such as, as requested we went to your lot, we found your monuments or we replaced some of your corners or whatever we did, and here's our invoice or whatever it needs to say. It may be a more detailed report that is required because there's a little bit more complexity that's involved, or you were asked to answer a question.

In many instances because of title issues a reference plan may be required, or because this is part of the severance process a reference plan is required. In other instances, it will be a subdivision. If it's a boundary that you need to provide a plan on, then you provide a plan of survey. The Committee feels that in some instances a sketch, because it's really a single issue that you're looking at, that a sketch as part of your overall reporting process may be a viable product to provide to your client.

So, how did we get here? Starting in 2013 this became a topic on our agenda, and for nearly the past two years it's - I think we started right after the AGM in 2016 - it became the primary focus of all of our meetings. Committee meets once a month by teleconference usually an hour to an hour and a half long. At least once a year we have a face-to-face full day meeting. For this particular topic we met to kick it off in 2016 and again fall of 2017 to try to wrestle it to the ground. And then, because of response from Council, we met again with Council for four or five hours in January to discuss various concerns that Council had.

So, there's been tremendous, tremendous thought that's gone into the proposal that we've put before you. We've looked at all kinds of sketches that have been provided, many of them considered to be bad practice. And so, we need to see what's going on so that we can say, no, we don't feel that that is appropriate. We've looked at other sketches that we say, yeah, that seems reasonable. And so, that came into coming to a conclusion.

In 2016, we sent out a Survey Monkey to the membership and then spent considerable time going through the results from the Survey Monkey, which I have to say was very inconclusive. There were essentially two camps on either extreme of the spectrum and not a lot of common ground in the middle. And so, although it was interesting to see, it didn't really tell us anything about industry trends. We don't want to put rules in place that hinder valid practice.

If our membership is doing something and doing it properly and well, then we don't want to, just for the sake of having rules, stamp out what they're doing. We also hired a consultant who did a lot of review of existing legislation and made some

recommendations for us. And we took all of that and we put it into the blender and we tried to come up with something that we thought was workable.

And what we came down to - might call it a cop-out, but we felt comfortable with this - is that the 1982 guidelines, although somewhat outdated in terms of technology and that sort of thing, basically capture what we need to do. And that is that sketches under the right circumstances need to be distinguishable from survey plans, so that the public, when they look at a sketch, they can tell I'm not looking at a plan of survey, and not be confused.

If they've got something that has your company name on it, we heard comments even as recently as two days ago from some members of Council that that looks too much like a sketch, how can I tell the difference. So, we need to make efforts to be able to distinguish them. As I think back over my career and not hearing a lot of discussion about sketches, and perhaps because I have a great deal of respect for all of my colleagues out there, I like to think that everyone who is an OLS is at least willing and trying to follow the rules. That doesn't necessarily get supported by some people's experiences, but I think we have to give our membership the benefit of the doubt in that regard.

When the sketches came out in 1982 I was still an articulated student, and it was at the very same time that the one monument building location survey was also being brought into effect. And I can recall all kinds of discussion about that, I can recall a question on my professional exam about the merits of building location surveys. I don't recall any discussion about sketches at that time, and other than the 2013 Bulletin that came out, I don't really remember much discussion on sketches ever since. The membership was essentially left to do it themselves.

So, I and the Committee strongly feel that if we have a problem a big part of it is going to be resolved by reminding the members of what the rules are. Another problem that we have is there is this insinuation that there is widespread misuse of sketches, but all it is, is innuendo tales of competing firms. I don't do that, but the other guy doesn't mind doing it. So, we don't know really whether we have a problem. We're seeing examples of bad practice, but we're not sure whether it's intentional or whether it's through ignorance.

So, the Professional Standards Committee strongly recommends that we go further with the idea that projects are something that needs to be reviewable. We are recommending to Council that all projects be assigned a project sticker number or a project number. Whatever the mechanics of that are don't matter. What does matter is that every project that a survey firm opens needs to be available for review. Obviously just like reference plans, only a small minority of them will ever be looked at.

But, I was astounded the first couple of rounds of survey review, comprehensive reviews, how every time they pulled a plan they found a problem with it. So, that's

gotten better, obviously, but I think the same logic will carry that once a survey review is able to look at all of our files, we'll pull up our socks just like we have in the past, and part of this problem will go away just because the membership is becoming educated.

So, sketches need to be sufficiently different in appearance. The first, I think, six points that I'm going to be making here is a straight review from 1982. I would point out that sketches have been in use for a long time and they're used for a wide variety of purposes, but we don't want to eliminate them as an option for professional surveyors to use. So, the existing guidelines. No preprinted forms. Well, I don't know if anybody uses preprinted forms anymore, I seriously doubt it because everyone's using CAD.

So, that's still there, but the idea is that we don't want to take some kind of a plan blank from another product type. So, we don't want to take a reference plan, use that to make a sketch without completely modifying all of the information that's on it. Number two, sketches should indicate in their title blocks the purpose of the sketch. For instance, Sketch For Building Permit Application. Sketch for Severance Application. We suggested a number of other options. Sketch for discussion purposes, sketch showing topographic information for development permits, for grading permits.

Any number of situations where a full-blown plan of survey is either not appropriate, or is not necessary, at the present time. Sketch should not show the geographic location of the parcel in the title. That is a very major way of taking away the similarity between a sketch and a plan of survey. By all means, show it on the body of the plan. We had some examples where firms were leaving a column down the full right-hand side and showing all kinds of relevant information there. The property description, the owner's name, the applicant's name. Whatever was relevant all got put down in that right-hand column and further distinguished the product from a plan of survey.

Caution note. Caution, this is not a plan of survey, and shall not be used for transaction or mortgage purposes. And either contained in that same note or separately, this sketch is protected by copyright. We were wondering about the relevance of mortgage purposes anymore, but we recently heard of some sketches that seemingly were being prepared in an SRPR kind of format but being called a sketch. And so, I think it's, for the time being, we should leave in that note and we should clarify the intention of how sketches should be used and shouldn't be used.

We should also have a note that says, should not be used except for the purposes indicated in the title block. So, if it's a plan for a severance application and you say - or, sorry, if it's a sketch for a severance application and you say, this sketch should only be used for severance purposes, or for purposes of the severance application to the municipality of 'x', then anyone who is thinking at all will be able to tell that that is a one purpose sketch and not intended for any other use. And if use is made

for it for some other purpose then clearly the person is not following the indications on that sketch.

A note should appear on all sketches indicating the source of the dimensions and information on the sketch and noting if they're obtained from survey. I haven't seen this showing up on very many sketches, and I certainly, as I've been going through this process with PSC and at the same time as I've been preparing sketches of my own office, I've been digging in and making sure that what I send out now is much more in compliance than they used to be. So, again, my expectation is that the membership will do the same thing.

Sketch should contain the statement that the copy must be embossed with the surveyor's seal. Good idea, becoming more difficult to work it because so many of our products are sent out digitally now. We talked about various ways of protecting the misuse through a combination of locked PDFs, and certified PDFs, and that sort of thing. We probably want to bring in our technical people to make recommendations on types of technology that we can implement to make the sketches as difficult to abuse as possible.

No signature unless required by an approving authority. The Committee was more in favour of removing the possibility of signing a sketch, but we were told that some municipalities have been educated by their surveyors to expect a sketch to be signed to prove the validity, the genuineness of that sketch. And so, we're saying it shouldn't be signed under most circumstances. A municipality requires it then by all means don't put a full-blown surveyor's certificate on. You might sign according to the date of the completion of any fieldwork that was done, or the completion of the sketch itself.

And then, additional items that should be shown, these next items were not included in the original guidelines. A north arrow is usually a good idea. Some cases it may not be relevant, but I don't think that's very common. A note about the units of measure being used. And to beat our drum a little bit, get that project sticker on there. We're not at that place yet, but as we move towards it, then get in that habit of assigning every project a sticker number.

Bearings should not be shown in most situations. Sometimes they're necessary, and if that's the case, then do it. But, for the most part, we feel that bearings make it look too much like a plan of survey and so should be avoided.

So, other survey information that you might put on there, and I'm just going to remind you again, because I learn better by getting hit over the head two or three times - I'm assuming some of you do as well. The sketch is one vehicle, one product that we can provide to our client to explain our opinion; our findings.

The sketch doesn't get issued until all of the proper job has been done. So, again, the research, any fieldwork that's necessary. Under those circumstances we move onto -

or, with that expectation, sketch should not show survey monuments unless they have been verified by current survey. This is one of the items that Council is concerned about, so it's very much going to be open for discussion in the next little while.

Again, the Committee feels that a simple monument being shown without all of the other requirements, so no origin, no indication of the markings, as long as the surveyor has done their due diligence and is satisfied in their mind that it's not just a hunk of metal in the ground but that it's actually a survey monument in its original position, this one is still to be determined and may or may not stay like that. And this next item falls into a similar category.

Sketch should not show ties from existing property lines to buildings or fences unless determined from current survey. The Committee feels that as long as that boundary has been properly surveyed, and particularly if the focus is something such as, 'Is that tree on my lot?' 'Is it on my neighbor's lot?' or 'Is it straddling the line?' I can answer that question in a letter, but as soon as I start saying it is east of the line, it is west of the line, half of my clients or more get confused. So, having a very simple sketch that shows the situation, to the Committee, is reasonable. Again, this is yet to be determined by Council who, at the end of the day, have the final say.

So, this is a recap of what PSC has been doing this year. What we've been doing has been an effort to help our members perform their duties to the public better. And I know that some of the things that we are suggesting are controversial, and we encourage your input. That's how this is going to get resolved; is not from vitriolic comments such as we got from some members in the Survey Monkey, but helpful recommendations, helpful discussion so that Council can make the decision that they need to make.

So, at some point the Committee is planning to have a traveling road show to bring examples around to the regional groups and otherwise engage in discussion, but that won't be happening until the final product has been determined, and we know what is actually going to be approved. So, thank you for your attention.

RUSS HOGAN: So, we do have a couple of minutes, not a lot of time, but if there are some questions, Bob's willing to try to respond. The other thing is, of course as we've mentioned, there's two Concurrent Sessions, so you'll be able to get into, you know, a lot more in-depth discussion probably at the Concurrent Session.

SAEID SEDAGHAT: Sorry. My name is Saeid, and more or less just a quick question. We need to show easement, or right of ways, or any right, that affect my client on the face of the sketches or not?

ROBERT HALLIDAY: I would think that if it's relevant to what you're trying to indicate, and in some cases, it would be essential. If you're doing a sketch for a new

construction and you find that the proposed location for the house is sitting on top of an easement, you probably want to let your client know.

CHRIS OYLER: Chris Oyler from Windsor. My understanding is a sketch is just that, a sketch. And it sounds simple to say, but we have other products available to us, such as a plan of survey that if we're showing a boundary, shouldn't a plan of survey show the information, like a tie to a boundary? You mentioned in your presentation that you can show as long as it's current. I was under the impression that a plan of survey would deal with that, and a sketch, anything related to a boundary would be covered under a plan of survey and not a sketch.

ROBERT HALLIDAY: I think that according to the 2013 Bulletin, your interpretation would be correct. The Committee felt that there are some situations where the retracement isn't of value to the client. And a couple of examples that we looked at were municipal situations where the survey department has been asked about the location of a fire hydrant, or a manhole, or tree or something like that. And the users are not conversant with survey plans.

And so, all they're really asking for is a yes or no answer, and that as long as the answer we give is based on valid work, and not on going to some advanced Google imagery and picking it off, that it would be acceptable. But, that remains to be seen.

HELMUT PILLER: Helmut Piller, Toronto. I will take responsibility for some of the vitriolic comments. As it is well known, I'm dead set against sketches. What we see in our sphere of practice is that people come with sketches which are surveys. They get sketches for building permits, for building, which is they take it as a survey. As a matter of fact, at one time I had a confrontation with a colleague. I called the architect that he did the survey for, and said, did you want a survey, did you want a survey, of course I want a survey. I mean, do a survey to get a survey, not a sketch.

I said, well, you got a sketch and it says right on there that it's not to be used for this, this, this. This is the issue. Not the sketches that we can prepare for to illustrate a description or for severance and so on. And that is what has to be stopped. What you're presenting is a survey. The sketch, to put sketch on it instead of a survey as real property report, it's no different, what you would allow, or what your Committee proposes to allow, and would not allow.

And that is the issue. That is what has been driving this whole thing for years now, and resulted in submissions to the Registrar time and again to say, what are we going to do here. And it's the public interest that this Council, Association, has to protect, and it's not. Because as I said, we had instances where people come to us and they say, well, 'What do you mean it's not a survey?' I went to a surveyor. If I want shoes made I don't go to the dentist, I go to the shoemaker. And that, to me, is a clear principle of what we are supposed to do.

We have to tell our client, not to give them - as I think it was suggested yesterday - to do an option, well, I can do this for you for this much money, or this for you for that much money. I tell you what you will need in order to get a severance, to get a building permit, whatever you need because it's my knowledge that I'm telling you. You don't like it, you don't like my price, go to my colleague. Thank you.

ROBERT HALLIDAY: Okay, thanks.

JOHN D'AMICO: John D'Amico from Orillia. I think Helmut has made a valid point. I think it's a case of misuse and misinterpretation, and really a surveyor opening themselves up to liability. I think a lot of these sketches, as much as we may attempt to set out what is best practice, or what should or shouldn't be shown on a sketch, it's really the public use that--I have seen the public take the fact that you are a surveyor so I'm going to extenuate and interpret this as a different form even though we have particularly tried to put disclaimers or limit the amount of information that's put on a sketch, as these things are going to get sent around and misused.

That's the key, and I've seen it in practice. You're a surveyor, so this is a survey. That's one possible problem. So, again, it's opening ourselves up to liability. But, how can we stop, say, okay, you can't, and you should, and you shouldn't do this, especially when it becomes to something that is more guidelines and it isn't necessarily regulated in that certain way, so it's open to certain interpretations as to how we're preparing things? So, any good professional will do their best to advise their clients accordingly and try to protect themselves. But I think things might get tested and challenged when they get misused, and then you'll see to what extent you're being held liable for what information you're handing out.

The other thing is sketches in the topographic survey thing. Well, there's another thing that potentially we're opening ourselves up to liability, because I think a lot of times what's happening is things are being prepared and then they're being used.

They're being used for design purposes, and then you're constraining yourselves into saying, okay, this is going to be the extents of limits, a design has been done, and then you haven't properly spent enough time doing the work to provide an opinion as to exactly where the extensive boundaries are.

And then, you are going to, what use this information when you're then doing the first application or you're doing something that's more in the case of the property information? That's the other fear I see happening out there with some things that are floating around with the topographic sketches.

And lastly, the stickers. Yes, all projects should. Should they have stickers? Well, we know that there are other professions that are preparing things that surveyors can prepare, and they're not subject to the same constraint of having to put the project sticker.

I'm not advocating I'm for it or not for it, I just think that that-- and I've thought this through when I was in private practice. Okay, I'm going to prepare a lot grading plan and I've got to put a sticker, but the engineer that prepared it doesn't have to put a sticker. So, I'm going to wear a different hat, I'm not going to do it under my C of A. That's another thing that potentially is a problem.

JEFF BUISMAN: Jeff Buisman from Guelph. Sketches are a passionate discussion obviously. I have seen your Survey Monkey, and as the passion that's coming out today. And I applaud the Committee for the work they've done, what I've seen in the presentation and I appreciate it. I appreciate the opportunity for the dialogue, and the different ideas on what should go in the sketch and what shouldn't.

Your comment about the idea of a traveling road show after you've figured out the policy— I guess I'm a little disappointed. Almost I'd love to have the traveling road show now, so it's a better forum for discussion. I guess what I'm looking for is what is a good method of discussion of some of the details of the sketches? I know we have the seminars yet today, but I'd love to sit down with the Committee and sort of say, okay, you know, this aspect and that aspect, I'm curious why you're thinking that, where are you going, give me examples why you're leading this way.

I'm interested in that detail and I'm wondering if the traveling road show before the policies or the guidelines are finished might be an opportunity for the members to provide input on some of the details. So, I'm asking really what is a good opportunity for us to really sit down and review some of the details because I'm interested in knowing where are you coming from; why, and my thoughts on it as well.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, good recommendation. Thanks. Okay, thank you very much, Bob, I know this has been a challenge for you and the Committee, and I really appreciate the effort. We've given a donation to Project SHARE in your name.

ROBERT HALLIDAY: Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Yeah, I do want to, I guess, say a few things with regard to this whole sketches issue. It has been taking a long time. I thought we were going to be here and were going to be saying, okay, this is the direction we're taking, and as Bob mentioned, the Committee brought their recommendations to Council and we've been back and forth a couple of times. And I guess the bottom line is, is that, you know, sort of the eleventh hour, but there was enough discomfort at Council that we just felt that we couldn't nail it, and come to the group here and say this is what it is.

So, yeah, the opportunity to provide input, I'm hopeful that - I know Jeff was just asking, like, you know, when can we have that conversation about what

considerations the Committee, you know, how did the Committee arrive at some of their recommendations. And I'm hoping that today during the other Concurrent Sessions, if you ask those questions I think Bob, and the other folks on the Committee would be able to provide you that feedback so you have an understanding of where they were coming from.

So, anyway, excuse me, not to belabour the point, okay, yeah, we're at 10:00. So, we'll have a 30 minute break before the Concurrent Sessions that start at 10:30. The Concurrent Sessions are on the fifth floor in the Strategy Rooms. And that agenda that you have says where those are. The Convocation Lunch takes place in this room at 12:30, and then following the Convocation Lunch we'll have the second round of Concurrent Sessions. Enjoy the break.

--Upon resuming at 10:30 am

CONCURRENT SESSION: TERAVIEW ON THE WEB & ONLAND PRESENTATION

JEFF BUISMAN: Murray Purcell and I are the co-chairs for the Digital Plan Submission Task Force. The task force has been meeting pretty much since the fall of 2014. I'm a little bit more recent than that, that I've joined the team, and our intention is to review the development, and the digital standards for AOLS members. Trying to establish or develop digital standards is a big challenge in the light of the rapid changes in technology and the breadth of things to address.

Probably the most significant item we have been discussing is the electronic registration and the deposit of survey plans into the registry office. We've had an opportunity as a committee to scrutinize and advise how the office at Teranet should be implementing the digital plan submission. In addition to protecting the public we want to make sure that the surveyors are being treated fairly.

A couple of things we insisted on is that the digital plan only be in PDF format, and the other is that the plan back to the surveyor be identical to the plan that Teranet - to Teranet's digital public files.

It's been great to have Ken Wilkinson on our team, OLS, and Examiner of Surveys for the province on our committee. So, Ken and the government have responded positively to our challenges. Not taking an authority and ram it down your throat sort of approach, and they've been sensitive to the surveyor's range of needs.

In turn we have offered them AOLS support to this initiative, and our task force has gathered assistance from the Professional Standards Committee, Continuing Education Committee, Survey Review Department, the Province-wide Survey Index Committee, and the Registrar. Our commitments have been to keep the membership informed, make training available, and keeping in mind that the digital plan service is voluntary and to help members in this transition time. This is a

cooperative effort.

I personally appreciate the precursor step to the e-mail submission for pre-approval of survey plans. It saves time, travel, and courier costs, and strengthens the consistency of plan review throughout the province. E-Reg of plans will bring us another step in a positive direction.

We know that E-Reg of survey plans is important to Service Ontario as indicated by their top-level participation in our committee, and we see their enthusiasm here today by bringing their big guns for this upcoming presentation.

We have four speakers today. Ken Wilkinson, Examiner of Surveys, and Deputy Director of Titles for the purposes of confirming boundaries under the Boundaries Act and a Deputy Director of Land Registration.

Angie Statevski, Senior Product Development Specialist of Teranet. Angie Statevski joined Teranet in 2001 and has over 16 years of experience in supporting the delivery of government solutions to legal professionals. Angie's primary focus is the Teranet product and she's currently working on delivery of OnLand phase two.

Jennifer Connell is the Teraview Product Manager at Teranet. Jennifer has extensive experience in developing government solutions to legal professionals. Prior to the Teraview portfolio, Jennifer managed Teranet Express and Roscoe Solution on-site across Ontario and the land registry offices. These three people will be talking about OnLand and Teraview on the Web.

Izaak de Rijcke - we all know Izaak and his massive credentials as a lawyer, and a land surveyor. Izaak is an important member of our task force. We have Izaak here today primarily to share his views and insight of the digital submission process from his real estate law practice.

Digital submissions have existed within the real estate transactions for some time now. I must admit I was much more hesitant in accepting this process before listening to Izaak's perspective. He will be providing some of our future training through his Four Point learning portal as well. So please join me in welcoming our speakers as they tell us more about these services and future opportunities.

ANGIE STATEVSKI: Good morning. I'm Angie Statevski. I'm here to give you a demo and overview of OnLand. OnLand is a website application we have built on behalf of Service Ontario to basically bring any type of record that you get at the Land Registry Office onto a digital online format. If you're not familiar with OnLand, OnLand was released in December 2017. Currently on the website you can retrieve any historical books, like abstract records, parcel abstract books.

OnLand will be released in two phases. As I said phase one was released in December 2017, and phase two will be released later this year. So, I'm just going to

do a walk-through of what's available on the site currently then give you a brief introduction to what will be available in phase two.

So, when you go to OnLand.ca, what you'll be presented with is basically an area - where would you like to search from? So, in here you can either enter the city that you're looking for the record, or if you know the Land Registry Office. For example, I'm going to enter Scarborough, and when I enter Scarborough it will let me know that it is in LRO 80, so I'll select that.

Once I select that it will basically give me the next option of what would I like to search. So, as you see currently right now, because we're in phase one, the option to search historical books is available. When we launch phase two later this year, you'll be able to do property title searches, do search by address, search by pin, obtain parcel registry abstracts, obtain documents, plans, bit certificates, and also what's new online is to be able to request certified copies of abstracts and parcel registers. So, you'll hit search.

So, when you search the historical records you're given two options. You can either go to search books or go to browse books. If I jump to browse books, for each LRO, it will give me a listing of what types of records are available. So, in the case of LRO 80, I can search for my abstract parcel register book, general register index, by-law index, power of attorney and re-take.

So, for the purpose of the demo, I will go into the abstract parcel registry book. So, I go in here and it will basically give me every book that's available in the Toronto registry office, sorted by book number.

If I want to I can then sort and filter by municipality. So again, if I was just interested in Scarborough, I can select Scarborough, and again it will give me by book number, each book that's available with its description. The description and the book number also follow the same concept that's at the registry office, for law books. It should be very similar to that. So, in this case I can see that book one is parcel 1-44.

Normally when you search the books you have the geographic you actually want to search, so what you can do is go to the 'search books' feature. This is very useful when there is a lot of records in the registry office and if you really do know what you want to get to, you might as well just go to search book. In this case I can go to the search book category, so when I want to look for an abstract parcel register, then I can enter, for example - if I want to see all the plans available in Toronto I can select search book. Again, it will give me all the plans that are available.

If I want to refine my search I can enter the plan number I'm specifically looking for. In this case it would be 3467. You can narrow down your search by lot, block, street, after this, but depending again how the book was indexed, I would suggest you search with the plan first. So, hit search, and in this case, it will give me

everything in Toronto that has Plan 3467 in it. So, in this case again I was looking for Scarborough, so I will hit new details. At this point it will load the abstract book as it was in the registry office. At this point I can either navigate per page. For example, if I know I'm looking for Lot 31, and I think there's 3 pages per lot, I can jump to page 90 from here, hit next, and it will give me Lot 22. I can keep hitting next or select 120. If you want to get close to your lot number, you can hit next, and eventually I'll hit Lot 31.

At this point, you can also enter a full screen mode to make it easier for you to read. You can zoom in, if you wish, and zoom out. Currently, with phase one, you only have the ability to view. With phase two we will be introducing the option to print the pages or download copies of the pages. With OnLand we support all the browsers, so you can use this in Chrome, Firefox, IE, Safari for the Mac users. We also support tablet and mobile. The site is responsive. For example, if I go back, if I minimize this, you will see that you get the zoom in, zoom out options, so if you are a tablet or mobile user, it will allow you to view the records as well. Another feature I just wanted to point out is the 'contact us'.

On 'contact us' we have smart form searches. So, depending on your question it will funnel the question to Teranet or Service Ontario. For example, if you're looking for records and find that the record is missing or illegible, you can complete the form. It will go to Service Ontario and it will upload the re-take on the file.

Like I said phase one is open to everybody. You don't have to register to use it. You just to go OnLand.ca and then when we introduce phase two, that's when historical books plus the parcel registers images, documents, plans, will be available, and that's later this year. Am I taking questions now or later? Or if you have any questions?

DAVID WYLIE: Quick question. David Wylie from Ottawa. The scans of the abstract pages; are these re-scans of the books? Or are these taken from the microfilms?

ANGIE STATEVSKI: They're from the microfilms, and like I said if you do see image problems, we will do the retakes and upload the new ones.

DAVID WYLIE: What's the cost? Is there a cost for viewing these things?

ANGIE STATEVSKI: So, phase one currently there is no cost. You can go ahead.

DAVID WYLIE: [unintelligible]

ANGIE STATEVSKI: Correct.

PETER MORETON: I've used it quite a few times. It's excellent.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Your name?

PETER MORETON: Sometimes the earlier abstracts can be a little rough but it could be the same as looking at it in a book. The quality is good, and if you take the time to go through it, it's really exactly what it should be.

MURRAY PURCELL: Just for the record this is being recorded I believe, so if you can say your name before you speak, that would be Peter Moreton.
M-O-R-T-O-N.

PETER MORETON: M-O-R-E-T-O-N.

DAVE WILEY: I have a question. How far are you along this scanning the old documents, the deeds, and surveys attached to the deeds?

ANGIE STATEVSKI: With that I wouldn't - I don't know if Service Ontario knows.

KEN WILKINSON: Ken Wilkinson from Toronto. I can tell you we have done a lot of work on scanning. I believe we are approaching the end of the scanning process, and the reason we're doing all the scanning is so we can upload it online for a fairly low charge, and make it available to surveyors for research. We are very close.

DAVE WILEY: Dave Wiley again. Once phase two roll-out there will be a fee associated with the phase two OnLand. How does that fee structure tie in with Teraview?

ANGIE STATEVSKI: I'll be honest with you, phase - we haven't defined the fee structure yet for phase two. We're still working with the government.

KEN WILKINSON: We can't really talk about fees. Ken Wilkinson again. We haven't defined the fees yet. The fees are defined primarily to put a slight barrier so someone couldn't come to the website and download the entire thing. So there will be a small cost to get the thing similar to what you would have paid in the registry office, maybe even less.

DAVE WILEY: But will there be a registration fee similar to Teraview or no?

ANGIE STATEVSKI: No. You'll be able to access the site as a registered user. The benefit of that, you can save your credit card details for example, or you can be anonymous.

DAVE WILEY: So, it will be just an e-commerce site?

ANGIE STATEVSKI: Exactly.

UNKNOWN MALE: By-laws, will they be abstracted against their old pins?

UNKNOWN FEMALE: [unintelligible]

KEN WILKINSON: That sounds like more of a conversion question or an ongoing thing. The by-law index going into this OnLand, I don't know that it's in every registry office yet, but they are scanning the by-law index and over time it will be loaded into this.

ANGIE STATEVSKI: It's right here.

REYNALDO ISIP: Reynaldo Isip, MTO. Are you also including the highway registry in that, highway plans?

ANGIE STATEVSKI: The highway registry index?

REYNALDO ISIP: The highway registry.

ANGIE STATEVSKI: That's in phase two.

OLIVER BIRCH: Oliver Birch, North Bay. The documents when they're available in OnLand, will all of them be printable? I know the ones you have now through Teranet you simply can't print because the pages are either scanned sideways or are too large. The staff can always print them from their printer but could never figure out why the printer on the other side of the counter couldn't do them, but the staff printer could.

ANGIE STATEVSKI: It would be the same. It would be available in a PDF format.

OLIVER BIRCH: But all of the documents would be available to be printed?

ANGIE STATEVSKI: Yes, in phase two.

KEN WILKINSON: We have a lot to cover. Thank you.

JENNIFER CONNELL: My name is Jennifer Connell. I'm the product manager for the Teraview application. This is our second time attending the AOLS conference, so we want to thank you for allowing us to be exhibitors.

A common theme over the past couple of days is people visiting our booth and letting us know that they use Teranet, so I just want to level set on the products on services. So there is a booth where we have a gentleman from GeoWarehouse. His name is John Tsang, and many of you are GeoWarehouse users.

Then Angie and I are on the electronic search and registration side of Teranet, so we're responsible for things like Teraview, Teranet Express, OnLand, and Roscoe. We've had people come to the booth and say they use Teranet. So what I'm speaking to today is Teraview users. So many of you are Teraview users. You

currently have search accounts with Teranet, and unlike OnLand, and Teranet Express, and even GeoWarehouse which are primarily used to search, Teraview's the only application where you'll be able to register your plans.

So, it's an important distinction for those of you who will not be electronically submitting plans. If you're using Teraview to search, or Teranet Express to search, or GeoWarehouse, there will be no change in your day-to-day.

What we're going to focus on today is the registration; the creation of a plan instrument, the signing and registration thereof, and then Service Ontario will pick up what happens after you sign your instrument.

So, for Teraview we recently launched a web version of Teraview that some of you may have heard about as existing Teraview users. Currently Teraview is a desktop application that you would have to install a new version every year, so we've been very busy moving Teraview to the web. We had a pilot program in October, and we launched in region A, so about 13 LROs representing 5,000 end-users in January.

We are on a very accelerated course for upgrading; and unfortunately, if we don't have your e-mail address we were unable to directly contact you to let you know when it's time to upgrade. So, we do have a booth. We're sharing a booth with Service Ontario.

If you have any questions about your Teraview account - some people - their account structure has changed but their account name hasn't changed. Just swing by our booth. We have all of our administrative applications available. We can find out where your account, is if you're a search account only and we can move on from there.

So, once you successfully log into Teraview, we're not going to be spending a lot of time on search. The main focus of my part of the demo is to show you what your electronic plan document would look like.

But again, same as current Teraview, before you can start any activity you must open a docket, and you'll see once you've successfully opened a docket that we've broken the application down into two sections, instrument creation or search.

Those of you who are search users won't see an instrument creation tab necessarily. When you become plan submitters in Teraview you will see those two tabs, but for those of you who are existing Teraview users who have made the move to the web, if you login today, you may only see the search tab and that is fine. When you become enabled through Service Ontario to register your plans electronically, all of that will happen on the back-end and the instrument creation tab will be available to you. Once you're under the instrument creation tab and you select create new, you will see a list of all the instruments that are available for creation and signing in Teraview.

The majority of them have been in existence for 20 years as we've had lawyers electronically submitting in Teraview since 1999. Where you'll want to focus is the plans section, so it's alphabetical, or you can use a search feature, and it will give you the plans available for creation and signing. We're going to focus today on the deposit plan, and we've created one to show you the structure of the instrument.

In current Teraview for a lawyer creating a transfer or a charge, the instrument was based on what the user would see in paper. So, you start with a PIN moving into the consideration and you would follow the same structure. I can appreciate that for most of these users the concept of an electronic plan is brand new, so we'll spend a little bit more time going through the tabs.

The first thing that you'll always do when creating an instrument is indicate the PIN number. So, what we've done here is created an instrument in progress, so you'll see that the PIN number is there, the status of the PIN, the municipal address if any, and the legal description. From here you can amend the description if necessary by selecting the PIN number. It will give you the city, town, et cetera, and you can either add property, remove property, or edit any of these fields.

Moving down to the applicant, again we've created an instrument in progress and when you select applicant you will see all of the Service Ontario provided statements that come with the creation of a deposit plan instrument. For those of you who are familiar with Teraview, you would be familiar with the concept of statements. You will see here that there are statements, the texts and numbers of which are provided by Service Ontario.

Teranet can tell you how to create the instrument. We can't tell you why we're creating the instrument. If you call customer service and say do I need statement 2909? We would transfer you to Service Ontario. Teranet does not control the numbers or the statement texts. If there is an error in the text, or the text is not clear, Service Ontario would open a change request with us and we would make the amendments to it.

So, you'll see within the application that there are three different types of statements. One is in normal text for lack of a better word. You'll see that in statement 10. If you're ever in Teraview and see statements that are bolded, those are lawyer statements, and you must be a lawyer, eligible to practice to see those; and if we move throughout the form you'll see the surveying statements in particular are italicized. So, you can see here that statement 3605, 06, 07, are italicized statements, and those are the AOLS statements.

So again, we've created the bare minimum that we need. I just wanted to point out where you could-- anything that is in upper case with a hyperlink underneath it is either asking you to import something or to add text. So, for instance statement 3605, I click the hyperlink and I put my own name in it, and there are also areas in statements where you'll have to import something. So, for instance 3607 also had a

hyperlink to include a file. So, we've updated a file in that first statement, blank field there.

One of the biggest changes we made with the move to the web is how you sign an instrument. Again, because the majority of you as Teraview users wouldn't have signed it, it will be less of a learning curve than the 18,000 lawyers that we've been dealing with.

When you sign an instrument on the backend of Teranet, it creates a signature verification strain. Teranet can be called to testify to the strength of our signatures and the security around the end-user signing an instrument. So today in Teraview when you log in you have a USB connected to your PCs. With the move to the web you'll no longer need the USB. For those of you who will continue to use Teraview for search only you will just need a password to access Teraview. For those of you using search only, you will only need a password to log into Teraview and complete your searches.

Those of you who will be signing electronic plan documents will require a second piece of authentication, and that is the RSA token. The RSA token is available in two ways. It's either a hard token or a fob, and you can come up later, or come to our booth later and see it, or it's an app on your smart phone.

All it is, is - all the RSA token does is create a series of six-digit numbers that helps validate that you are who you say you are when you're signing an instrument. Every user who is going to sign plans in Teraview, regardless if you have one person in your firm who will be doing that, or if you have 10, will need their own.

You cannot share these keys and you know, why would you? Your name would be on every plan you submitted whether you did or didn't. Every user in your firm who will be completing the instrument, the deposit plan instrument, and signing and registering in Teraview will need one or the other. The hard fob has a five-year battery life, so in five years we will be sending you a new one. The smart phone just lives on your smart phone.

So, let's say you got the token and you left it at home, and you need to complete your deal? You can call customer service and they will give you a six-digit number to get you through that business day. We certainly don't want any calls to Wanda and Ken saying Teranet won't let me sign today.

So, when you go to sign your document it will be a two-step process. The first step is just to make sure there are no errors, that you haven't missed anything. We created an instrument again this morning. We're going to hit validate. You'll see your authorization statements as provided by Service Ontario there. You'll hit validate. We know there are no issues with our statement. We've made all the necessary statement selections. We've uploaded all the necessary documents.

You will enter the password that you used to log into Teraview, then you'll pick up your token, look at it, 046742, and you'll sign. You'll get the message that the instrument has been successfully signed, and from here you can go ahead and register.

Service Ontario will pick up the demo in a few minutes to let you know what happens once you've signed it and it's been deposited to Service Ontario, but from a Teranet perspective, once it's been signed and registered, it leaves our queue and moves into Service Ontario's queue. Are there any questions about this move to the web or the creation of any of these instruments? Yes?

JOHN D'AMICO: John D'Amico. I guess I suffer a bit from digital paranoia, getting older and not understanding some of the technology. This app that you talk about on the phone and this six-digit - are there all sorts of security protocols in place that there wouldn't be - you know how someone at an airport can access your phone and pick your password, and all that kind of stuff, and all being careful about that kind of stuff - how does that protect it and what can happen?

JENNIFER CONNELL: So, the six-digit number is only half the story. When you're signing your instrument, you need your password plus this. So even if I left this here and you took it, first of all this token is a sign to me when you become a Teraview on the Web user. You register with us, tell us what token you have, so even if I left this behind, and you even had a Teraview account, you would need to know my account, my user name, and my password for this to be valid for you. All this is doing is running six numbers.

Some of the banks have introduced the second factor authentication. All it's doing is generating six numbers, but it's useless on its own. Just like if I knew your password and I didn't have this, I would not be able to sign as you. It's just generating six digits. This just has a battery in it. I can bury it in the backyard, dig it up two weeks later, and it's just generating six numbers. It's tied to your person, that's correct, but it's useless on its own. Yes, in the back?

UNKNOWN MALE: Did I hear you correctly that there are no more hardware locks on standard Teraview searching? In other words, do I need a hardware lock or whatever fobby thing if I'm just searching?

JENNIFER CONNELL: So today you're using a USB that has your profile on it. When you move to the web you will no longer need that. You will be creating your web profile. It will be your existing account and user name, and you will create your password for web, and you'll be able to search that way.

UNKNOWN MALE: Will there be just one password for account searching?

JENNIFER CONNELL: So, every user under your account - the question is about searching, so if we had a firm, Angie and I, I would have my own username and

password for Teraview. Angie would have her own user name and password for Teraview. That does not change.

UNKNOWN MALE: Right now, there are multiple USB ports to different people in the organization. That's the way we keep track of documents, so you can't keep multiple passwords for the same account?

JENNIFER CONNELL: No. So, each user should have their own Teraview profile even today. The USBs should have - that may not be the current practice, and we're not here to police that, but especially when you're signing you want to ensure that each of your staff have their own Teraview key.

So again, we have a booth downstairs, the GeoWarehouse booth. We're sitting on the other side of Cansel. If you have any questions about your Teraview account, if you want to make the move to the web today, you can come by. We can certainly enable that for you. As always, we're available for any questions. You can swing by and get our business cards, if there are any questions about OnLand or Teraview. I will now turn it over to Service Ontario who will tell you what happens once you submit your plan.

KEN WILKINSON: I'm told this is being recorded. My voice is not a super projecting kind of voice, so I'm going to sit by the mic. Hi, I'm Ken Wilkinson here, Examiner of Surveys.

I'm going to back up a little bit. I won't just talk about how it's processed once it hits Service Ontario. I will actually back up and go through Teraview a bit from a surveyor's perspective.

But I want to give you a little caution right up front. This is not a training session. This is a high-level overview. Nobody leaving this room is certified to use this process without going through training and a little bit of testing on your own, but I will give you a high-level overview.

One thing you may have noticed is the training environment available. I think Angie was running through there. That is available I believe to anybody and you can go give it a try yourself in the new Teraview on the Web.

So, first slide there, you may have seen this picture before. Teraview on the Web is coming. It's here. It's actually tested. It's working. We're pretty pleased with the way it works, and it's pretty slick. We're introducing it in phases, so it only applies to land titles, reference plans, at this time, and we're very close to the kick off for what we call direct electronic submission of plans or e-plans. It could be as early as this month that we bring the regulations in and allow it to actually go big time.

As I said we're starting with land titles reference plans. That means no registry plans, registry plans to paper, Crown Lands plans even if they are land titles. There

is no PIN so they have to come in paper and hard copy as well. There's probably other plans I haven't mentioned, but what we're looking for is land title plans that have a PIN. The second phase will be subdivision plans and that will come in.

Once we're ready to go with that, once we're pretty comfortable with the land title reference plans. This phase approach works well I think for both clients and staff, and the land title reference plans have that really big impact for our system. It's the number one plan that we do take in.

For subdivision plans, we're currently working on making a very standardized process across Ontario. Right now, we have 444 municipalities and we have seen 444 ways of getting a subdivision plan into the system. So Teraview on the Web as you saw has the two surveyor only type applications, the application to deposit plan, and the application to register plan. Now as Jennifer mentioned, many of the forms in Teraview have lawyer only statements. These two types of applications have surveyor only statements, so they're a little different. The application for the deposit plan is the one we're going to open up first.

To get to this point though before you're clicking on that particular type of form, you're going to have to go through plan pre-approval by e-mail and plan pre-approval by e-mail is mandatory for an electronic plan. I'll talk a bit more about why that is later. The pre-approval number you get from the plan pre-approval by e-mail will need to go into the form prior to submission to the ELRS, Electronic Land Registration System.

Plan pre-approval by e-mail has gone very well. We introduced it in November and we're about 80 percent of the firms are now uptake, so it's gone pretty well. I think it was a great innovation. So, I find that forcing you down the plan pre-approval by e-mail route is not going to be a difficult issue. This is the guidebook for Teraview on the Web. Basically, it's the Bible. It's available in English and French, and its updated changes are made in the system.

It gives you ideas about what you should be entering in the statements and what the statements mean. It's still your responsibility. The statements are still a surveyor's responsibility, but the guide helps you out a lot.

The general requirements section at the beginning of it tells you a lot about what's needed for every electronic document, and essentially every electronic document has properties, statements, authorization of documents, signatories, and registration of documents. Every document in Teraview has these five sections, not really identified as such, but that's the way we've made the forms.

Moving on. So, this guide's required reading - there are ways of getting questions and answers on electronic registration. As Jennifer said you can phone the 1-800 number. There's a bit of triage there. If you have a question that relates to the Teraview application, it goes to Teranet. If there's a question about the statements

or something like that, it goes to Service Ontario. There's a brand-new e-mail address, examinerssurveys@ontario.ca you can now use and if you have questions as you get into e-plans, I encourage you to use that e-mail address as well.

So, you saw this earlier in the live version of what the Teraview on the Web screen looks like when you're creating an instrument. You basically hit applicant deposit plan. Okay. So, we'll flip to the next one.

The PINs— first step is you enter the PINs that are included in the survey. You might be surveying part of the PIN. Just enter the PIN straight from your form to schedule. That's - there's no opportunity to amend your PIN in this process as you're depositing a plan. You're not really registering anything else on title that would change the PINs, so all we're looking for is that you enter the PIN. Once you've entered that PIN the information from Polaris is imported into the document. If the application, which is basically your plan affects more than one PIN, you add another PIN.

This is the applicant screen. A little different from a transfer of land. Normally this applicant, if you're transferring property, normally the applicant is the person who owns the property. For a surveyor depositing the plan, the applicant is the land surveyor. It can be an individual's name, which if it's an individual's name it should consist of the first name and last name. So, if you typically go by JD Smith on your surveys, at this point you're going to have to enter John Smith as the applicant. You can also enter your company's name and that would open up additional screens for information you have to fill out. So, you've got options here. I should tell you that the applicant's name will go on the PIN. So, it's something that's available, it will be seen, so you may offer to have your survey company name there other than just the surveyor's name.

I'll leave that with you and I would suggest you review that particular applicant screen with your company to figure out what you want to put there. Here is the screen with the statements. There's very specific surveyor statements required for the application deposit plan. Some are mandatory, others are optional. Basically, select the applicable statements. The one I've got circled there, that's where you're inputting the plan as part of your statement. It's going to open up a screen. Really critical here that you select the right plan when you're uploading this plan. There are a few things that are really critical and that's one of them.

The actual application can be completed by a non-surveyor. So, the whole application basically can be put together by one of your staff. But as Jennifer was saying it can only be signed by a land surveyor and you have to have the two-part authentication.

If a document is changed - so say you've somehow found out that it was signed and you're in the field and realize there's a problem, and you want to phone back to the office, can you change that application, have a problem with that, either selecting a

new statement or attaching a new plan, it has to be reassigned so the system knows you've changed the application, and even though it was signed previously, and if it's changed in any way after signing, you have to re-sign.

Once all the signing has been done and there's no changes to the document, a non-surveyor can submit that. So, if there's something, you're out in the field, maybe waiting on some event, sitting there all queued up and signed. You're away. You can phone back and have one of your staff submit the plan once it's signed. So now we'll get to what happens after it's signed and sent.

Teraview sends that plan to the ELRS, the Electronic Land Registration System, and the application itself is abstracted on the PINs you selected. So that also means that the plan you sent in is on the PIN and available to view by basically anybody in the world that looks at that PIN.

So, here's why we have mandatory plan pre-approval. We don't want a work in progress sitting on the PIN being viewed by the whole world. The plan should be signed. It's been sent into the ELRS. It's 100 percent at this point. We will review the plan, but it's your professional responsibility to make sure the plan is correct.

The process for us once the plan has been sent in, currently what we have set up is a queuing system. We have a group of people who are going to be combing the P2, our backend system, for all the plans that were sent in the previous day. They're going to go into a special queue, and then they'll be certified by a group of people who are good at doing this work.

If there is a problem, if they open up the plan and it's clearly a much different plan than the one that was pre-approved, it could be sent back to you. If there's a technical problem with the plan, say sent in orientated wrong or the box size for some reason is incorrect, then we'll send it back to you.

The send back thing, you've got to watch your account. If a plan is sent back to you, we want you to act on that fairly quickly. The bad plan is still sitting on the PIN and we want you to fix that as soon as possible. This is basically we want you to watch your account in case something does come back.

For the most part it's going to be very unlikely that a plan will come back, so once you've sent the plan in, assume it will be going on the PIN fairly quickly. I know in the past with lawyers when we first started doing E-Reg there were a lot of panicked phone calls to the registry office saying hang on, hang on. I changed my mind. That may not happen with us. In the old days of processing was a little slower, but the plans, the process queuing system we've setup, the plans will go on very quickly.

So, there's not going to be that opportunity to make that panicked call. Just going through what the staff do at certification. We have a plan pre-approval by e-mail. We will have a digital version of the plan sitting on a server and we'll check it with

the version that came through Teraview. Really critical that the size of the box left for the certificate is the right size and that it's in the right orientation. In the old days you would write in most of the certificate and we would fill in a couple of numbers. Now the entire certificate gets stamped on the plan and I'll show you some examples in a minute.

That certificate going on though, if your plan is not the correct size, if it's orientated wrong, that stamp will come down and wipe out anything below it. So you can imagine the plan turned or something, it would be certified with a big stamp over the top of your important information. We don't want that. It would look really bad.

We can do plan corrections if something awful happens but we're expecting that it won't. So, the final steps, what have we got here? I've got some hints. The plans are abstracted and all of that. You can see on the screen - I just want to give you some hints though, or some things that have changed. The sticker that you used to use, people are probably wondering about the sticker plan. That is being now replaced with a statement on the plan that sets up the plan approval form sticker number. It will be near the surveyor certificate. Murray mentioned the plan coming back to the surveyor. That is correct.

So, the plan once it's certified, it's coming back to the surveyor who submitted it within seconds. So, here's the thing. You've got to enter the e-mail address correctly, and you've got to enter the e-mail address. The system will tell you if you have not entered an e-mail address. It will not tell you if you have entered it wrong. The plan will go back to the e-mail address you have entered there. If you are processing through and maybe your staff are processing it through, and you have not entered the e-mail address, it will give a flag. It will say you haven't entered an e-mail address. You have an option here. You can say it's fine, keep going, or you can go back to the screen and enter the e-mail address. But if you go past the warning screen, you're not getting the plan back, then you've got a problem. The other thing I wanted to mention one more time is, assume the plan will be deposited if there's no issues that would affect the land registration system. So, we're not checking it twice. We're looking to make sure it's the same plan we checked previously.

Sub-search. The process in Teraview on the Web is kind of cool because it gives you the last registered instrument on the PIN before you've actually submitted the document. So, if you have done your search, it will tell you the last registered document. If you look at your PIN and it's not matching what you have on your PIN as the last registered document, we have a problem. You might want to back up at that point and make sure there's new easements, or some other registrations on title that could cause you some issue. Last, but not least, image only plans. So, the system was set up and this was certainly what we all agreed to, image only PDF.

An image only PDF should be produced directly from CAD. And I know personally that you can produce an image from CAD and then I can write on top of it using a

PDF writer, and it looks just like a regular PDF except it's coming up from CAD and you've got some writing on top.

Maybe even just writing a signature on there or something. What happens with that is it comes through the Teraview system. All that stuff that was written on top is stripped off. The only thing that's left is the image, so if you want to change your plan after it's produced from CAD, you've got to go back to CAD, change it in CAD, produce it to a PDF again. So, image only plans. Here is a couple of examples of the stamps that go on. The reference plan index - reference plan is on the right, end plan on the left, little small. The box there is filled in at this point. I don't have an example of a blank space, but this is one with a blank space filled. There's different certificates obviously for end plans and our plans.

The information's populated automatically and includes the next available number, so it's not possible to reserve a number. This system is reserving numbers, knows the next available number, and that goes on the reference plan. The name of the person who certified the application document - this person whose name is going on there, they can be located anywhere in the province. The plan pre-approval has happened, and then what we do is we send the plans out to be certified through electronics. We can get it certified in North Bay. The plan is from Toronto. Also populated on there is the date and for subdivision plans, the registration number for the plan document is populated there as well. Once this stamp goes on the plan, it's being e-mailed back to you, also to the AOLS.

Access to the system. So, access to ELRS, it goes through the Ministry of Government Services, goes through Service Ontario. Wanda Griffin who's sitting up front here has been giving out information at the Teranet booth where Angie and Jennifer are both sitting, so if you have questions about the signup process for e-plans, talk to Wanda. She'll give you good information. If you happen to have brought the information that we had in the e-mail blast just before the AGM, you can actually do the complete signup right here.

The Teraview account is required. I think we've covered that. The big part that a lot of people aren't familiar with is the EMGCS authorization. A lot of you who have searched before are aware of the whole signup process. The authorization, you may get the fob through your signup process, but you're not authorized to use the system until you've gone through the EMGCS. The good news about EMGCS authorization is that it's free. Keep going.

So, I'll end on just one more there, OLS professional responsibility. I used this a couple of times and I've done some testing on the system. It's so fast and so easy, I really have to stress this part, and I think you might hear a bit more about that in a few minutes.

Teraview is a secure system with specific identification requirements. Surveyors need to be aware of their professional obligations and responsibilities when using

this system. It's not a toy. It's not sending an e-mail to a friend. You're submitting your plan. It's on the PIN. It's viewable by the world and we're going to certify it very quickly. It's based on trusting the professional. I don't think we'll have trouble with the land surveyors, as long as we're cautious with how they treat the system and once it's sent in assume that it will be deposited. I will turn it over to Izaak.

PETER MORETON: A question about certification. Do the same rules apply to any other document? That it is 21 days according to the Act?

KEN WILKINSON: Yes. That's true. There is a time. Although it's 21 days; we have 21 days to notify you if there's an issue. After we've notified you if there's an issue, the clock goes a little bit longer at that point, so we'll give you time to fix that issue. Saying that though, we're not anticipating a long time to fix that issue, and we have issued some directions on how long we will wait for you to fix that issue. If there's an issue that will not be fixed, the plan will be withdrawn and sent back to you, and you'll lose your money.

UNKNOWN MALE: In the extremely unlikely event that there is an error that is discovered a month or six months later on a plan - like right now, is there a mechanism to correct the plan?

KEN WILKINSON: Those are still in place.

UNKNOWN MALE: How would that be handled with this?

KEN WILKINSON: This plan would be correct the old-fashioned way. So, we would correct a paper copy of the plan, then it would be re-imaged and sent back into Teraview to replace the original electronic copy.

UNKNOWN MALE: Would this system allow me to sit in Florida and register the plan if I so choose?

KEN WILKINSON: That is correct. The land has to be in Ontario.

UNKNOWN MALE: Prior to online registration, you used to be able to submit a plan of subdivision for pre-approval with a number of lots. At the same time, you could submit reference plans that may not be for the purposes of clearing the impending order or dealing with the impending order. My concern about this is here, that once - and all those reference plans, you can continue to use the term [unintelligible]. So, in this situation when the plan gets registered, is it still going to be a mechanism where they saw it before they create PINs for the lot, streets, to allow you to get those plans deposited under Teraview?

KEN WILKINSON: So, as you have identified, there are issues with how subdivisions would come through this process, and I just mentioned briefly we're working to make a more consistent system throughout Ontario about how

subdivision plans are registered, and we are working with municipalities on that so that so we have a consistent practice and e-plans could be used for subdivision plans.

We're not quite there yet, and that's why subdivision plans will come in the second phase. And there's not mandatory to submit land title's reference plan in through E-Reg, so if you have a subdivision plan, or a reference plan that's connected to a subdivision plan, I would encourage you to keep that package together so that you can get everything in order. Everything is in one package for a subdivision type development. Does that answer your question? It's coming in phase two.

UNKNOWN MALE: How long for [unintelligible] plans?

KEN WILKINSON: That would be phase three.

UNKNOWN MALE: How about the signatures on the end plans from the owner and the planning authority? How do you handle that?

KEN WILKINSON: So, when we get the subdivision plans, the subdivision plans will not be required to be signed by the owner.

UNKNOWN MALE: What about the planning authority?

KEN WILKINSON: That will be imported as a separate certificate. There will statements from the owner, statements from the planning authority on the face of the plan, but much like any other severances that we do, the subdivision plan will have an imported separate planning certificate, but we're not quite there yet.

JULIA MELDRUM SMITH: Julia Meldrum Smith, Cornwall. I have a question about timing. I know nobody likes to commit to timing, but you said really fast - and I bet you're really fast, and my really fast are not the same -

KEN WILKINSON: I'm government.

JULIA MELDRUM SMITH: I remember the days when you would waltz in with your plan, and [unintelligible] signed it, and you waltzed out. I suspect that won't be the case. When we queue are we estimating, speculating, 24 hours, a week? I realize it all depends on how many of us dump our plans in the queue at the same time. I'm not going to [unintelligible] into it. I'm just asking you to speculate.

KEN WILKINSON: This is for certification so once the stamp goes down -

JULIA MELDRUM SMITH: Sent my plan in, have my pre-approval by [unintelligible] and doing everything right. Now my plan is in the queue waiting to get an R number.

KEN WILKINSON: Looking at days, yeah.

JULIA MELDRUM SMITH: Days?

KEN WILKINSON: Days. It depends on uptake. It's hard to say what the uptake will be. We're assuming a slow ramp-up. We're also ramping up staff to certify them. The certification at this stage where it's actually, just before the stamp goes down, is much easier than the whole plan pre-approval. That's a bit of work. There's often back and forth and reviewing the plan to make changes. At this point the plan is perfect from our point of view, so we're checking for the technical things. The plan didn't come-- in angled wrong, or are the boxes the wrong size? Technical things. We're not checking the plan again, so it's pretty fast. Days.

PAUL GOODRIDGE: Paul Goodridge, North Bay. You've alluded that the new digital plan will come back as a fully authorized plan. Until the system rolls out, right now we don't get that in the paper system. We get a hand letter signature instead of the actual signature of the registry office. That is an issue for some law offices or municipalities. Can we get an authorized, signed, version rather than being told to come back later once it's in the folder? We basically buy our own plan back from the system?

KEN WILKINSON: For that kind of situation I recommend e-plans because you're going to get the plan back really fast and it's the official plan.

PAUL GOODRIDGE: That's why I said until e-plans comes in, hopefully it's very quickly, but until then can we get a signed paper?

KEN WILKINSON: You're actually getting a bit into what - there's a difference between Teranet and me, and a difference between me and operations. I can take your concern back to Denis Blais who is the Director of Land Registration and ask him about that. But I can't promise that. I'm a policy sort of guy. I don't do operations.

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible].

KEN WILKINSON: We're going to meet with the digital plans task force before it rolls but I'm thinking that we're very close now. Phillip?

PHILLIP HOFMANN: Phillip Hofmann, Thornhill. Can you elaborate a little bit on the stats you're referring to saying these stats will be put on the plan when it's ready to be deposited, but how will our drafting staff arrange their sheets depending on what they're doing to make sure that you have space on those plans?

KEN WILKINSON: That's the blank space. That's the Taylor Swift blank space. You have to provide your plan with the blank space, with the right size, and it's right in the regs. As soon as you see the regs, you'll see a whole definition of the blank space that has to be left for that certificate stamp.

DAVID WYLIE: David Wylie from Ottawa. One quick question. You stressed the e-mail address for returning the plan, is critical. Are you - do you have a redundant entry of the e-mail so if they get it wrong, it's caught, or is it just a single entry and whether that entry is good or not?

KEN WILKINSON: Single entry, get it right. You can copy and paste, right, and just make sure that way you're not typing long things you might screw up. Copy and paste. It's much like the rest of the document where it's not a dummed down document. This is a document for professionals, and you've got to make sure everything you've done on that, all the statements, all the entries are correct.

UNKNOWN MALE: One address or can you go multiple?

KEN WILKINSON: One address.

KENNETH KETCHUM: Kenneth Ketchum, Woodstock. Discussions with corporations such as Ontario Hydro, but they're aware that one plan goes in digitally and there will be no actual Mylar coming back to us.

KEN WILKINSON: I think you might want to let your clients know, about what their preference would be, but I suspect they'll be fine with - given we've gone to CAD for almost everything now, that this would be fine getting the PDF original rather than the Mylar. Okay. Thank you. Next up is Izaak de Rijcke.

IZAAK DE RIJCKE: Okay, so good morning everyone. I brought along a series of the slides you're going to end up looking at. Right now, they're available for pickup, hard copy, next to the projector. You can either pick one up or I have a pile of them left at the back at the door as you exit. There's also a similar printout of all the slides that you've seen from Ken Wilkinson's presentation. They're all available right now as well.

It may first appear that electronic registration of survey plans is a wonderful thing, and yes, it is. There's obvious benefits. We're familiar with the benefits in terms of productivity, workflow improvement. There's clear efficiencies we're hoping to accomplish. We also have many references in this presentation earlier this morning to direct submission electronically of the plan to Service Ontario through Teranet, with no waiting, when it actually comes time to register for ultimate approval to be received because you will have had it pre-approved.

There's also the benefit in terms of the public service for clients. Clients are living in the year 2018. Maybe we should be too, right? We all know that this is time, and it's timely to get with the delivery of digital projects for clients who are already working in that environment. So, this is actually a very short add-on to the presentations from Teranet, and Service Ontario, and the purpose is to simply raise awareness about the professionalism issues that have already been alluded to that

will apply to the use of a digital plan portal for submitting plans to the land titles office through Teraview.

I was called to the bar and yes, I'm a lawyer for perhaps too many years, more than three decades ago, and when real estate was done back in the day, conveyancing relied on paper deeds. We did 40-year title searches and we had to make sure that affidavits were sworn, that signatures were witnessed, et cetera, because it was a registry-based system.

This was the analogue paper-based registry system, and then the land registration re-format rolled out with standardized forms. My life and that of all other lawyers in the province seemed to become a lot easier.

We applauded the prospect of block maps because we could now see the interrelationship between parcels of land and conversion to land titles also meant that life would become yet easier still.

Then of course the whole idea of electronic registration began to sink in. I think having been part of the lawyer real estate group that was first exposed to the rollout of e-reg for transferring, and dealing with ownership, and mortgages registered against PINS, there are things that were acquired in the subsequent years that I'm hoping we can pass on, or at least help you gain some benefit or insight to make this adaptation easier from the point of view of your comfort level, and also your level of trust.

There's five questions that we have on this particular slide. You can read them yourselves. You probably have already, so I'm not going to repeat them. But let's turn to the first question.

These changes may seem today as inconsequential but at the time when they happened they were literally a tidal wave in terms of representing a culture shift from what we were used to. Lawyers 25 years ago vigorously resisted e-reg in many parts of the province. They wanted no part of it.

The most important aspect was the fact that as a profession, lawyers were asked to play a trusted role in making sure that we verified the identity of the parties. After all, we were practicing law. We were not identifying the identity or the validity of a driver's license that our client would walk in the door with, and we came to realize as lawyers we were trusted with the authority to actually effect changes in the ownership of a PIN. We could register a charge, or a mortgage. We could register a discharge of a mortgage. We could with one fell swoop, or a few keyboard strokes delete a one million-dollar mortgage from a PIN.

So many lawyers immediately got uncomfortable with this reality and said, "Where are the safety nets?" "Where are the protocols in place in order to protect me from doing the wrong thing?" "I don't want to end up being found to have done

something improper because we're sometimes talking about pretty significant dollar amounts.”

We became trusted agents of a land title system in Ontario that served the public and played a crucial role in how property rights of the people in Ontario were recorded and made valid, and the companion: parcel boundaries, are also critical for the making of a system such as this, work well. Service Ontario has accepted the signature of a surveyor on a survey plan as a trusted and reliable certificate. That's important if you think about that for a moment. What you've been doing for decades, well over a century at least, is that the land registration system has accepted your signature on a plan as meaning something.

The system trusts you as the professional to do the right thing when you sign that certificate. So, for example you have to submit payment of a plan. When it is submitted, there are other deposits and things that have to end up being done in terms of the protocol to be followed.

But like lawyers, ultimately, we are trusted and depended upon to uphold professional standards that will translate the parcel fabric by creating new lots on a plan of subdivision, new parts on a reference plan, and of course we know for example monuments are in the ground when they're shown on such a plan. It's that ability to sign a certificate as an OLS, on a Mylar, if you will, the analogue signature that we're used to signing; the acceptance of that certificate in the past by Service Ontario that makes for changes to the parcel fabric while we also participate in maintaining it.

We are trusted to do for boundaries what lawyers are trusted to do for title. Simply said, we have no change taking place through e-reg that hasn't been done in the past in terms of what you do to the parcel fabric by registering or depositing a plan of survey that has your signed certificate on that document.

So, can we relate to e-reg for plans to the submission of a signed Mylar? And I think the answer is yes, almost. Almost. The submission of a signed survey plan is taken in by the land titles office, Service Ontario staff, as a basis for amending submissions, for PINS, for the thumbnails, for creating new PINS, but historically there has also been considerable vetting of a plan before it does get registered and a number is assigned.

The goal was to reduce staff time and to place more responsibility on the surveyor so that the submission of a plan through e-reg will be presumed to be not only correct, but Service Ontario will only perform limited plan checking functions.

In other words, you've seen the description of the checking protocol that Service Ontario was going to apply, and for the most part it's benign. It doesn't go through the protocol of a checklist. Is there mathematical closure? Do you have a north arrow? Do you end up having things that shouldn't be on the plan? You're not being

checked for your professionalism, because you're the OLS, so we're no longer seeing Service Ontario's getting granular and checking plans at that level.

The plan will be assumed to have been checked before submission and therefore will treat your signature as a form of guarantee or assurance that a signed certificate is true, a signed statement is correct, and that the signature on the plan is yours. In other words, you're not touching that plan because it's a digital product, but you are authenticating it as having been electronically signed by only you as the OLS.

Of course, you asked, well, "What can go wrong?" "What might go wrong?" Well in this context what could possibly go wrong is similar to what we might have seen 20 years ago and that's the lawyers in the 1990s who asked also what could go wrong. You have the benefit of their insight because unfortunately, a number of things can.

First of all, survey plans are not the same things as transfers and charges. Survey plans interact with and implement changes in Ontario's parcel fabric in ways that lead to possible confusion, or ambiguity, and ultimately a breakdown in neighbour relations if we don't do the work that needs to be included and is backing up our survey opinion.

Second, survey plans are a graphic product. They always have been, but they have always included certificates, especially on plans of subdivision. These will be rolled out later, and I heard Ken refer to phase two, but a certificate on a digital plan will need to be backed up in some form or other by your own real estate certificate hard copy in the file. Lawyers have been doing this for 20 years.

If I say, when I sign electronically a deed, that I'm transferring ownership of John Doe's house, you better believe it that I have in my paper file, in my office, a document signed by John Doe, who I know to be John Doe because I also have his photo bearing ID, who authorizes me to specifically sell and transfer ownership of his house.

What do a password and the RSA token mean? I brought mine along. You've already seen a demo. A few people have shown you this mysterious device that keeps changing numbers. There's a display and the numbers keep changing. It's a random number generator. It's proprietary software that's owned by RSA Corporation and essentially, it's matched up with only one other version of that random number generator software which is on the RSA Corporation home server. If the two don't match, no matter where you are, Florida, California— if the numbers don't match, it's not correctly being entered, and you cannot electronically sign the plan.

Taken together they're known as a double entry security protocol which only the correct entry of both will allow access to all of the power that a signature from you as an OLS could wield in the past. The audit trail that was described by Teranet software allows for confirmation that you as an OLS are personally signing the

plan. It relies on your electronic signature for the same reasons as your signature on a Mylar.

Non-compliance has some unfortunate consequences. One, Teranet may treat a breach of the electronic land registration agreement, because you will sign a license agreement with Teranet to get one of these, and thereafter deny access to the system or suspend the token holder's account.

Second, Service Ontario may treat non-compliance as a reason to refuse the deposit or registration of your survey plan, and third AOLS as a regulator may treat non-compliance as falling within the definition of professional misconduct.

The experience with the law society has shown that compliance is extremely high, certainly for lawyers, and we have no reason to suspect anything other than that high level of compliance by surveyors, but in an effort to name trusts there's also a little hesitation. For example, on the part of the law society, to follow through with consequences.

There's the threats for example that law society has issued whereby lawyer's licenses will be suspended for misuse of the token, or the password, are not hollow, and there are many reported cases today from the law society tribunal showing decisions in which suspension of a lawyer's license to practice has been implemented as a direct result of sharing passwords or tokens.

The good news is that training is already being developed; underway right now, as of course myself and some of the many great presenters that you've already heard this morning, who are going to be contributors to this course. It will be designed as a hands-on training opportunity with more contributions to follow from AOLS and the Digital Survey Plan Taskforce. The goal is to create a single source for the client user guide, as well as on the Teranet website, Service Ontario website, and the Teranet resources, AOLS bulletins that speak to professionalism, are all kept current and updated as further revisions roll out.

So that's it. That's a short little heads-up. Thank you. We have a bit of time for more questions I suppose.

UNKNOWN MALE: This may not be a question for you but maybe Ken -

IZAAK DE RIJCKE: He's here, Ken is here, but can you please state your name and come to the microphone?

ADAM KASPRZAK: Adam Kasprzak, Renfrew. The question of the old sticker, I imagine somebody, somehow, will be collecting fees, and the question of registration fees, how is that going to be handled and when?

IZAAK DE RIJCKE: If I may suggest, the way in which lawyers do it, I for

example have an account and I put about \$500.00 in my Teranet account. When I need to register a deed or a mortgage, there is the registration cost plus HST deducted directly out of my registration account. There is no reason to think that the collection of costs for a sticker, on behalf of AOLS, wouldn't be part of that same protocol in terms of being able to - that's a functionality to be worked on.

KEN WILKINSON: You still need to buy your stickers. The only thing is you're going to take the number from the sticker and you need to put that on the face of the plan. You will still need to go to the SRD, and I think we need to do the training. That will come out in best practices.

IZAACK DE RIJCKE: That's even better news because then you don't get multiple sources of having to make accounts being paid.

MURRAY PURCELL: So, at this point there really is no need to panic. There is training. I'd like to thank our floor person.

ROBERT HARRIS: Rob Harris, Trenton. I'm interested in how the [Unintelligible] plan that was done years ago, or that surveyor who signed it is no longer available - how would that be done?

KEN WILKINSON: The short answer to plan corrections is nothing has changed. It's the same process. We've done some reg amendments, but we didn't touch the plan corrections section at all. A plan can be corrected even if the surveyor who signed the plan, originally, is no longer with us.

MURRAY PURCELL: On behalf of AOLS I'd like to thank our four presenters. We do have a donation on each of their behalves for the Project SHARE and thank you very much.

CONCURRENT SESSION: POLICY ON SKETCHES OVERVIEW

GAVIN LAWRENCE: So good morning everyone. While the presentation gets linked up I just wanted to share a few words before Bob delivers his presentation. My name is Gavin Lawrence, and I'm on Council, and I'm the rep for the Professional Standards Committee. I think by judging by the amount of people in this room, we know how important this topic and issue is to us.

I shared three points at the plenary session and I'd like to do the same here. The first thing is that council is and continues to be grateful for the work that Bob and others are doing on this committee and we continue to support them.

After some back and forth between the committee and Council, Council did accept their recommendation in January of this year, and not too long ago, Council still grapples with the issue and there remains some doubt.

Lastly although there are some Survey Monkey results, this is an opportunity for Council to gauge and get some direct input from our members, so please listen to the presentation and provide us with your feedback. We appreciate it. Thank you very much. I'd like to welcome Bob Halliday to the podium. Are we setup here yet? Maybe I'm a little - I got it.

BOB HALLIDAY: Yes. I think we're ready to go now. I apologize for the confusion. So, this presentation was prepared by Ted Williams, Dave Raithby, and myself.

Ted, unfortunately, can't be with us today due to some family issues, but Dave and I are going to be co-presenting here, and that's the committee as I alluded to before, and I have to commend the hard work of all of these people. I mentioned that we have monthly teleconferences, face-to-face meetings at the AOLS office, as needed, once, twice a year, for a full day, and it's a big sacrifice and commitment that everyone has made.

Did everyone see the presentation at the plenary session? Okay, well I'm not going to waste your time. Most of these first few slides are just a re-hashing, but I do want to stress this point, because this is the basis of this concept for moving forward. If we do a survey, they're all the same.

They all have hundreds of different components, but they're all the same. The client comes in and talks to you, find out what they need, you get your project setup, do your research, as required do your field work, do your analysis in the office, draw your conclusions and report to your client. It's the same stuff, whether the crew spends two hours in the field, or whether they've been there for three months, it's still the same basis, and the question then is how do we communicate with our client?

I was talking with someone over the coffee break which I never did get to partake of, but these are some of the ways we can communicate with our client. And during that conversation, Dave Raithby said, even just a phone call is part of your return to your client. We tell our client what they have inquired about with us. It's our responsibility as a professional to find out - you've all had it happen. Client calls up out of the blue, the first time they've ever spoken to a surveyor, and they say I need a survey, or someone told me I need a survey. That's nice. We do surveys. What do you want? I don't know.

So, you talk to them and you find out exactly what it is that they need, and then you tailor your project to meet their needs. I've heard - I've had some pushback from people who say I'm not going to let my client tell me what I'm going to do for them. I'm the surveyor. I'm going to tell them. Well you can tell them what you can do. You can tell them what you can lawfully do, but at the end of the day they've hired you to fulfill some need that they have, and it's up to you to fulfill that need, and if all they need is a Datsun, you don't give them a BMW.

That's kind of where we're coming from. We're not saying the plans of survey should go out the window. We're saying sometimes they don't need something as complicated as a plan of survey, and sometimes a sketch is going to be more relevant. I also alluded to the fact that there's two camps basically within our association.

What I didn't realize earlier, but I'm starting to realize now is, an awful lot of the opposition to the use of sketches or to expanding the use of sketches or whatever. A lot of that opposition seems to be coming from the GTA, where there seems to be - I don't have any metrics for this but just what I'm hearing from input, the people who are really strongly opposed to sketches seem to be in the GTA.

All of the committee members— or I should say none of our committee members are from the GTA. Some are from cities, but smaller cities, some are from rural areas, so we are not seeing the same problem that is perceived to be existing in the GTA, and I'm thinking probably moving forward, whoever is going to handle the rest of this process, whether it's going to be Council or whether it's going to continue to be the Professional Standards Committee, that we're going to need a volunteer from the GTA to help bring that perspective, so that we know what problem exists and we're not just dealing third hand with someone who's upset because their other competitor down the road offered to do it more cheaply.

That seems to be what the bottom line is. We're not talking about providing a product that allows us to do things more cheaply. We're talking about providing what it is that our client actually needs, to meet their client needs.

This next point is - I thought it was fairly simple until I met with Council on Tuesday, and one of the samples we're going to be looking at in a little while is a severance sketch I prepared recently. Someone said that looks an awful lot like a plan of survey. Well the title block says sketch prepared for severance application, or consent application, gives the client's name, names the municipality on the face of the sketch. It shows the lot and concession that is involved, and I thought that it completely was in compliance with not only what we're talking about now, but what we've had since 1982, so I don't know. Things could change a lot in the next - well, I'm not going to go through the 1982 guidelines. They're available in the manual if you want to see them, if you don't have them, and they're certainly reiterated in the new guidelines.

I think really, I'm going to talk very briefly about just these last few. Again, talking to someone this morning, he said I like to show bearings on my sketches. The committee feels it's not a good idea because it makes it too close in appearance to a plan of survey. We've got to leave some things to professional judgment. We're all professionals, and if people are not willing to act as professionals, then that's what the firing squad is for right?

Survey information - again the committee feels, provided there is sufficient

information in your project such as field notes, such as measurements, some CAD portion to show where you have done some sort of analysis of the survey monuments that you want to show, that it may, if it's helpful to your client and it doesn't muddy the waters, then it's appropriate to show survey monuments.

And the second item, the ties, again the committee feels and Council disagrees - the committee feels it's appropriate to show ties. We're not talking about an SRPR. We're talking about something relatively simplistic. It may be that the client came in and said, "I don't know whether my shed is over the line or not." You have to be the judge. You have to decide whether that's a plan of survey or whether that's a sketch. We think that should be there as an option if the circumstances warrant it. Ted, or Dave, did you want to talk about the 2013 bulletin a bit?

DAVE RAITHBY: It's a full room. I don't know. It's a long ways to the end of the room.

BOB HALLIDAY: We'll get you on the stage here.

DAVE RAITHBY: Just before I sort of step into walking through those, I don't know if it came across to everybody this morning - when the committee got together, we've been through all of this information again, and again, and again. We all sort of came to the same opinion via different routes that we think this issue is going to go away.

There will not be a sketch issue at the point in time that Council decides that projects are reviewable. At that point, the issues tend to go away. Your project is going to be reviewed, it could be just the sketch, it could be just a letter, it could be a number of sketches, an SRPR and a reference plan— all included in that project, but that would be reviewable by SRD. So if you were putting together a sketch that is in fact an SRPR, which is sort of against the rules, we've seen some of that stuff but at that moment in time, if it is reviewable, then SRD is going to have a chance to look at that and make comments.

So at that moment we think that issue is going to disappear, and I think that's a big issue for a lot of people to say, "Hey, this is something that's a sketch, that it looks like an SRPR, got the house, showing the information, and why is that not an SRPR?" If it's part of a reviewable project, I think that issue will go away. So what we're talking about when we talk about sketches, when we talk about the 2013, or the sketch issue, we're talking about having the ability to present your professional opinion to your client in a number of formats; tailored to give that client what he's looking for.

We're not suggesting that when you talk to your client, your client says I want a sketch because it's cheaper. You need to figure out from your client what it is he actually needs and provide him with the product that is comparable to what his needs are. Your client calls you up and he wants to know very specifically what that

one tie is.

If this project is reviewable you're going to have the research. You're going to have gone to the field. You're going to have done some work and you're going to present your opinion to your client based on all of that information. At that moment, you're going to give them a sketch to illustrate what is it you have done for them. That project will be reviewable by SRD, if that's the way Council decides to go. So when we all get together and talk about this, that's where we're looking for the future.

Moving on - what do I do now? Oh, here. So when we're talking about this bulletin that came out, there's a number of issues that come up that council are looking at slightly differently than the committee looked at it. So when you're looking at the regular performance standards, 216/10, if you're doing work that is illustrated, if you're doing work that's a survey, you should represent it as a survey.

When we talked about presenting information in sketch format, we're talking about information that you may have the work that's illustrated here. It may not be reasonable to present an entire plan of survey when you want to talk to one very specific issue. You can issue a report to your client. Maybe it has some information in it. Maybe it has a picture in it. There's all kinds of ways to present that.

Locating existing physical features relative— this came up again, and again, and again. How do you do that? Have you done the survey to establish that? That's where this plan of survey comes in. You must be prepared. I mean you still have to do the work. You still have to do the research. You still have to go to the field. You still have to comply with all that information. So that is in your file. If your file is reviewable, SRD will have a chance to look at that and make sure you've done your work. You'll certify it, form one, as you always do.

When we talk about changing methodologies, the guys using total stations, using different ways—field notes. Tim's going to talk about that later this afternoon. Those are all defined, and we know that SRD needs to be able to look at your file and understand what's going on. I think I'm going to put you back on these statutes and we'll talk about that again as we get to the end. Thanks.

BOB HALLIDAY: So, we were thinking through the full gamut of scenarios you might face and decisions you may have to make regarding what to do for your client. So I know I run into this every once in a while.

Client comes in with a building plan and they need something to present to the municipality to prove their big house can go on their little lot, and you're the guy. So, you don't need to do that. All you need is the pre-existing data. You need to know "What are the dimensions of the lot?" You need to know, "What are the setbacks you'll have to comply with?" You need to know, "What are the dimensions of the proposed house?" Do you go out and do a full survey of the lot before the person has permission to build the house? I don't think it's necessary, so here's a

simple example, probably more complete than many architect plans we get.

Hand drawn sketch by the client - this is something that - I don't know where he's come up with these dimensions but this is what he's got. This is what he wants to put on his lot. In this particular situation we had already done a reference plan. So, we had an existing relationship with this client. We had done a reference plan. Our environmental branch had gone out— and this was in an environmentally sensitive area. So, there was only going to be certain spots that were going to be suitable for house construction that wasn't going to adversely impact some wetlands. So, we have, based on the information from the environmental assessment, we had a building envelope that was defined. So, this became, in addition to the zoning setbacks, this was another one of the parameters that we had to deal with, to stay within, and so you take that information and you make a sketch. I think that the sketch meets the requirements. This was done when we weren't quite sure where the project sticker issue was going.

The title is nice and concise, sketch for site plan agreement, gives the location, Stewart Lake Road, gives the name of the municipality, and gives the various features that the building authority has to review and approve. This isn't anything new. I expect for any of you that's in private practice, you've seen this. You've dealt with this. This is the perfect opportunity for you to provide a service to your client and to show off your prowess because not everybody has the ability, as I've said in my notes, has the ability to determine whether you can put a 6,000 square foot house on a 5,500 square foot lot. Yes?

UNKNOWN MALE: That's all well and good. You did the r-plan so you know precisely where it is. What happens if you [unintelligible]?

BOB HALLIDAY: Then you probably have to do something different, but I'm talking about if we have available, reliable information. So you've got a recent plan that somebody else did— as long as you're satisfied that those dimensions on the plan are close enough to being accurate, and as long as you've got some amount of safety that you more than meet your minimum setbacks, and everything is good, and if your comfort level is such that you can go forward— if you don't have the comfort level you have to do more.

UNKNOWN MALE: Okay.

BOB HALLIDAY: So again, this is talking about your professional discretion to do what is needed to provide a service to your client. So, this is a severance application that I recently prepared for the Manitoba Planning Board. So again, sketch doesn't make any reference to the geographic description. That information is included on the face of the plan. There are notes on there that relate to the source of data. So, there were some buildings on there. The planning board wants to know what the setbacks are going to be between existing buildings and the proposed new boundary. So, I had my crew go out and tie in a minimum number of monuments,

just enough to determine where the lots were to tie in the buildings. At some point in the future if this is approved, the planning board is going to ask us to survey the lot line which presently is in the boundary because the parcel encompasses four lots there.

This is something I'm sure most of you do, but we're just talking about the format and the types of things that need to be included on the plan. We've got a copyright note and an indication that the sketch is only supposed to be used for severance application purposes. We got some information about the source of data and all of the other notes I've already alluded to. Just make sure they go on so people are clear.

My crew went out and tied that in because I identified the fact that that was going to be a question. It shows a distance from the building to the proposed new boundary plus or minus. It doesn't show the distances to the old boundary because that's not at issue. The planning board is only going to be interested in— any zoning infractions that are existing are going to be grandfathered. They're just not going to allow the severance to go ahead if we're going to be creating zoning infractions with the new boundary.

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible].

BOB HALLIDAY: This planning board doesn't. If they did, and as long as - then you'd have to do sufficient survey work to be able to say with complete certainty to support your opinion -

UNKNOWN MALE: They were saying [unintelligible].

BOB HALLIDAY: That's the existing guidelines. The committee is strongly suggesting that as long as you've got that information in your project file to support it, that that should be permissible. Why would you do a plan of survey of this entire 400-acre block - so I think we have to be reasonable - for a summit sketch. At some point in the future some or all of these boundaries - probably only some of them will get surveyed if this application goes forward.

This one comes from our municipal people, and this has been a contentious issue for them. We looked at a number of examples of sketches prepared by various municipal departments. Now we have issue with the fact that they've included the lot and registered plan in the title block. We don't feel that that is appropriate.

Other than that we're quite happy with this and we're happy with it because the city survey crew has gone out and they have re-established Alphonse Crescent to the satisfaction of the surveyor who was supervising this, and they have prepared this sketch to illustrate, so that the - the way the situation is described to us, some city manager— I guess trees, or parks, whatever, came to the survey department and said we need to know whether we can cut this tree down. Yes or no? Is it on

municipal property? So, they had to do sufficient work to make that determination. The committee's viewpoint is the methodology is the responsibility of the surveyor. He has to stand behind what he has done, and this is an acceptable vehicle for reporting his findings.

Other sketch types— I'm sure you've all seen lots of examples. This is one that came from our Sault St. Marie office. The city wanted a guarantee that a certain number of parking spaces were going to be made available. This is all compiled information from aerial photography, but the surveyor who prepared this was able to properly scale, so he knew that the parking spaces that were plotted on here were reliable. This has nothing to do with boundaries, whatever, but we're surveyors. Give me one sec please. We're surveyors, and we deal with measurements, and we know where we can access the kind of information that is necessary. So, if not us, then who? There was a question sir?

UNKNOWN MALE: On your previous slide there, as long as the surveyor has done his research and his field evidence, showing the location of the field vs. a boundary how is that any different from me, finding the bars on the street and showing the location of the fence...[unintelligible]

BOB HALLIDAY: The committee feels that if in your professional opinion that's the best way to represent your findings— we were talking about this at break. If instead of the street line it was the line between these two lots here, and two neighbors were arguing over that, I would say do a plan of survey because chances are it's going to end up in litigation somewhere at some point, so do the plan of survey now. But if it's really only an issue that's fact-finding and fact telling, then there's nothing wrong with a plan of survey.

UNKNOWN MALE: It's the same thing. If you know that it will probably go to go through litigation too... [unintelligible]

BOB HALLIDAY: It could. Use your discretion.

JAIME GELBLOOM: Bob. I have a couple questions one, more of a comment. I think you work for Tulloch don't you? Ok. That's one. That's a statement.

BOB HALLIDAY: Thanks for the advertisement.

JAIME GELBLOOM: I don't know who's speaking over there, but I kind of agree with them. Let's cut to the chase. Let's get rid of the SRPRs and plans of surveys then. If that's what you want to do, you're going to have to increase the budget of the SRD because one person's interpretation of what a sketch should be, and the other interpretation of what a plan of survey should be - it's going to be different, every time.

If we sit across from each other and have a beer, and you're going to disagree as to

what a sketch should be. But the point is, is that you're just leaving it up to be open and you're saying use your professional opinion, which is good, but if that's the case, I want you to trash the plans of survey that aren't going to be registered or deposited and trash the SRPRs and just call it all sketches. Not you. SRD laws and just follow along, because that's what you're doing. Not you, but - [applause] and I understand where you're coming from. I work in the country too. But we have rules right now and regulations, and we all have to be on the same page, and if we want to change it, okay, we can go for it, but don't pick it up and leave it up in the air. You should have someone from the GTA and I'd like to volunteer right now.

BOB HALLIDAY: Sorry, name?

JAIME GELBLOOM: Jaime Gelbloom.

BOB HALLIDAY: Sorry, didn't recognize you Jaime.

JAIME GELBLOOM: That's all right. I didn't recognize you either. At that point, just because it's a tree, or a corner of an old shed, or a substantial [unintelligible], I mean-- it doesn't matter because those are issues, and it doesn't matter that it's abutting the private or municipalities, because the reason we do that, 9 times out of 10 - 10 times out of 10 is because the municipality doesn't want you to cut it down. They want to make sure it's part of the property and say no you can't do it, or/and the opposite is on the client's side, that they want to leave it on their property and show that. So, it doesn't make a difference between, private and private or, private and public.

The point is they're all clients and they all require our knowledgeable services, and the standards that we're told to work under, which there should be certain standards so we're all on the same page, so I'm not coming to the guy and saying, "Hey, I'm going to do a plan of survey, and certifying the boundary, all this kind of stuff and give you a CAD file, that you're going to use to develop, to come up with the design." Whereas, the guy down the road is saying, "I'll get you a sketch. Don't worry about it." Then they find out later on, that they needed something else, something that was certified by a competent authority.

BOB HALLIDAY: Any other questions before we move on?

UNKNOWN MALE: Another comment. One of the things I find exceptionable. If you have a landscaping firm coming to you, saying, there are two dilapidated soccer fields, and we need to get a topo of that section just to rejuvenate life into that and go out there, the boundary is 10 or 15 meters away from the soccer field. So, you have the new line showing it. You show them a topo. I think a sketch, you don't really need to set it up, but now if the soccer field is within a foot of a boundary limit there, and now I will be like, "No, you need a plan of survey to show the limit of that soccer field." You don't want the contractor coming in putting the soccer field and now it's into the other property. It's going to be a problem. Putting a

parking structure for GO or anything like that. The survey [unintelligible] based on a full sketch. So, all design, and everything has gone through. The sketch is a boundary, and I'm coming there to survey. I don't want to get a survey [unintelligible]. Oh, there is nothing. What?

JAIME GELBLOOM: I don't understand. You have digital plans so all the consultants [unintelligible]. You go out there and tie in a head wall. You do a topo for the current surface [unintelligible] and you send them a text about it, or whatever they need. Everybody's gotten [unintelligible]. There's all kinds of crazy stuff that can happen. I don't even know where that tree is. It's on some drawing for someone to deal with. You show the drip line. You show the center of the tree. You show the wetland boundary.

BOB HALLIDAY: Yes.

GORD WALLACE: I just want to focus back on the sketches. First, we're actually all here because of all of the surveyors in the GTA who are producing plans of surveying along the sketches. They're defining boundaries and the reason they're doing that is for infill housing. That's why we're all here, and the surveyors are arguing that— they're skipping out on monumenting, skipping out on easements, title search, and producing a very bad product for somebody who is going to build a three million-dollar house. That's why we're here.

Number two— we're circumventing all that. That is the issue. The 400 acre thing, all of that is kind of interesting, but that's the problem we'd like to attack. What happens to those duplexes? Or do they actually have a valid reason to produce a plan of survey, show where the bars are, set a bar—sorry, it's not a plan of survey. It's a sketch. Okay? It doesn't show easements. They do have [unintelligible] which is what the problem is. That was my statement. The question I have here is why wouldn't that department do a plan of survey on that one line to show where the tree is? If they define the line then they should show how they define the line and monument the line, because that line doesn't align. I look back and go I don't know whether that tree is— how do they define the street line?

BOB HALLIDAY: We've got a hand over here.

UNKNOWN MALE: That was a question.

BOB HALLIDAY: Oh, that was a question.

GORD WALLACE: I wouldn't think they would want to do a plan of survey because— usually the answer is they didn't want to spend the money and the time.

BOB HALLIDAY: If they had found monuments here and there, then it wouldn't be a problem. If for the sake of a simple sketch though they had to go some distance up or across— perhaps get up both sides of Alphonse and Sophia, I think that is, and

do whatever they had to do, and all of a sudden the sketch is a much more complex drawing, then again the committee feels as long as you can justify in your file what you have done, then—

GORD WALLACE: How did they get that opinion? That is not the north limit Alphonse Crescent. That's the opinion of the Ontario Land Surveyor not shown on that sketch as to where that is. I think we've all seen that. [unintelligible]. So how does that stand up? You can't just say that's where the limit is. That's the surveyor's opinion on where the limit is. Maybe there's a building tie, or maybe a bar's out.

JAIME GELBLOOM: I would be saying the same thing if there was some kind of title issue, let's say, or some issue with some structure outside the CN Tower, and I had to figure out where the boundary was, and there's a skateboard park, or whatever it is. Then I'd have to say then boundary is of the skateboard park is over here and I would do a sketch. Thank you. It makes no sense. It doesn't matter the geographical features and how far you have to go. If it was a plan of survey you would have to show all of that stuff. So, what is the difference? There is no difference. [Unintelligible] because this is what we do.

DAVE RAITHY: Jaime, I've just got to comment - all good points, all points that we've spoken about at the committee. These issues have come up time and again. What you're talking about is somebody doing a survey and calling it a sketch. Nobody likes that. Nobody in the committee likes that. Everybody understands that. How do we stop that? We stop that by making the project reviewable at SRD, as a chance to have a look at this and see. We're talking about producing sketches where it is reviewable, and the surveyor has the option to produce a sketch instead of a plan of survey. In this case, I think we talked about the sketch and the establishment of this, the surveyor did the work. He had the underlying information. He had the research, and he produced this as an internal document for another municipal department.

So, did he need a full plan of survey for that instance, for this application? The answer was no. He didn't. If this was, for use then that professional would make that determination, if you were going to produce this plan, and there were other issues, and there was something else going on, and you were beside the CN Tower, I think it incumbent upon you, absolutely, to produce that plan of survey, and illustrate your opinion on that plan of survey. Have that opinion reviewable by SRD in a regular process, and then everybody can feel comfortable that everything you've done is reviewable, is contingent with the regulations, and is correct.

JAIME GELBLOOM: Let me just clear something up, okay? You mentioned the internal document. Yes, I will backtrack. This is the city, this is [unintelligible]. So, one department, is doing this for another department, within this internal document. That's great. I can do plans of survey all day long and send them over to the guys in my office and that's fine. I can make mistakes. I don't have to put stickers on it. That's fine. It's an internal document. But if you were hiring someone, say someone

was hiring me, and the city of Mississauga is hiring me, then no, you should not be producing that.

HELMUT PILLER: If this is the tree issue here? I get a call from the owner of the parcel of land and he said, "Is that tree on my land or not, and sends me that?" I say, I don't know. I don't know what this is. There's no methodology there. There's no bars shown. Is that found or methodology how I set it? Yes.

DAVE RAITHBY: I think you're exactly right. I think in that case you wouldn't end up with a copy of that, right? I think that was for a specific purpose as an internal document. If you in the same circumstance were asked to do that survey and show that illustration, then absolutely you could do it as a plan of survey. But what we're talking about is having the opportunity as a surveyor to present your opinion to your client based on his needs, right? And you have that conversation with your client, you understand his need, and you provide them with something that illustrates that. If you in your conversation with your client come to realize he needs an SRPR, you provide him with one. If he needs a reference plan, you provide him with one.

BOB HALLIDAY: Just before we go on, Drew, it was pointed out to me that this is being taped, so anyone who wants to speak is welcome to, but please come to the microphone, and give your name just like all of the others.

DREW ANNABLE: Drew Annable. Survey Review Department has been mentioned much here together with Doug Reitsma. The two of us are the ones doing the comprehensive reviews. Pretty unique position in that we've probably been in most survey offices across the province, and we've seen a lot of sketches, and their misuse if you will.

The notion that this is acceptable so long as you have the documentation in your file for review, kind of thing, well that is the one thing that we see a lot is that there's not the documentation in the file. The surveyors aren't good generally at documenting things. We're going to have a field note seminar this afternoon that's going to point this out. So, to say that so long as you have it documented in your file, this is acceptable, is a slippery slope. The plan of survey and the rules of a plan of survey showing a lot of that documentation were put in place for a reason.

This kind of a product was one of the reasons, and I think we're just going back to that point in time. This kind of a product we see getting used— there's a digital delivery of it to whoever, and they don't understand it, and they start plotting this, that, and the other thing. So, before you know it the plan has been used for something that was not the original purpose.

In our reviewing when we see existing features, existing boundaries, monuments and that sort of thing, we say it's a plan of survey. We fall back on 2013-01 and existing rules. There's grey areas, but our basic interpretation is that this should be a plan of survey because it's an existing boundary that's being retraced. There is

existing information being tied to that boundary, and while I've got the mic; sketches showing topographic information throws up red flags to us because usually, very rarely have I ever seen just topographic information with no boundary shown on a plan.

Everybody throws a boundary on it and they put a statement saying this is not a plan of survey feeling they're protected. Well not really, because again it gets misused and things get plotted to it. Somebody said building a three million-dollar building. So, we're trying to save them a few hundred bucks to build a three million dollar building by not following the rules. I think there's rules in place that are there now and got created for specific reasons, and to relive all of that is a slippery slope. Did you want to make a comment?

DAVE RAITHBY: Let me just respond to that beforehand—

DREW ANNABLE: Maybe before you do, Doug wants to add to that.

DOUG REITSMA: Doug Reitsma, Welland. Just keep in mind that SRD has been reviewing, for 20 odd years, all your files. And in those files, there have been sketches which we have been providing comments on and we get your feedback back. So just to boil all that down, your proposal to show ties and measurements to boundaries, I think that's where the dividing line is, because not only do we give you a reflection of what the rules and regulations are; we also want to make a level playing field. Any time we come across sketches that are showing bars, and ties, and why is there an SRPR, and the guy down the street is doing all these sketches and I've got to compete— I think the idea is that the sketch, the plan of survey sounds like a lot of work. Well I don't know. Just as much drafting went into that sketch but the public thinks I've got something cheaper and he didn't go through all that trouble. So just for the purposes of having, I'm expecting the lightning bolts to hit when I say I'm in agreement with Jaime, but the idea is not only to consider what the public— because when surveyors - I'm going to give you a fair warning here.

In response to an issue if you said, "My client wanted to have" - I say you're not satisfying your client. I know you are satisfying his needs, but it's your responsibility to satisfy his needs within those boundaries— and establishing very definitive boundaries. So the boundary, "we" or the SRD— or I might say personally with a half-SRD hat on is to say draw that line that says, on sketches nothing that gives the public or anybody else the ability to position the boundary based on the information you've given him, and that would include digital files showing topographical information.

But then on the other hand, if a sketch is prepared for something, then 'a sketch showing' is not 'prepared for', so 'prepared for' has more of a connotation that you're preparing it for severance, zoning, building permits, all those things already define what they want on a sketch. Don't put me in a situation where I have to define that he was okay to prepare that sketch, whereas his competitor might say no,

that's - I don't want to be arbitrating that, because it's got a huge grey area in there, so my comments.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Hi everyone, Gavin Lawrence, Newmarket, Ontario. So, I'm just going to take off my Council hat, speaking as a surveyor now. Show of hands. Going to do some in-depth research. How many people have staked a fence line? Staked a property boundary for a fence line? How many created a plan of survey for all those fence lines? I'm not trying to get anything out of that or say anything by. What I'm trying to ascertain -

HELMUT PILLER: In this case you have a conversation with the client. You say, "You want it staked so your contractor can build it on the line?" Or "Do you want it established so you can satisfy your neighbour, so they won't call the cops?" Then you say you need a plan of survey. Monument on either end, wire the stakes which are identified on the plan, was prepared for that purpose, and that they cannot show. So in some cases where they just want a record of what they did we take a page of field notes. In our firm we still make field notes.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thanks for that example, because what we have here is a buffet of different options that are offered to our clients, and it depends on the situation. That is the product that is offered by the professional. I think for myself though is, all of these are legal opinions that were offered at a point in time. Are these legal opinions being reviewed? Or should they fall under our Acts and Reg's?

JAIME GELBLOOM: I believe that's apples and oranges; what you're bringing up right there. That's apples and oranges. When you're shown a plan, you know that's going to be for an intended purpose. It can also be for an unintended purpose. You're working out the line that you're working, [unintelligible]. That's the part that the client, the neighbour, [unintelligible]. That's different than making a statement to the world, using this plan because you're doing it for a purpose, saying that's my tree and I'm going to cut it down, or for whatever it is. So then because you were providing a product that can be transferred to many people, you would follow that kind of plan.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: To me there's no difference because in both situations you're offering an opinion, whether you're putting it on your field notes and it's within your office or whether you're giving it to the public at large.

JAIME GELBLOOM: You're offering a plan. You're offering an opinion.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: So, when you're offering an opinion, shouldn't your opinion be reviewable by the Survey Review Department?

JAIME GELBLOOM: Okay. No, it shouldn't be. Why not? I'm sorry. You guys are going to have to retire early.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: What I'm trying to do is just to gauge.

JAIME GELBLOOM: The plans of survey, the SRPRs, because we're all professionals. You want to do an ethics-based, professional organization. Go ahead. Do it. But don't cut me off only at the ankles. Take all my notes.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Jaime brought up a good point twice there. Should we be getting rid of plan of survey? Can we get just a quick answer? This is not going to be set in stone.

JAIME GELBLOOM: You said I was being sarcastic. It was, but -

GAVIN LAWRENCE: I know -

JAIME GELBLOOM: You should ask that question.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Which one, the question of whether we should have plans of survey or not?

JAIME GELBLOOM: I think there should be.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: So, you think we should have plans of survey? What we have though is sketches; which does not fit into a pigeon hole we currently have. We do not have a pigeon hole where we can control or look at what is being given to the public at large. I think that is my concern and how do we deal with that. If somebody's got a solution to that issue, I'm all ears. Thanks Jaime, if we can just carry on. I appreciate it.

MARVIN MCNABB: Marvin McNabb. I'm wearing a few hats here but I work with MTO up in Thunder Bay. I'm also the new chair of the Survey Review Department Committee.

So, I have a few comments and some questions. I also have seen really good use of sketches. I sit on the Committee of Adjustment in the City of Thunder Bay, and we deal with minor variances in the severance consent, and it's a nice day for community adjustment when you do get a sketch that was prepared by a surveyor. The applications go way more smoother. The sample that was shown here, splitting up 400 acres or whatever it was, there's no reason why you survey that in advance. You don't know what's going to get approved at the committee of adjustment.

So basically, a surveyor, once they're onboard, to me that's an awesome use of a sketch. Eventually, if the severance does get approved, then it's going to lead to a reference plan that's required for that.

So, one of the questions I have - I think what's coming out here is there's a lot of misuse of sketches. The Survey Review Department right now is set-up to check

based on the by-laws that are available, check the SRPRs, reference plans, registered plans, condominium plans, expropriation plans, but— and I did hear from people on the - in the Survey Review Department that they come across sketches all the time.

But they're not coming across those through their random selection of files. They just happened to be perhaps in the file because they're actually looking at a reference plan. So they're not setup to check sketches at this point in time and I was curious about the approval philosophy that was going on in January. We're now into March 1st. What kind of went sideways, and was it just a little bit premature in that the SRD is not really setup to look at sketches with stickers on them? Was that part of the pushback?

GAVIN LAWRENCE: I'll put my Council hat on for that one. So we'll blame Council for that one. Council themselves are still wrestling with what that should look like and what it should not look like. There were some differences of opinion as to some of these varied examples we're looking at right here. I don't know Bob if you wanted to add anything to that, but that was the reason, is that indecision.

BOB HALLIDAY: I think to answer your specific question it had nothing to do with whether SRD was involved or not. There were some concerns about whether, the primary issues Jaime was raising about ties shown to boundaries, such as this sketch here. That was really what Council was continuing to wrestle with, so it had nothing to do with SRD.

MARVIN MCNABB: It just strikes me as being - the Survey Review Department should definitely be involved with - perhaps someone should be on that committee as well. I feel like it's the cart before the horse. There's all sorts of things to work out in order to have a smooth implementation. I think the— in terms of the...

BOB HALLIDAY: Can I just comment in response to that one? What we're seeing is we've got three pieces that all need to move forward at the same time, and we can wait until we have review by SRD, but by the time all that legislation gets passed we might be about three years away. So, in the meantime do we just shut down the computer and not talk about sketches? The third piece is the education piece, whatever is decided by Council, we need to make sure that all of the membership at least has a chance to be in compliance with it. If we don't talk about it, then they're not going to know.

MARVIN MCNABB: Absolutely, and thanks for all of your hard work on this committee as well. Thanks.

HUGH COUTTS: Hugh Coutts, Renfrew. Two examples that you showed up there, the one with the parking space and the one for the severance; those are all things that don't need a boundary. The severance sketch is just someone's idea. It's a conception. They would like to do something, and this is my general idea. And don't

have a problem calling either of those a sketch. But the moment you get where there's an issue as to whether something's on one side of a boundary, or it's too close to a boundary, or anything like that, that's a plan of survey. There's no way to get around it, because the people want to know where is the boundary and is that tree on the city side or is it on the private side? I've had many surveys just like that, and no matter what it takes, you don't have to monument it. I'm not saying you're compelled to monument it.

You're going to make an opinion, as to what it is, then you're going to say it's a boundary, you should be able to substantiate it. Maybe you're saying it ought to be in the records and all that sort of stuff, but I think when people look at this, despite the fact that it says sketch showing, they're looking at it and they're thinking plan of survey. A boundary's been laid down and an opinion's been made as to where the boundary is. The object of the query is that tree, and we're saying it's on the city side. That's a plan of survey. You can call it a sketch, and you can put lipstick on a pig but you still can't call it a ballerina.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: I hear what you are saying. The question, sorry, before you leave the mic; the question I have though is what if an internal department said I need a letter, all I need is a letter to know whether that tree is in, on, or over the boundary. Would you consider that?

HUGH COUTTS: No. An internal document, somebody's going to use that. It could be that municipality—I'm going to extrapolate a little bit on this and just say one department in the municipality, maybe the legal department, they are - or parks and rec has come, and they say we've got this tree, and it's diseased. We believe it needs to be cut down. So, they go and say "Whose tree is it? Is it ours or does it belong to someone else?" So, they send their surveyors out, send the crew out, and they do whatever they need to do to make a determination about where this tree is. They had to establish the boundary and the fact that it's an internal document. So, then it goes from the parks and rec. It now goes down to the legal department who maybe made the initial request because they went to parks and rec and said is this your tree? I don't know. So, then they make the decision, this is where the boundary is. The lawyer then calls up the home owner and says we've had a survey done and determined the tree is on public property, we'll cut it down. An opinion was made as to where a boundary was. It's a plan of survey and the fact that, what it does, or where it starts, or where it ends up is neither here nor there.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thanks Hugh.

HARRY KALANTZAKOS: Harry Kalantzakos, Hamilton. I agree with Hugh. I think if you're making a determination on the location of something in relationship to a boundary, it's considered a survey. A sketch like this needs ownership, so whoever made that determination needs to sign that, at least saying that they signed it and the date. I think that way we can track down who made the opinion, whether it's in letter format, or in plan format. That to me looks very much like a survey. I

don't think that is what a sketch is meant for, and if we're basing it on boundaries, we need to refer to a boundary, somehow, in the sketch.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: I appreciate that and something else we're looking at is not just sketches but a variety of opinions that have been given to the public, whether that be in the form of a letter, or in the form of a wooden stake that was planted in the ground to demarcate a certain interval between two monuments for fencing purposes. So in my opinion if you're just doing that and the client doesn't need a plan of survey, put a plan sticker on the back of your field notes.

HARRY KALANTZAKOS: Or a bar in the ground, a field note to the client -

GAVIN LAWRENCE: The issue again, and I'll reiterate this, is since I have the podium, there is no mechanism to deal with those type of opinions that are being given to the public, that wooden stake in the ground. This is why we are contemplating or proposing at least to have a project-based review.

HARRY KALANTZAKOS: And I agree with you. There should be some sort of review, on any stake boundary by the surveyor. They need to take ownership. There's no reason for a surveyor to have a sketch like this and now we're guessing this could happen anytime in the last hundred years. How do you know when this happened? There's no information on here other than 'City of Mississauga'. Do you have to go and figure out who was working at the city for the last hundred years to figure out who prepared this?

COLIN BOGUE: Colin Bogue, J. D. Barnes. Toronto. I just want to say again thank you to your committee, and commission, and I want to recognize David Raithby for all the work and passion he's shown us over the last 10 years regarding this issue. I know it's not a small issue. I'm not very good at public speaking, so bear with me, but what I see here is that you're trying to - someone's trying, not you - have two products, and the one product is trying very hard to be the other product, so hard that it might as well be.

So, we have two people in the room, Helmut Piller and Jaime Gelbloom. I don't know if you've ever agreed on anything, but you're coming from different ends. Helmut, I think is saying get rid of the sketches because they're the same product. Jaime, facetiously, said get rid of plans of survey because it's the same product. It is the same product. One's trying to be the other.

Where I'm going with this, the problem is if you go back to the last - not this one so much, but the other ones, look a lot like surveys. Nobody can say that's not a survey. If I want to the planning department with that, and I'm sure there's surveys on there somewhere, and that fine print is supposed to mean something - that's a survey. It's a survey to the public. It's a survey to the end user. If it's not to be a survey it should be a red stamp right across it, watermark, for internal use only. Bang. Forget about little caveats in the corner. It's a loophole. You created a way of

a loophole and undercutting your client, doing your client a favor, and what's the expression? The road to hell is paved with good intentions. This is the road to hell because it's a good intention, you mean well, but you're really causing a problem.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thanks Colin. I appreciate you for sharing, and actually on that point there was some discussion on having watermarks across the face of the plan. There's been lots of discussions, and I'm glad to know that we're not -

COLIN BOGUE: I just - my point is anybody in the planning department, anybody who isn't a surveyor, and maybe some surveyors, would look at a plan like that with no deference to, can't see who did it, and it looks like a survey, and if it looks like a survey and is trying to be a survey, then it is a survey. And calling it a sketch, I don't know what that does except help your client find a loophole. Is that what we're in business for?

GERHARD AUER: Gerhard Auer. I think there are a matter of degrees. To me, for that particular purpose, that was acceptable, the severance sketch of the 400-acre farm. In the other case with the tree— supposing I know where the sidewalk is from a prior survey, and its five feet from the legal limit, now I'm asked to determine “Where is that tree?” Well the first thing I might do is go out - that tree is at two-foot diameter up against the sidewalk. It's clearly a previously established boundary. So, I report within my department, that based on our previous surveys - I wouldn't have done a sketch probably, just do a written report based on our previous surveys. The tree is in the public right of way and I think you've making a determination of an object from an object that you've already known the position of.

Now you've got to know that the sidewalk hasn't changed and all that stuff. I think that's where you start exercising your professional abilities. If you make that measurement to the tree, it's a little dicey, well now you've got to do something more, get the instrument out and determine where that line is, quite possibly monument it, whatever is appropriate for the circumstance, and I think that's where we exercise our professionalism. Thank you.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thank you. Jaime?

JAIME GELBLOOM: I'm not saying it should be me, Jaime Gelbloom. But from talking, and you saying as well too, I think a determination should be made. Some people are saying you're doing a professional opinion no matter what, whether you stake the line, and don't produce a plan, or produce a plan; I think there is a difference. I find it hard to believe people don't see that difference. I think when you're producing a plan, that's the thing. When you're producing a product, then we have standards and regulations that when you're doing something, making a determination and putting it in a graphic form that is easily foreseeable, that is going to go around to a number of parties, that we have to show this— go by what our standards are, or else get rid of the standards.

So, I'd like to at least have people agree on that there's a difference between just going out and staking a boundary, and producing a plan, and let's not do the apples and oranges thing, and with that I leave.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thanks Jaime. Not thanks for leaving though.

JAIME GELBLOOM: Drops the mic.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: He knows I love him.

UNKNOWN MALE: You had the one that was showing the plan of survey or sketch showing the site plan. That's a site plan. Let's call that a site plan. Why put sketch for site plan agreement? No, this is a site plan. It's not under - it shouldn't really be under the guise of the association for that. That can be produced by any engineer that does site plans. So, confusing it with it being a site plan, or a plan of survey, take all the notes that are required by us off and say this is a site plan prepared by-- or using the boundaries shown on a survey prepared by X Ontario Land surveyor, dated so and so. They can go back. That's a site plan.

Can you go to the next slide? That's a draft reference plan, so let's take that. Rather than calling a sketch of a survey, say this is a draft reference plan, put all the certificates on it for a draft reference plan, because at the end of the day that's going to be a reference plan when you're finished.

Go to the next one again. That's a legal survey. That is the re-establishment of the north limit of Alphonse Crescent, registered plan to so and so - that should be up here, not the sketch.

I think anytime it shows a boundary, on a plan, it's a plan of survey. It's not a sketch. You can't confuse the two. There's no grey area. It makes it easy for the Survey Review Department to take a look at it. If it shows a boundary, it is a plan of survey.

Sketches should be reserved for things, a report to my client of the grid lines I laid out. The location of the parking lot that I just did a topo because there's errors in the drainage after the paving. That's a sketch. It doesn't show a boundary. It has features on it that can be related back to, when I walk out and take a look at it. Here's the curb. I know if I go this far off this curb, here's a depression.

Or a sketch for a water park in Downtown Toronto where somebody says "We need to redo this water park. We need a survey to go get planning done from a landscape planning department or engineer", and we provide them no boundary. Here it is. You can now relate where you are, to relatable stuff on the ground. It can be ground truthed, but it doesn't show a boundary. If it shows a boundary it's a plan of survey and it should be reviewed by the Survey Review Department, should have a sticker on it, should have a signature and all of the detailed investigation and records you

have, and registry office should be kept in your files so its reviewable.

JEFF BUISMAN: Jeff Buisman, Guelph. We've heard all kinds of opinions this morning. It's great, and that's the purpose of this session, and I'm sure you've taken notes and are bringing it back here. I see both sides of the argument. I can see the simplicity of presenting this.

I'm just going to give you one example of what happened. We staked out a boundary at one property and then my colleague thought okay, the client called and said, "You gave me points on the back and the front, but I still can't figure it out in the middle." Then we thought, oh, that's easy. We did tie in the building, so what we'll do is give you a quick drawing to show you the relationship of that property line right up the side of the building. You can measure that out yourself quickly. You can figure it out. Then your fencing guy, you've got the front and the back, got these little ties, you can figure it out.

My colleague thought he was doing this person a favour, and in a way this drawing ended up showing a little too much information. Now that client grabbed that and kind of pushed it off and presented it as an SRPR sort of or tried to meet the municipal requirements. So, my colleague that presented the drawing didn't know that it would be abused, in that, he was genuinely trying to help the guy out, and that's the nature of surveyors. That's what we like to do.

It was a lesson for me to say this smells like a survey. Maybe we should make it look formal like a survey and do it that way. It was just a lesson, and yeah, we can try to be helpful, but there's a purpose for us showing the formal presentation of it as well. I don't know if that's helpful.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thanks Jeff.

DOUG REITSMA: Doug Reitsma, just one more point about the division between a sketch and a legal survey. When you prepare a sketch for severance - and I'll stand corrected here, but the purpose that you're preparing that sketch is very specific to that property, and to the needs of the people who are going to determine whether that sketch is valid.

That's why in that previous sketch you went out and located those buildings because it was critical as to where that dimension would be to the proposed boundary line, but you didn't show anything to the new ones because mostly in the sketch for severance, they're not determining whether it's by-law, whether it satisfies the by-law for existing setbacks. That would be a condition that the committee would have the ability to impose, if they want, then you do a legal survey.

So, the person who's going to decide, whether or not your sketch satisfies the purposes, is the people who are using it. I don't know how I'm going to go in and review a sketch as to whether or not it required a boundary retracement or not,

because that's the opinion of the people who are using it.

I think there's a distinction there that if a sketch was prepared and he didn't do a title search, because he didn't need one, that again is defined by whatever comes out of the people who are using that sketch, and whether they have an issue with it, and they'll determine that legally, and that's where it will come up as an issue, but I'm going to find it very difficult to judge whether or not somebody should have done a plan of survey or a sketch. That's where the grey area comes in, and I stress that that should be where the line is drawn.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Do you think it would be easier to determine whether or not some survey should be done, or the extent of that work if the line was shown on a plan or illustrated on a plan?

DOUG REITSMA: I'm sorry, say that again.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: What I was just trying to ask, is if you have a plan of survey and you have a sketch, regardless of the title. So, for example, let's try to use this example if we may.

In this scenario, regardless of the tree and the ties to it, if we just have a boundary there. If you're in the Survey Review Department, and you're given this, regardless if it's a plan of survey or sketch, will you look at the re-establishment of that line any different? Would it be a plan of survey or a sketch?

What I'm trying to get at is if we can look into the future and say if we did have this project-based environment, and maybe, but regardless of what that top end - right end title block said— regardless of what it said, would we not look at the survey methodology the same regardless of what it said if an opinion was offered?

DOUG REITSMA: The methodology would be dictated by what the purposes were for it, right? Again, every sketch I ever did, I had to consider what the committee was going to be concerned about. So, if I was defining a boundary line that was going to have to be four feet off an existing building, then I'd go out and find out where that building was relative to the existing one to determine where that was, and I would be showing that on the sketch. It's just for my protection, the client's protection, and approval. Because that four feet is going to generate a frontage. If that frontage doesn't meet the minimum, he wants to know all of those things, so how am I going to determine whether or not that sketch was appropriately done? If that's not an issue because maybe he didn't need to - so if he gives me a file and he did a title search, I'm going to review did he do the title for a plan of survey? He didn't have to do all the other— he didn't do the subject and abuttings, so how am I going to determine that? The whole determination of a sketch is based on its purpose, and that's where the grey area comes.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: I think you make a very important point there, that the

sketch, the reason for its being is important.

JEFF BUISMAN: I guess I was coming up in line to say exactly that. I probably do more than 50 severance sketches a year, and if I figure out oh, the side tie is going to be really tight, I get a survey crew to figure it out. I still don't show it on the sketch, my methodology, because it's for the severance application. But if I have severance sketches where the minimum side yard is 3 meters and I've got 20, roughly, I'm not doing a survey. Again, the purpose of, that's where professional ethics, comes into play. I guess the other comment I wanted to say was the crutch to say this is SRD reviewable, I could care less. I mean they could choose from thousands of surveys, most of them they'll never see. I guess my comment is we need to steer this in a professional direction and ethics, so the SRD reviewable is a non-issue to me.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: But you're okay with it though right? Because it's not an issue, and everybody shouldn't have an issue with it, because -

JEFF BUISMAN: No issue. Some people may see it as a threat.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: I think some people may see it as a threat. For me it's an educational piece, as well as doing road shows, going to regional groups, and helping them know what's good form.

UNKNOWN MALE: I'm as paranoid as the next guy but it's not a threat to me. It's a misrepresentation.

Why would you even call it a sketch if for whatever reason it's supposed to look like a plan of survey because that's what the building department wants? That's what the severance committee wants? In fact, in most municipalities, it has to be a reference plan. It has to be signed. It has to be a plan of survey. We won't consider it a sketch because anyone can draw a sketch and they'll have problems because that sketch was wrong. It was based on faulty information.

I hear what you're saying. We have two products, I suppose. I go back to my initial point. Why is one product trying so hard to look like another product? The only reason I can see for that is because it's being used for that purpose. It's trying to get through a loophole, trying to get through some path of least resistance to get to the end-product and save my client money. Look, I saved you money. I don't like it personally.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thanks. We have four minutes left, I believe, and the room is silent.

UNKNOWN MALE: My only comment which I just about forgot is - wait.

HELMUT PILLER: No, all I wanted to say is, this needs a lot more discussion of

this kind. This was very enlightening, very thorough, but it has touched on many things, and maybe all of us can walk away from this and rethink it. It is an important issue, and yes Bob, in the GTA, it is misused, and that is a problem. I have spoken to that time and again, and it's not only germane to the GTA.

We don't go very far out of the GTA, but we have come across these things in Hamilton and along the Lake Ontario development. It was a survey. It was called a sketch illustrating something something. There was a new house on there, there was a water line, it was a survey. The kicker on that one was it was prepared by a surveyor that articulated under me many years ago.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thank you very much. I appreciate your comments.

UNKNOWN MALE Just one additional comment somebody made over here, but I run into this misconception - a Surveyor's Real Property report has to be on the whole parcel. You have to survey the whole parcel to do an SRPR, but not a plan of survey. A plan of survey can be one line of a parcel, two lines, and that, but I frequently run into people with that misconception.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: That's also a very good comment.

UNKNOWN MALE: One last point, and I know I'm hogging, and the point is you're right, the rules now don't allow these things, but we have to look to a point of changing the rules, changing the guidelines, changing the standards to allow for one solid product that combines both products, and don't separate them, then you won't have them misused.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Any other comments? David, welcome.

DAVID TURNER: Dave Turner, City of St. Catharines. I work for the municipality. Many of you probably have put on subdivision plans, then slapped on a reference plan, which is a wholly compiled plan, which there's provisions for. It's a plan of survey, no field work done, yes, the boundary was traced.

At what point do you put that plan on? What's the delay? The contractor goes in, and puts a sewer in there that isn't within the easement, and you slap this plan on, showing the easement but the actual plan is not within that easement, so that quite frankly is creating mischief, and it doesn't happen that often but it does. So there's a product that's approved by the registry office, got all the stamps on it, but you have not confirmed that the sewer is within what you've shown in that plan. In most cases that plan goes on prior to the actual construction, and in some cases it doesn't.

JEFF FEE: Jeff Fee, Thornhill. Just a question to the committee. This issue wasn't unique to Ontario. We have 10, 11, 10 sister associations that have been dealing with the same issue. I can tell you by my exposure to other jurisdictions, it's not at the same level that it is at this association.

But we all agree there's a multitude of opinions in this room and within the membership of the AOLS. Quite often when you're looking for a solution, looking elsewhere is a smart thing to do. I know there was some discussion about this when the committee was struck. Do you know if there has been any contact with our sister associations about how they've dealt with this?

BOB HALLIDAY: There has not been, Jeff, other than members who are members in more than one association. I think we're going to have to call it. You've got the floor.

GORD WALLACE: I'm going to make a closing statement and then walk out just like Jaime did. Make a good line, walk out of the room. Still the whole - we've probably been here for an hour. I tried to do it under the radar. The whole problem still is all the professional surveyors - you might know I'm not one - all the professional surveyors calling themselves professional, producing topographic surveys on residential surveys, sometimes setting bars, sometimes not setting bars, and producing a product called a topographic survey, that doesn't have a sticker on it or doesn't have the proper certificate on it, that sort of thing. They're cheaping out on and putting bogus boundaries on those, as we said a sketch or topographic survey so somebody can build a three million dollar house. There's no mention of easements. That's not the due diligence you go through for an SRPR or plan of survey showing topography. They're producing - they never provide that product for them, so they can lowball the price, drum up more work. I want to hear from those people that are doing those surveys, and saying why they can do them, or I want somebody to tell them that they can't do them. That's the problem here. We've skirted around that whole issue and not really addressed it.

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Gord, my question for you though is with what authority can we tell them that they can't do it? Because at the moment, I think the only thing we really have is our guidelines.

GORD WALLACE: Code of Ethics. They're misrepresenting themselves. They're misrepresenting the plan. It looks like a plan of survey. That's the whole duck thing that we're talking about, and as I said, I just saw one that had bars set on it, no sticker, no certificate, but it shows some wonky methodology that they set bars, and this surveyor's been in practice for a long time, and obviously believes they can do that.

I want to hear from that surveyor to say yes, I can do that. I can produce something that looks like a plan of survey that doesn't have a sticker on it, doesn't have a certificate on it, and I can do that, and misrepresent my client. I'm not sure if those are the right words. The client thinks it's a survey but it's not. It's a cheap, cheap product. It's the doctor or the surgeon not washing their hands before they stick their hands in your body. Okay?

GAVIN LAWRENCE: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Just a couple words

from myself. I don't know if Bob wants to say anything afterwards, but I'd like to thank everybody for their participation, and thanks for the comments, and thanks to the committee again. I look forward to the one after lunch.

CONCURRENT SESSION: COMPLAINTS

DAVE KOVACS: I don't know if I have the 52 people here I was told were going to be here, but thank you all for coming. My name's Dave Kovacs. I'd like to thank you all for choosing to attend this presentation on complaints. It's not the most exciting topic to sit through, but if you can take two or three things away from this presentation, then I think we've achieved a common goal here.

Just to give you a bit about my background, I graduated from University of Toronto Survey Program in 1994. I completed my articling through the Ministry of Transportation in Thunder Bay and was commissioned in 2000. I put in 20 years in MTO before going into private practice for 7 years, and 3 years ago I decided to return to MTO and I'm currently the acting Head of Geomatics in the Northwest region. I've been a member of complaints since 2006. I've been the chair for the past two years.

During the past 12 years of my tenure on the committee I've seen over 200 official complaints before us, lodged by both the public and other surveyors. So when I was asked to put something together for the seminar I wasn't really sure about how to approach this. I was initially thinking of doing a statistical analysis to show if there's any correlation between implementation of continuing education, or professional development, and the possibility of a decline in complaints.

Unfortunately, since CPD has only been around since 2013, there really isn't enough empirical data to make such a conclusion yet. So, then I thought these seminars are supposed to be of some educational value to our members, and you should be walking out of the classroom feeling you're taking something away that's going to make you a better surveyor and hopefully a better professional.

I remember a friend of mine who runs his own surveying company, he called me and he said, "Hey Dave, I think someone might be lodging a complaint against me. What do I do?" I had to pause and really think about how to respond to him.

As I recall he was doing SRPR for a typical residential lot. He was having trouble getting the street line up, and he was trying to locate survey evidence on his side of the street from one end of the block to another. He finally had some luck in locating a bar at one end of the street corner, and he had just finished tying in the bar, and he was replacing his divot when the owner of the house came rushing out asking him "What the heck are you doing tearing up my lawn?" So, he got all the questions I'm sure we've all heard before. Why are you surveying my property? I already have a survey. I don't need another one. Is the city widening the street? Are they taking my land? Did my neighbor put you up to this?

So, I asked my friend. I said did you knock on the person's door and let them know what you were doing? He says, "Nope. I was only going to be there for five minutes to get the shot." I explained this could have all been avoided had he knocked on the door, introduced himself, gave the owner a business card and explained what he needed to do, and how long he expected to be there. Ten minutes of your time as a courtesy to an owner, may spend you hours upon hours of time responding to a complaint.

Yeah, section 6(1) of the Surveys Act gives the surveyor the right to enter land for the purpose of making a survey, but the right is not a right of anonymity, and we just can't sneak on and get the shot. I'll get into this in more detail. So in 2014, Andrew Mantha who was chair at the time, and the Registrar, Bill Buck, finalized version 2.4 of the Manual of Procedures for the Complaints Committee.

The purpose of the manual is to be a guide for the committee members to ensure consistency, openness, and fairness in the treatment of a complaint. The manual is a working document. It's continuously under review and subject to revision, and a copy of the manual is available to members for viewing on the AOLS website, if you're interested.

Also, in the Spring 2015 issue of the Ontario Professional Surveyor Magazine, an article by Bill Buck had been published entitled, "Complaints and how to avoid them." In his article one of the topics Bill discusses are the five main types of complaints he typically receives. He also provides some very interesting statistics that cross reference these types of complaints with how many were made by members of the public versus other surveyors.

So, I've used the complaints manual, used Bill's article, along with section 21 of the Surveyors Act. I've used that as the premise of my presentation, and I'm hoping it will shed some light on what our Complaints Committee does and hopefully you'll never have to meet up with us.

In Bill's article he also provides a brief history of the evolution of the Complaints Committee, and to quote a section of that article, "The Complaints Committee did not exist in its current form until the Surveyors Act of 1987, was proclaimed in 1988. Before that the committee was formed by AOLS Council under association bylaw. Council made the rules and there was no specific representation - there was no public representation on the committee. The 1987 Surveyors Act introduced mandatory procedures and mandated the inclusion of both an elected Councillor and a Lay Councillor on the committee." I'm happy to see two of our Lay Councillors here today.

In 2009 the Act was further revised to make the elected and Lay Councillor a requirement for meeting quorum. Other significant revisions in 2009 included the requirement for the committee to refer members to AOLS Council rather than

directly to the Discipline Committee. It provided the ability for the committee to refuse to consider a complaint if it was deemed to be frivolous, vexatious, or an abuse of the process.

Complaints Committee members, section 21 of the Surveyors Act defines the qualifications required to become a member of the Complaints Committee which is essentially one, the person appointed to the Complaints Committee under clause (1)(C) should have practice professional surveying in Ontario or another jurisdiction for at least five years at the time of being appointed to the committee.

Two, no person who is a member of the Discipline Committee can be a member of the Complaints Committee. So, our current committee has 10 members including 2 elected members from the AOLS Council and 2 Lay Councillors appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

The objective of the Lay Councillors is to independently represent the public interest and I can positively attest that having Lay Councillors on the committee is a great benefit to both our association and the public. They bring a unique perspective to the group and they continually remind us that our primary objective as a self-governing profession is to protect the public interest.

Committee members represent both the private and public sectors, and come from all geographic areas of the province. While the Registrar is not a member of the Complaints Committee, he does attend the monthly meetings. He prepares meeting agendas and minutes, and ensures that complaints are processed appropriately and in a timely manner.

When the Registrar is required to declare a conflict of interest for a specific complaint, the Deputy Registrar will attend in place of the Registrar.

Complaints Review Councillor - in the event that a complainant is not happy with the treatment of a complaint, they may apply to have their complaint reviewed by the Complaints Review Councillor.

The complaints will be processed - it is not an appeal decision, and the Councillor can only review and comment on the procedures used by the committee in arriving at their decision.

Under section 23 of the Surveyors Act, a Complaints Review Councillor is appointed by and from the members of Council, and the Complaints Review Councillor is not eligible to be a member of the Complaints Committee or Fees Mediation Committee.

The objective of the Complaints Committee— so there are six bullet points that are sourced from our complaints manual that define the main objective of the complaints committee, and I'll go through each in a little more detail, but here they are in bullet form.

Number one, the committee will consider and investigate in a timely manner all complaints that are presented in a form consistent with the Surveyors Act.

Two, the committee will maintain complete and accurate records of each complaint file.

Three, the committee will ensure that confidentiality is maintained of all files and associated materials used during and after its deliberations.

Four, the committee will ensure that all new committee members are provided training and sufficient materials to assist the member in serving on the committee.

Five, the committee will attempt to inform and educate members and the public of the surveyor's roles and responsibilities.

Six, the committee will strive to ensure all parties to a complaint understand the aims, objectives, and powers of the committee and the reasons for each decision.

Let's have a quick look at each objective. So, number one, again, the committee will consider and investigate in a timely manner all complaints that are presented in the form consistent with the Surveyors Act.

Section 22 of the Act states that any member of the public or a member of the association may file a complaint in writing with the Registrar. The Complaints Help Form is the preferred method of making - submitting a complaint. Let's see if I can clear it here. Here's the Complaints Help Form. So, what you're going to see on this form is we want some information about you, including all of your contact information. We want information about the surveyor who you're lodging the complaint against including their contact information. What was your relationship with the surveyor? Were you the client? Number two, what were the services you were expecting to receive. Number three, what was the quote? Was it in writing? Number four, did the scope of the project change? Number five's the big one. What's the nature of the complaint? Number six, have you discussed the complaint with the surveyor and if so, what was the result? And number seven - this is always a fun one - what do you feel is an appropriate resolution to this complaint, taking into account that complaints cannot deal with boundary issues or fees?

So, bullet two was the committee will maintain complete and accurate records of each complaint file. This should probably read, the committee, through the Registrar, will maintain complete and accurate records of each complaint file. Although the Registrar is not a member of the committee, it is the Registrar who prepares a paper file for each complaint and ensures that a copy of all documentation related to the complaint is kept in the file. He ensures that an electronic file containing a copy of all documents is maintained in a secure location on the internal computer system of the association.

He ensures that any electronic file is also posted in the secure and confidential Complaints Committee section of the AOLS website, prepares and circulates draft agendas to committee members at least one week before the date of a Complaints Committee meeting, and the Registrar also acts as a liaison between the parties to the complaint and the committee. Any documentation that comes in from parties to the complaint or that goes out from the committee is funneled through the Registrar.

Number three, the committee will ensure that confidentiality is maintained of all files and associated committee materials used during and after its deliberations. So again, any documentation received that forms the basis of a complaint is stored in both hard copy form and electronically in a secure location on the association's filing system.

Any electronic file that forms the basis of a complaint is posted in secure confidential Complaints Committee section of the AOLS website and is accessible only to members of the Complaints Committee or the Registrar.

If there's even the potential for perceived conflict of interest, the committee member must sign a conflict of interest and confidentiality statement, and that form is kept on file at the office of the association, and that member must also refrain from participating in the discussion regarding the complaint they've identified a conflict with.

Okay, bullet number four. The committee will ensure that all new committee members are provided training and sufficient materials to assist the member in serving on the committee. Our manual states that all new committee members are obligated to attend the next available Administrative Law Seminar hosted through the association. But realistically this has not occurred routinely as we would like so sometimes it's a couple of years before new members can attend this course.

But what it does however, it gives the existing members an opportunity to re-attend these seminars and to stay current with existing legislation and case law.

Occasionally, our Complaints Review Councillor will attend our face to face meetings and provide recommendations on the Committee's procedures for dealing with complaints, and new members may also benefit from the experience of existing members and from reviewing decisions made in past complaints.

Five, the committee will attempt to inform and educate members and the public on the surveyor's roles and responsibilities. And in my opinion, this is definitely the most important role of the committee. It's much like the Survey Review Department. Our intent is to provide a resolution that's educational in nature and tries not to be punitive.

But additionally, because we're often dealing with members of the public, we're also

educating the public about the roles and responsibilities of a surveyor. So the surveyors on our committee often find it a challenge to provide a response that's not too technical for the average layperson to understand. And that's why our lay members are very valuable to us in instances like that with their ability to keep our responses in perspective.

Number six, the committee will strive to ensure that all parties to a complaint understand the aims, objectives, and powers of the committee and the reasons for each decision.

It's important that all parties to the complaint get their fair say. Both the complainant and the respondent have two opportunities each to provide information related to the complaint to support their position. If the committee feels more information is required, they may request it from either party, and both parties are always privy to all information that is exchanged.

After the committee has had ample time to review and discuss the complaint submissions, they'll render either an interim or final decision. This decision will typically include a synopsis of the complaint, a summary of the material submitted, issues to be considered, the decision itself, and the reasons for arriving at that decision. And the reasons will include references to any statutes, regulations, AOLS guidelines, or bulletins, or any relevant case law that may apply.

Powers of the committee— so in contrast to the Discipline Committee, the powers of Complaints Committee are somewhat limited. For example, section 26.4 of the Surveyors Act defines the powers of the Discipline Committee. There they are. I'm not going to read these out to you, but I just wanted to give you an idea graphically of what the difference between the powers of the Discipline Committee and the powers of the Complaints Committee are.

So again, these are the powers of the Discipline Committee. These are the powers of the Complaints Committee. So the powers derive from section 22(4.3) of the Act which states upon consideration of the complaint of any response received under subsection three, and of any other investigation, record, or document relating to the complaint that has come to the attention of the Complaints Committee in the course of its investigation, the committee may (a), direct that the matter be referred in whole or in part to Council with a recommendation that Council refer the matter to the Discipline Committee, or (b), take the action it considers appropriate in the circumstances, and is not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations or the by-laws.

So, let's consider section (a) of this portion of the Act. Direct that the matter be referred in whole or in part to the Council with the recommendation that the Council refer the matter to the Discipline Committee.

As a committee of the Association, one of the most difficult things we have to

contend with is sending one of our peers to Council, especially with a recommendation of discipline. In most cases it's an absolute last resort.

Generally, this only happens when a member is a repeat offender with a pattern of prior complaints, or there's an undeniable violation of a statute or regulation which may cause professional misconduct.

A failure to comply with the code of ethics or standards of practice of professional surveying is one of the definitions of professional misconduct. That does not necessarily mean if you breach one of the items in the code of ethics that you're automatically going to Discipline.

For example, if a member of the public lodges a complaint against you alleging you charged more for a survey than what was verbally agreed on, is this a breach of the code of ethics per section 33, Regulation 1026? Well the code of ethics states, you need to be sure clients are aware of the complexity of a project and the need for fees per service. So how did this complaint come to be? Did the scope of the project change? If yes, when? Did you make the client aware of any rising costs? If yes, when? Did you put any of this in writing? And again, when?

The committee can only consider information that has been submitted in support of your complaint. If you don't have that information documented somewhere, you might be on shaky ground.

Signed agreements hold far more weight than verbal agreements, in particular when it comes to complaints. If the scope of a project changes, you need to advise your client immediately. Determine the costs associated with the claim and have your client sign off on the new agreement. Try to ensure that all documents or agreements are time stamped and dated. If you can produce any of this evidence in response to a complaint against you, it's possible you won't end up in Discipline. In fact it's probable that you wouldn't have ended up in complaints in the first place. You may be advised by the Complaints Committee to better advise these changes to your client in the future or to perhaps consider a better way of documenting your work orders.

Now that's an example of an objective of the committee to render a decision that's remedial in nature and not punitive.

Now let's consider section (b) of this portion of the Act. Take the action that it considers appropriate in the circumstances and is not inconsistent with this Act, or the regulations, or bylaws.

So, what does this mean? It's kind of a catch all, but one thing that's clear is that the committee cannot take any action that's within the jurisdiction of the Discipline Committee, as specified in section 26.4 of the Act.

In cases where the committee concludes that evidence is not sufficient toward a referral to Council, but that the members actions do warrant further action, the committee may issue an interim decision that requires some type of remedial action by the member. I'd like to show you some examples of interim decisions. So an interim decision could include the following as appropriate.

So, listening to a memorandum of understanding, or undertaking from the member, that he or she will employ certain business practices in the future, such as signed work orders, change orders, or checklists, in return for taking no further action on the complaint.

The decision should note that failure to comply with the undertaking will be considered by the committee in any future complaints of the same nature.

So, I'll show you an example of a memorandum of understanding for right of entry. Come on. There we go. So this is a memorandum of understanding associated with right of entry. Bear with me for two seconds here. Uh-oh. Sorry folks. Okay.

So, it's an example of a memorandum of understanding for right of entry. It gets reviewed and signed off by both the surveyor and each field crew member. The memorandum reiterates what most of your field crews should already be aware of and it's a commitment to the following.

So, it's commitment to be polite and cordial to the public and their property. It's acknowledging an understanding of section 6 of the Surveys Act.

A commitment that your survey vehicle displays your company's signage - disappeared - that's all right. I'll run through the bullets all the same. A commitment to try and contact property owners or a commitment to leave a message with them, a commitment to minimize damage with your survey vehicles, a commitment to minimize damage to lawns, gardens, and trees, a commitment to leave fences and gates as you found them, a commitment to leave the work area in the same condition you found it, a commitment to cause no harm to livestock or animals, a commitment to not place monuments in areas where they may cause damage, and a commitment to conduct yourself accordingly to promote a positive image of the surveying profession.

That form is signed off by both the surveyor and the field crew member. So, the Complaints Committee may also direct that the member review association policy regarding the subject of the complaint such as right of entry, monumentation requirements, or requirements for research. They may be requested to review it with appropriate staff and report to the committee that it's been done.

For example, there are two bulletins that address right of entry. I'm not having much luck clicking on these PDFs so I'm not going to do it, but the first bulletin is from 1990, 1990-35, and they're all available on the AOLS website. You can find them.

It addresses four basic points, including vehicles not being able to be identified, parking where you shouldn't, and using vulgar language with land owners, but more importantly it emphasizes that right of entry does not allow for the right of anonymity. That's the big one.

There's a second bulletin from 2005. It's a little more detailed, a two pager, but it re-emphasizes the same points as the 1990 bulletin and that again is the right of entry does not allow for the right of anonymity. Again, both bulletins, they're available on the website, and I really encourage you to revisit them and review them with your staff. The Complaints Committee may also direct that the member apologize to his or her client for poor behavior. An apology from a surveyor may also extend to someone who is not the client such as a neighboring landowner, whose property may have sustained some damages as a result of your survey. I know it's sometimes a bitter pill to swallow, but perhaps an apology should have been forthcoming long before it got to the stage of complaint.

We have found that when a complaint is legitimate, and the surveyor who is the subject of a complaint is clearly in the wrong, they aren't as reluctant to issue an apology.

The committee may provide cautions or educational advice to remind and assist the member in avoiding behavior that causes complaints. An example of this, a decision may be made to recommend the surveyor devise and use a standardized form for taking work orders or a standardized checklist for checking plans.

Another example may be the committee cautioning the member to refrain from using verbal agreements. We may recommend mediation or alternative dispute resolution to negotiated deposition of a complaint. It's not a common route for an interim decision, but on occasion we've relied on section 25.1 of the Surveyors Act, and this section of the Act allows for a mediator to be appointed to meet with the member being complained against and any other interested party to facilitate a resolution.

If a resolution's not possible, the mediator can then decide if the matter needs to be referred to Discipline. We may also suggest referral to a non-disciplinary process such as a quality assurance program. This process is useful when the Survey Review Department referral comes before the committee in the form of a complaint.

If we agree that the member would benefit from additional monitoring rather than going to Discipline we can recommend that a monitor be appointed to the surveyor and submit to a follow-up SRD review in six months to a year or whatever timeframe is appropriate.

Interim Decisions are issued when the committee feels that the complaint does not warrant a referral to Discipline. The member should however demonstrate to the committee that he or she understands the action that resulted in the complaint, and

that it had some validity, and will not be repeated.

A Final Decision is issued once a surveyor has complied with the recommendations made in the Interim Decision within the required timeframe. If the surveyor does not comply, or does not comply within the specified timeframe, then the committee may decide to refer the complaint to Council with the recommendation that it be referred to Discipline.

So why is that so important to reply to the committee within a certain timeframe? The complaints process itself can take several months, depending on the severity of the complaint, the ability to determine an outcome, the timeliness of responses from both the complainant and the respondent, and whether the decision issued is an Interim, Final, or ultimately both. So, let's also consider the Standards of Practice found in Regulation 1026 of the Surveyors Act.

Standards of Practice of the Association require that every member shall comply with any written or oral request received from the Association, the Registrar, or the presiding officer of any committee of the organization within the time specified in the request and shall supply such information and copies of such material other than material considering the member's health or financial status may be requested. Again, a failure to comply with the code of ethics or the standards of practice of professional surveying is the definition of professional misconduct.

Powers of the committee and the limitations. So, it's important to understand the Complaints Committee is exercising its screening function. They're carrying out an investigation and making a decision as to the existence of sufficient evidence to warrant a referral. Complaints meeting is not a hearing to determine what the facts were or whether punishment should be imposed.

The Complaints Committee does not make findings of fact. So, while the committee will primarily focus on what may have been submitted as the basis of a complaint, they may also consider other information relevant to the decision. This may include a pattern or period of prior complaints, insurance claims, or Survey Review Department reviews.

So, here's a couple of common complaints that demonstrate the limitations of the Complaints Committee's powers. Boundary disputes. For example, the committee cannot make a decision on a boundary dispute that comes in the form of a complaint. We can only suggest that perhaps the Boundaries Act application would be more appropriate. We might however, investigate to make sure that the surveyor who is the subject of the complaint has performed sufficient research that allows them to render an informed opinion.

Fees. Another example may be a complaint where the member of the public is upset with the cost of a survey. The committee cannot make a ruling on the fees but again we may suggest that the complainant make an application to Fees Mediation.

The second complaint is quite common, but it does beg the question, why a final invoice would be so shocking or upsetting to the complainant? If the client were made aware of the cost for the survey, or any changes to the original agreement, and had everything in writing, they probably wouldn't show up on our doorstep.

In these cases, the committee will often suggest that the surveyor review the rest of the meeting, the client contract and invoicing process, and perhaps prove to the committee and demonstrate they've tried to improve this process.

Okay, so you're now the subject of a complaint. What do you do? If you are the subject of a complaint you will be notified by a letter from the Registrar and you will receive a Surveyor's Complaint Help List. It's your responsibility to submit a written response to the claim as well as forward any copies of any documents that support your defense.

The Surveyor's Complaint Help List is found as Appendix C in the Complaints Manual of Procedures 2014. Supplying the committee with the requested information where applicable will help to expedite the complaints process. There's nine items on that list and they are as follows: a copy of the job order sheet, job log, or other document showing original instructions from your client.

A couple of tips. Written contracts again hold far more weight than verbal agreements. Agreements are far more meaningful as well if the documents are signed and dated by both the surveyor and the client.

Two, a brief synopsis of your firm's usual manner of recording new projects, including estimating forms, approval letters, et cetera. Surprisingly, many of the firms that we request this information from are not able to readily produce it and it leads us to suspect they may have never had it in the first place.

Three, any correspondence including faxes and e-mails received or sent during the project. Again, another tip - always scan and copy all correspondence and keep it in the job file. When it comes to complaints it really helps to avoid a "he said, she said" situation.

Number four, evidence that sufficient research was conducted at the Land Registry Office, and the records of other local surveyors or sources where appropriate. This is a biggie. This is probably what we ask for in the majority of our decisions. Even if another surveyor has no information, keep a copy of the correspondence that shows you at least tried. If we request it and you can't produce it, we can only suspect that you haven't done it, and it could be the basis for referring the surveyor to Council. So always keep a copy of all of your research in your job file. You're probably going to need it as part of your SRD review at some point anyway.

Copies of appropriate field notes and plans. This means your old field notes and

plans. To ensure your field notes are complete, they reflect what your final decision was in the field around what's shown on your plan, and field notes, they need to be easily accessible and retrievable when requested, and that goes for when we request it as well.

Any other documents you may feel pertinent to the case - and these may include affidavits, witness statements, photographs, police reports, diaries or journal entries, invoices, work reports. Any change of orders received during the project—and again I can't emphasize enough - very important that these are in writing. The need for a change order must be discussed with a client immediately. The document should indicate the reason for the change order and the anticipated amount. Again they're far more meaningful if they're signed and dated by both the surveyor and the client.

A chronological summary of events leading up to the complaint. This may require your journal entries, or your field crew's journal entries and diaries if they have them, any e-mail correspondence is always useful, and having dates on signed agreements or work orders, again, critical.

A report on any remedial actions or steps you may have used to resolve this issue before the formal complaint was lodged. Did you make any effort to appease the complainant? Did you make a return trip to the client's property, perhaps meet with them face to face to review a situation or go over their survey or invoice? Did you provide a final report? Did you offer a partial refund for any work not completed or to pay for any damage your field crew may have caused? Did you offer an apology? Did you keep a record of your efforts to try and resolve the situation?

So, I've gotten an example of a surveyor's complaint help list. Again, unfortunately I'm too scared to open it, but we've gone through all the bullets on the complaints list. The only thing I wanted to mention was at the very bottom is there's a statement that says please be aware that a complainant does not have to have a contractual relationship with you or your firm in order to submit a complaint. You should therefore be prepared to report on any contact outside of the contractual relationship that you have had with the complainant.

Complaints statistics - so the Registrar maintains an up-to-date summary of all complaints including the names of the parties and the topic of the complaint. The Complaints Committee reviews this summary at least once per year to determine whether any complaints are similar in nature or whether a particular member has received an unusual number of complaints.

This may indicate that the membership in general should be advised to be aware of particular behaviors that may lead to complaints. So, I've taken some of this data and constructed a couple of graphs here, and it contains data from over 300 official complaints that were lodged between 2000 and 2017.

Chart one here, happy faces and sad faces, shows a number of complaints that were made each year between 2000 and 2017, and whether the complaints were made by the public or other surveyors. Since the year 2000, like I said there have been just over 300 complaints, resulting in an average of about 17 complaints per year.

Total complaints have ranged in frequency from a low of 8 in 2003 there, happy face, to a high of 30 in 2014. Complaints from other surveyors have ranged from a low of 0 in 2005 to a high of 7 in 2012, and complaints from the public have ranged from a low of 4 again in 2003 to a high of 27 in 2014.

But one thing that's really important to note here is, the number of official complaints that the committee actually sees does not even begin to reflect the number of inquiries that AOLS staff and particularly the Registrar receive concerning the behavior of our members. Most of these complaints are resolved without an official complaint being lodged.

Chart two here illustrates in graph form the numbers that were tabulated in the first chart. So, the green bars indicate the number of complaints lodged by the public. The black bars indicate the number of complaints lodged by other surveyors. Both the horizontal lines showing the average of 17 complaints per year - also note the vertical line that shows when mandatory continuing professional development began on January 1st, 2013. Notice here there was a slight spike right after CPD was introduced, followed by a pretty significant drop. It might even lead one to believe that CPD was indeed correlated with the decline in complaints, but then came 2017 and they shot back up again. So, there's just not enough data to make conclusion. I'd like to look at this again in maybe another five years and see if there is a correlation.

Chart three illustrates what stage a complaint might fall under. So, you see there's a final, interim, referred, withdrawn, and still active. So just to clarify, final indicates the complaint was essentially dismissed with no further action required by the member. You can see they make up 53 percent of the total decisions issued by the committee.

Interim means that the member was not referred to Discipline or Council, but the Committee did issue what was termed an Interim Decision that required some remedial action by the surveyor. Interim Decisions as well make up 36 percent of all decisions issued by the committee.

Referred means there was enough compelling information submitted to the committee that could be considered a violation of the standards of practice or code of ethics and hence constitutes professional misconduct and could warrant a referral to Council, perhaps with a recommendation that the complaint be referred to Discipline. Referrals to Council only make up nine percent of the total decisions issued by the committee.

Withdrawn simply means a complainant no longer wishes to pursue the complaint. Maybe perhaps a surveyor took some remedial action to resolve the issue during the course of a complaint before a decision was issued.

The committee may still want to review the complaint on its own merits to determine if there were any instances of misconduct that led up to the complaint being filed in the first place, so withdrawal doesn't necessarily mean you're off the hook. Withdrawals only make up one percent of all complaints.

Still active means we may still be working on it. There are a couple of outstanding complaints still from 2017 that are reflected in the data.

Sometimes due to health reasons of the complainant, or the surveyor, or ongoing legal proceedings outside of AOLS functions, the committee may choose to suspend the file until both parties are prepared to resume the complaint. So while the data shows that one percent of complaints are still active, the actual number of files open is actually much less than that. We recently completed and closed another four files even after this data was compiled.

Chart four illustrates the average disposition of complaints by the type of complaint filed. So, it's interesting because it gives an indication of the seriousness of each type of complaint.

For example, incorrect survey complaints - not many of the incorrect survey complaints get forwarded on for referral, and it may suggest that the alleged incorrect survey was actually a lack of communication or misunderstanding that was resolved through the complaints process. However, contractual and SRD referral complaints do show a high rate of being referred to Council.

In the case of an SRD referral, this data may suggest that the surveyor was not able to demonstrate a noticeable improvement in their survey practices as recommended by the SRD. In the case of contractual complaints, the data may suggest that there was a violation of the terms of a contract between a surveyor and the client. So, when it comes to contractual complaints, it's typically repeat offenders who receive referrals to Council.

Ironically, contractual complaints also appear to have the highest rate of withdrawals. This could be due to the surveyor reducing their fee-for-service if it's a fees dispute or perhaps come to some other agreement prior to the decision being made by the committee. Under right of entry complaints you'll notice there are far more Interim Decisions issued than anything.

This could be attributed to the committee requesting that the surveyor and their staff review section 6 of the Surveys Act along with right of entry bulletins or perhaps completing the memorandum of understanding regarding right of entry. The

committee will often ask for proof this has been done before issuing a Final Decision. So, this leads us up to types of complaints.

Chart five indicates the major categories of complaints, and as you can see the majority of complaints relate to accusations that a survey is incorrect or there has been some sort of misconduct on the part of the surveyor. Let's quickly have a look at each of these categories.

Incorrect survey. Hopefully not too many of you have been put in a situation like this. Around 40 percent of complaints are related to the perception that the member has provided an incorrect survey.

Some additional analysis of this data reveals that although 62 percent of these were dismissed, 38 percent did require further action on the part of the member and 2 were actually referred to Discipline. In many cases the committee needed to request additional information from the surveyor to determine if sufficient research had been performed.

Most of the cases for which additional action was required can be related to the requirements of Regulation 216/10, mainly a review of the project before it starts, and a report after it's completed. For the majority of these complaints, it's not a question of the survey being wrong but rather a misunderstanding as to what was to be provided or a failure to review the project with the client once it was completed.

Professional misconduct. Regulation 1026 defines what professional misconduct is. Listed under this regulation are 21 items. Some are very specific while some are more general in nature.

Professional misconduct comprises 28 percent of the total complaints between 2000 and 2017. Complaints of misconduct submitted by other surveyors do usually fall into one of the statutory definitions. Almost all of the complaints in the category of professional misconduct that were referred to Discipline or Council were made by other members.

Public complaints alleging misconduct however don't often fall into any of the statutory definitions in the regulation and are often related to the poor behavior of the surveyor. Public complaints have included allegations of rudeness, or failure to respond to requests that the complainant feels was unprofessional in nature.

The quoted section from Bill Buck's article on complaints and how to avoid them, "Most people see surveying as an exact science and believe that our sophisticated measuring devices provide us with the exact location of their boundaries. The idea of assessing evidence and arriving only at an opinion of the location of their property is not included in their concept of what a cadastral surveyor does.

So, when your survey plan tells them that they don't have a 50x120 foot lot that

their deed shows, and they've been paying taxes on it, they're often puzzled and sometimes rude, and indignant. Spend a few minutes to explain your survey. It may save you from getting a complaint or save me from having to explain it to your client for you."

We know there's a lot of information out there available to the public that often causes grief for us as surveyors. Teraview PIN mapping and MPAC assessment maps - great tools for surveyors, lawyers, and real estate agents, but in the hands of the average layman they're often misconstrued as a definitive graphical illustration of their property limits. So you need to take the time to explain to your client what these maps actually represent, and why a survey is important to properly define their boundaries.

Contractual complaints— misunderstandings about the scope and cost of a project have become one of the major causes of complaints. Contractual complaints comprise 19 percent of all complaints and may include such things as perceived over-billing, or the client not receiving such services they thought they paid for.

Verbal agreements in place of a proper written contract is the number one issue in this category of complaints. Regulation 216/10 under the Surveyors Act implies that the project should include the signing of a written contract or work order that clearly specifies the expectations of both parties.

There really is no excuse to not have a written agreement with your client. Remember that the client has likely received quotes from other surveyors and may have their written estimate in hand when they receive your invoice.

Memories can become pretty sketchy when it comes time to pay that invoice. In addition, you'd have a difficult time defending yourself at fees mediation with only a verbal contract.

Right of entry— I've already touched on the right of entry earlier in the presentation, but I'd like to speak to it a little bit more. Section 6.1 of the Surveys Act defines the surveyor's right to enter lands and buildings. That section states that a surveyor or a person in the surveyor's employ, while making a survey may, (a), at any time enter and pass over the land of any person, or (b), at anytime suitable to the occupant of a building, enter the building, and do any act thereon or therein for any purpose of the survey, but the surveyor is liable for any damage occasioned thereby. Again, it's important to emphasize that, with this right comes responsibility and does not include the right of anonymity. You must make a reasonable effort to identify yourself to whoever's land you're accessing.

Right of entry complaints comprise 10 percent of the overall complaints between 2000 and 2017. Public complaints about surveyors or their employees trespassing on private lands has made a resurgence over the last few years, and remain one of the more common complaints, with as many of five such complaints in 2014. So,

it's imperative that you and your employees are aware of the surveyor's rights and responsibilities under section 6.1 of the Act.

Again, AOLS bulletins, 1990 and 2005, give good summaries to this topic and reinforce the training of staff to make reasonable attempts to contact land owners or residents, is essential. If the property owner is not home leave a business card or a door hanger. Door hangers are available from the Association and they indicate you've been at their property.

I think I saw some on the table outside the main board room. Field staff should carry company identification including business cards of the managing OLS. Have your business logo on your hat or your jacket, definitely on your vehicle, and who knows, it may even lead to some additional business.

Survey Review Department referrals. SRD referrals reach the Complaints Committee through the Registrar. It's actually the Registrar who files the complaint with the committee on behalf of the SRD. SRD referrals seem to be a relatively new trend, and I'll demonstrate here shortly. SRD referrals are not so common, and they only make up 3 percent of the complaints between 2000 and 2017. Now this chart's a little busy but the whole point of it is I wanted to show if there was any noticeable trends, and the one noticeable trend I really want to point to are the SRD referrals.

You can see there were no referrals between - referrals are in the black here - there were no referrals between 2000 and 2012, not one, then all of a sudden we have eight of them between 2012 and 2017 with three of them coming at 2017. So just to back it up a bit, when the SRD completes a comprehensive review of a surveyor's practice, a comprehensive review report is completed, and that surveyor is assessed a grade. That grade exceeds a certain threshold, and I believe that's 25 points per project, the SRD must refer the comprehensive review report and their recommendations to the Registrar for review.

As part of their educational mandate the SRD will often recommend that the surveyor is subjected to a follow-up review, to give them an opportunity to address the SRD's comments and hopefully improve in the areas they were lacking. If after the follow-up review there are still major deficiencies, particularly in the areas already identified in the original SRD review, the SRD manager may submit another report to the Registrar for their review again. In most cases at this point the Registrar will submit an official report to the committee. The committee can deal with it in a couple of different ways.

UNKNOWN MALE: Do you know why [unintelligible] referrals that there have been recently?

DAVE KOVACS: No, honestly, I have no idea why that is. It's just an anomaly. The committee may choose to refer the complaint to Council with the recommendation that it be referred to Discipline, and again this is done as a last

resort, done when there are noticeable examples of incompetence, or a complete disregard to the Standards of Practice or Code of Ethics, something that would constitute professional misconduct, and may be perceived as a serious risk to the public.

The committee can request specific documentation from the surveyor that is consistent with the recommendations made by the SRD. For example, if the SRD recommended that the surveyor devised a better system for recording their title searches or research of another surveyor's records, we may request proof of this improved tracking system with some real-world examples. If the surveyor cannot produce the requested information or if what they do submit is not an improvement over what they've been using in the past, it's possible they got referred to Council.

The committee may recommend that a monitor be appointed for a specified timeframe. Of course, any fees associated with having a monitor appointed are borne by the surveyor. The committee may also request that another follow-up SRD review be performed, again within a specified timeframe, but when it allows the surveyor ample opportunity to implement the recommendations of the SRD. This would also be completed at the surveyor's own cost, but in effect this is giving the surveyor three strikes to get it right. They had their initial review, a follow-up review, then another follow-up review. Again, the goal here is to educate and not discipline.

So, in conclusion, the data compiled between 2000 and 2017 suggest that around 75 percent of our membership have never had a complaint against them, so I think we're actually doing pretty good. By the way I'm not in that 75 percentile, but there's always room for improvement.

So, a couple points of advice I'd like to leave you with so hopefully you'll never have to deal with us. Heed the recommendations made by the Survey Review Department in a comprehensive review. This review is done for your benefit and aligns mainly with the regulations under the Surveys Act and the Surveyors Act.

We're very fortunate to have a peer review process, so try to work with the system, not against it. Make sure your client is fully aware of the services being provided and the costs associated with those services. Provide your quotations in writing and have you and your client sign and date every agreement or change in scope. Take the time to meet with your client before and after you've provided your services.

Have a reliable system in place for taking work orders, forms for doing research, and a standardized checklist for checking plans. Take a good look at Regulation 216/10 under the Surveyors Act, particularly for what defines projects, reports, and records.

The big one, make sure you and your staff are aware of your rights and responsibilities when it comes to right of entry. Review the bulletins in section 6.1

of the Surveys Act, and one of the biggest ones I'm going to leave you with here under the Code of Ethics, section 33(2)(a), the Code of Ethics of the association requires that every member shall conduct his or her professional and private affairs in such a manner as to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession. Serving the public interest is a principle object of our association. You need to embrace that philosophy in your professional practice.

We're a self-governing association and we must hold ourselves to a higher standard of care in the level of trust. Without the public's trust, we have no credibility as professionals.

With so much information now available at the click of a button, whether it's right or wrong, we're constantly being scrutinized and challenged by the clients that we serve.

Just to leave you with, we need to be extra diligent, take greater pride in our profession, more now than ever, and hopefully reclaim some of that respect and prestige that I feel has been lost over time. So, I'd like to thank you, and I am willing to take any questions you might have. Yeah, Roger?

ROGER: The Complaints Form, the complainant fills that out?

DAVE KOVACS: That's correct.

ROGER: I'm sure you don't want to lodge a complaint unless it's correctly filled out, but as you, [unintelligible], some of the complaints coming in must be very vague.

DAVE KOVACS: They are, and in those cases, we can actually request that the complainant clarify them. If there's certain areas that we have no idea what the complaint is or what their expected outcome is, we can send it back to the complainant and ask for some clarification.

ROGER: Is there communication around that time too that maybe it's not even [unintelligible], go back to the complainant and say, "Hey, this is the deal."

DAVE KOVACS: We try to treat every complaint like a valid complaint. We have to take it on its own merits. We can't just dismiss it unless it's obvious that it's frivolous or vexatious. Even in those cases we kind of have to look, well, is there some merit to this? Is there something the surveyor really did that pissed this person off?

ROGER: Because let's face it, the public doesn't really know anything about surveying.

DAVE KOVACS: Nope, and that's our job too, is to help educate them. They may think because the surveyor hasn't called them back within five minutes of them

calling the surveyor and leaving a message, that that's professional misconduct. Well, we have to explain that to that complainant that it's a company, it's a business, and you can't always get back right away.

ROGER: One other thing, the complaints, you have the charts up for complaints. I assumed most of the complaints are [unintelligible]. Is that a fair statement?

DAVE KOVACS: Yeah, I would say that's a fair statement. I'm from Thunder Bay and we haven't seen a lot of complaints come through for the Northwestern area, so yeah, it's probably just because of the population density more than anything else. That would stand to reason. Anybody else? Again, I thank you very much for taking the time to come and join us here.

CONCURRENT SESSION: PROVINCE -WIDE SURVEY RECORDS INDEX

BRIAN MALONEY: Good afternoon folks. I think we'll get started. It's just barely after 3:00. We were supposed to start at 3:00, so I think we'll get going. Hopefully, you can hear me without me getting this microphone too close to me here. The purpose of this session today is meant to be an interactive session, so you're going to listen to me a little bit but I'm hoping to listen to you.

Mike's going to be taking some notes and helping me along with some of the technology here so that we move our way through this. I doubt you're going to be here 'til 4:30. You'll have time for an extra drink before the dinner dance tonight, so we'll get her going here.

So, we are going to demonstrate the existing property line application. It's been very slightly customized, but not much. So, what you're seeing is certainly not the exact functionality you're going to get in the Provincial Survey Records Index, but it's going to give a good flavour of the kinds of things you can do.

We're going to be looking for some feedback in terms of the functionality, in terms of the data included, and in terms of some of the filtering or other links we want to build into this. So, we've got lots of opportunity to customize this, so this is really a starting point. This is the platform that MPAC uses and they have a number of different suites under this property line umbrella. So, this is a fairly generic one that's been stripped down with a lot less functionality than what MPAC has, but I think it will give you a flavour of what's there. As I mentioned, clearly, we will be able to customize this, and intend to customize, and have to customize it. The trick for us is how much we customize it, because the more customization we do -- although MPAC will be paying for the build in the first case, as I mentioned yesterday, we will be responsible for the maintenance of the additional functionality we have built on top.

So, the more of the core technology that we use, the less the cost of the Association

in the longer term. I don't want to limit what we want in terms of functionality but if you want to take a total left turn and go to a different system, that's going to be a different game then obviously. So, we're going to try to work within this context as we move forward.

I'm going to go back to these. I'll look through this really quickly. This is meant to be a refresher, so I wouldn't dwell on it, maybe a little less when we get into the actual application and have a look at that. It really is intended to be an index only, and I mentioned that yesterday, and I want to reiterate that because I've had concerns with people going, "You're not getting my records." Well I don't want your records. I don't want your actual plans of survey. I want an index. And when I say I want to, I'm doing this on behalf of Council. This is not a Brian Maloney initiative. This is me working on behalf of Council to try to get this thing in place.

We are looking at tabular searches and we can show you some of that as we move forward, but this is primarily a spatially-driven application, and it does index and relate to the parcel mapping that is in behind the system as well. So that comes with the good and the bad as I mentioned yesterday. We do have multiple layers and we'll show you those layers as we go through here today, and we do have the opportunity to add additional layers if we so choose. So that's something I want to get some feedback on. If you have ideas around what we should add to this that would help you in terms of research or usability, then clearly that's something we can do as long as we can source that data. In terms of searching I think I've touched on that already so I won't touch again. It does maintain a search history, and I'll show you a little bit when we get into the actual application. It can also generate reports for you, so if you want to actually create a paper report of some type for your records when you've done your search, you can certainly do that. If you want to create some type of report to send out to your field group, you can do that. There's some flexibility in that. We can talk about what the requirements are around that.

I didn't have a separate slide for that but that's something we can do as well. We certainly anticipate working with existing providers, and certainly Pat, and maybe Saša or Andy are going to be contributors and we're going to work with them, and this is really in order to facilitate those surveyors who are already loaded with those records and those repositories.

Our anticipation is we don't want to compete with those, so we're going to have an index with pointers back to those applications, so they can actually fulfill the records, and if there's a charge or whatever the relationship is there, you'll have to have that relationship with that provider in order to deal with that, but we'll try to facilitate that interaction as we move forward.

We have a number of administrative tools. I didn't go into detail in this presentation around those. There are some that are specific to the firm, so if you want as a firm to see what searches have been done or what data has been loaded; you'll be able to

do that. So, you've got that ability as well you will actually as a firm be able to manage your own permission. So, if you have a new employee you want to be able to enter records or do searches, you can manage that. It's not something you're going to have to go to the Association to have managed. We're going to set it up, so you manage that yourself. Because clearly if you have an employee leave, you want to be able to deal with that correctly and stop them. We don't want to have a whole bunch of delay in dealing with that kind of thing.

We also have some other administrative tools that are going to be put in place for the Association. So we're anticipating being able to do a search of who's actually input records or not input records in the last month, so it gives us some chance to understand who's interacting with the system, who's done searches or who has not done searches, and I don't think this is meant to be the big stick, and we're going to have to talk to the Association about who actually has access to those reports as we move forward. But at the end of the day we want to make sure we're enforcing, if we move forward with the regulation.

So, we will be building those kinds of things in place. I don't think there's much I have to talk to on here. It is hosted on the Cloud service, and a Canadian one, which is good. The year reporting, I don't have any ability to demonstrate that I think today, but the intention is if you find an error as you're going through and doing a search, and you click on a plan, and you come up and that record isn't properly positioned, you'll be able to go, "Wait a second. This needs to be fixed." There will be a message sent back to the owner of that record, so they can have a look at it and go, wait a minute, yeah, need to fix it, or say no, you're crazy, and we'll be tracking that so we can actually improve the records as we go.

Because we know with the amount of data we're going to put in here, we're going to have problems, and I know Saša can attest to the challenges, especially when you're georeferencing data, that you run into in terms of that. So, we know it's going to take some time to straighten that stuff out, and get it going.

We're planning on an automated batch loading and a set of exception handling processes that will allow you to go in. So, whatever doesn't succeed -- we'll talk more about that as we get into it.

I think we'll jump in and actually pull up the application here and try to walk through this. Hopefully, I won't screw this up too badly because I'm certainly not one of the guys who demos this stuff. So, this happens to be -- this is the existing property line piece that we've got. This happens to be a property just around the corner here. Mike and I were playing with it right before you came in here, and it allows you to move around -- we've got four windows open, at this point in time, so certainly you've got all the normal functionality you expect in terms of zoom, and pan, and all of that good stuff for a particular property.

You can turn layers on and off, so if we wanted to turn the parcel data on and off we could certainly do it. There's actually a couple of different -- we'll get into the

layers that are included here. We're actually looking at the moment at Google imagery in this particular case, and I saw you had done a search in here. That's why all these little things are showing up here. So, this is Google, but we also have the First Base Solutions imagery in here, so if we wanted to turn that on we could move this over back to a map view and turn that particular layer on, and now you're actually getting the First Base Solutions. You've got as you would expect with most of these things, you can fade it, so you can either brighten it up, or darken it down, or whatever you want to do with it when you're looking at it, so now you can zoom in, so now you're seeing the parcel layer.

In this particular case, we've got the assessment role turned on, so if we wanted to get information on a particular property -- now what will happen when we move forward with this as a plan index, this will actually become plans that you're seeing as opposed to -- in this case we've just got property information because we're using the existing MPAC data. If this was a plan you could click on it and it would open a window with some information around that. In this particular case it's telling you a little bit of information. As I said we have a subset of data loaded here from MPAC. So, it's a residential property, single family dwelling, then it's got a short description associated with it.

So, we'll still have access to this data, or we're expecting we will, as part of it, but additionally obviously we'll be starting to put the plan information in so you that you'll actually see the location of any surveys that were done that were loaded into the system. We also have access to the streetscape level, and depending on where you're at -- yeah, I want to see you interact.

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible] The assisted legal searches is a truncated legal search. It's not the full legal description that a lawyer might have. It's more like plane based as opposed to [unintelligible]. So, it's essentially what's on your property tax [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: I think from a find yourself location, it likely does the job. Clearly, this is not meant to be the de facto tool in terms of doing your title searching. It doesn't do that, clearly. In terms of the streetscape stuff, if there were multiple versions, then they actually show up here.

So, the streetscape is the iLOOKABOUT imagery. The street view is the Google imagery that would be there for it, and all the normal functionality you would have with a Google or iLOOKABOUT solution in terms of looking at that. So again, I think that's useful for surveyors in terms of a quick, somebody calling up for a quote. You can at least have a look at it, and see what's there, and get a sense around it.

MIKE POWER: Regarding the streetscape imagery, 25 percent of the province is captured annually, so those updates occur in terms of the problems we've had. Again once it's done it's there, and Brian touched on First Base Solutions multi-

image orthophoto imagery, so when you're in an area, no matter what imagery is available to you, that has been captured on an annual basis. Once the [unintelligible] is made available to us to recalculate in the platform. So is that something on a regular basis -- the [unintelligible] will be part of the application as well.

BRIAN MALONEY: As an example, I just pulled it up and I don't know if you can see it there, but you actually have got three vintages of orthophotography available in this particular area.

MIKE POWER: Clearly causing problems.

BRIAN MALONEY: Clearly, so again that's something that may be useful to you as a surveyor if you want to step back in time to see what was there 5, 10 years ago. You may have access to that. It really depends on what's available. Clearly, depending where you're at in the province you have different availability. If you go into Northern Ontario you'll have pretty limited access to that, so it really depends where you're at. If you're in the GTA, a lot more data obviously as you move forward. So one of the things that in this case -- demonstrate a search you think Mike?

MIKE POWER: Yeah, sure. Just to give you a sense for it-- you probably can't see it in the back but there's a variety of single search capabilities across the top. So if I do a single search, I can look for a property assessment roll number, address, my PIN, my legal description. If there's an instrument there that I happen to have I can search by instrument, and I can search by legal description as I mentioned earlier. But of course, I can also search spatially, so the map has a panning capability. I can zoom anywhere in the province and click on a parcel and utilize that as my base point.

Google also delivers as part of the application the ability to look for a common place in the search. So, I can do a plus sign, enter in "Sheraton Falls", or I can enter an actual x, y coordinate for that location, so that's where you connect your search. But as Brian is entering in the address at the top, it will then find you the location. You don't have to enter in the full address. It can be a partial address, partial assessment roll number, partial legal description, and it will provide you all the options that exist with that address or [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: This happens to be my property.

MIKE POWER: It looks like it's under assessed by [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: Let's not talk about that, Mike.

MIKE POWER: So in this situation first Brian selected a property. If he wants now to look for -- imagine if you will -- plans around it, he can go in and do a spatial search by hitting the spatial button, select a boundary.

In this situation by the way since we're using MPAC data, it defaults to the property code which is the residential data code. So, what we're going to do is find all the other single family residential properties around Brian. Ultimately, you'll be able to go in and look at plans on this. So, you may if you provide the metadata filter your plans by their plan type, or if you're interested in looking forward, plan forward by a year. You can see everything after 1970, or everything before 1970. So, you can go and look for that metadata as the system is populated by years, so you can minimize the records that come back to you that you otherwise don't have an interest in. So, in case Brian's case does a [unintelligible] on his property, he's going to go and do the search. Once he hits the search button on the left-hand side, just over here--

BRIAN MALONEY: Oh yeah search, here we go.

MIKE POWER: He's done a little bit of a search, has a little bit of properties. So now the results screen down here Brian, if you just enlarge it -- so it's brought up all the properties that happen to be within the search. Imagine if you will that those happen to be plans that exist around his property. So you don't have to list them. You can select or deselect them. Once you enter your metadata you're also going to identify whether you are fulfilling the request or whether the request is being fulfilled by one of the existing repositories, Saša's [unintelligible] LSR, so if I took all these plans, and some of them hold these records, and some of them were already sitting in a repository, yours or elsewhere, you then send that request to whatever repository the data existed at that fulfilled it.

Ideally, what you'd also do with the metadata is identify what the cost of that record is for whoever's requesting it. So, when you're doing your research you know how much it's going to cost you to go acquire all of those plans. It sends it to the request office -- Brian indicated if you send the request to these two areas on this date, so if you have an issue where I sent this a couple weeks ago, not getting a response back, and this is a repeated offense by the surveyor you're requesting it if you want to pass it onto the Association to deal with, and they'll have that ability. The Association will also get those records, so they will identify after a fixed period of time who hasn't fulfilled the request and have a copy of the fact that you have made the request for the records.

So, then you can go in and select and deselect, and those should be fulfilled for you, if you're using another repository, or you fulfill them yourself, if that's the way you'd prefer to operate. So, Brian can select and deselect. He can also have the ability to export it in Excel. So, if you wanted to keep a copy of it for your old records, hey, I know on this day one of my guys sent out a request for these records, for these surveyors, and you are going to put this into my project file and wait for it to be fulfilled. I'm sorry, back to your question?

UNKNOWN MALE: I'm curious to know, does it show the properties or the plans

that you're searching for in relation to the property that you're searching for?

MIKE POWER: As long as the property is indicated, the [unintelligible].

UNKNOWN MALE: You can zoom in and see where they apply in respect to the records?

MIKE POWER: No, they're not georecords. They're geocoded. So, all that tells me is that the plan is done. Maybe it can be a subdivision plan, a boundary plan, whatever it is that you and your colleagues effectively have put into the system. So, remember all I'm doing is providing this kind of blank canvas and it's no good at all if you don't otherwise put your records in and that's all that's going to be returned. And when I say records, I'm talking about the index, the metadata, not the actual record. You still have to facilitate the fulfillment of that

UNKNOWN MALE: And are they going to charge you for records?

MIKE POWER: There's certainly an opportunity to talk about that for sure. One of the things some organizations have said is I've got all these records here, is there some way for this to be in my own office as well, so I've got all of my records. Maybe some are customer files that I don't actually want to put in the provincial index, so I'm using this for my office as well, so we can chat about that.

BRIAN MALONEY: One of our challenges though is we're trying to keep the cost and effort associated with the historical loading to a reasonable level, so there's a balancing act. We can look at a go forward basis perhaps as a new survey comes in, you can actually put the extent of the survey in, or whatever as you go forward, but historically that would be a very costly and heavy-duty exercise. So, we're not expecting to try to go back and deal with that historically. It's just too costly for us.

MIKE POWER: One of the things Brian mentioned is there is an algorithm that's been developed that will facilitate the bulk-loading of files. So you would take your file, repository off of your C: Drive or however you describe them: Excel format, load them in. There's a portioning mechanism that will identify geographic features that may be in your file or the legal description, lot plan concession, address, some other identifier. Those ones that can be geocoded get geocoded. So that record is in the survey record index, and it's there for use [unintelligible], but ones that can't be geocoded for whatever reason, not enough information, confused data, whatever, they fall into an exception handling queue, which is your exceptional handling queue. So, every survey firm has its own instance labeled with its own name.

So, these are the ones that I, or my administrative staff, or my field crew, when not in the field will have to go through and help me identify where they belong in the index. One by one, I'll go through and look up, perhaps open the plan up, and ok I know where this is, and they identify the PIN address and the legal description so they can tie it in, or for that matter, they can go and simply open up the map and

say, I know where this goes, double-click on the parcel, its tied to the parcel, goes into the exceptions queue and that goes into the index. If you've got old plans that you're trying to index, and the parcel imagery doesn't now correlate to your plan, you'll have the ability to create a polygonal or linear feature. So, if it's a road segment, you go and say, I have a road plan that's goes from here to here, create two points, and now anyone that does a polygon search in that area around that linear feature will bring in your plan as part.

If it was an old plan and it covers this entire area and then some, you can zoom out and create a polygon, identify it as your plans, and again anybody who goes in to look for it spatially, as long as they intersect the polygon you created, then that meta data will come back on the results page. So, what we're trying to do is default to giving you more data rather than less. Irrespective of perhaps how broad the area is, some of the locations, the idea is to give you the opportunity to delete the plan from the list as opposed to saying, gee, how did I miss this one? Yes?

UNKNOWN MALE: I have a lot of old plans with no municipal address, no lat and long, and it's going to be very tedious to put those into any kind of system. Can we get some brainstorming, or perhaps if I could indicate what the cutoff is for putting records in? I am going back to 1960. It would be very difficult to input. No one has begged me for that, and no one has asked me for the information.

BRIAN MALONEY: I appreciate that. That's a concern I've heard raised now a couple times in the meeting, and I think that's something we want to go back to the task force with to think about how we handle that, and I think even Ottawa only goes back to 1960. So, we're going to have to talk more about how we deal with those historical records, and it may vary from area to area in the province. In the ideal world you'd like everything. But I have heard now from a number of people saying we don't use some of these records very often.

So, maybe there's some way that we handle those as a separate overall bulk-record, and throwing an idea here. I don't have this completely thought out yet, that says anything pre-1940, or 1930, whatever the number is, in this area, there's a record that says Gifford Harris has got a record, or something like that. So that means unfortunately that doesn't fulfill what we wanted which was the one search, one location, but maybe that's a practical approach to getting as far down the road that there's still significant value in this. We can't be missing a lot of records, certainly modern records. Anything you want to use we want to make sure is in here, but we've got to be practical about this. I don't have a complete answer.

UNKNOWN MALE: The only thing, to answer your question, is the objective here is also to create an alias table, so if any of the means by which we have the index records that don't match what the original records were, too old, then you can create an alias table or perhaps the system can generate an alias table that still has an old record that can use any of these other matching algorithm approaches to index, but it's got a record. This is what's on the record, and you know you've got it.

BRIAN MALONEY: The other thing we can do is go up a level, so if you happen to know the lot and the concession as an example, you're in, but you don't have it drilled down any finer than that, you can actually enter it at that level. So if I do any search in that lot and concession, it's going to bring that record back, and we'll at least know there's something there. Somebody's still going to have to look at the metadata and decide whether they want to use it, request it, or not. That's the challenge we run into. You may end up getting requests because there's a generic record in there with not much information, but that is what it is. At least you've got a choice to go in and look for that.

UNKNOWN MALE: But doesn't that also involve people looking at field notes going back through all of your records and seeing if there's at least some kind of metadata. It's still not avoiding the cost to this guy or anybody else, it has to go all the way back to records, for something that may or may never be accessed.

BRIAN MALONEY: I think maybe that's another solution, that we only go back so far, and on a request basis, if there's a request for the plan, then it gets added to the system at that point in time. It may be another approach. We haven't really -- I didn't realize what a problem this was going to be and I'm seeming to get a lot of kickback on that so I think we need to talk about if it's useful.

UNKNOWN MALE: Like I said, the records of so and so, from 1920,
[unintelligible]

BRIAN MALONEY: Adam?

ADAM: I'm coming at this from a different perspective here, in thinking about all of this. Is this a done deal here or is this kind of a sell-job you guys are doing now? I'm just not sure where you're coming from.

BRIAN MALONEY: I'll try to lay it out as clearly as I can. Council is quite interested in moving forward with a Provincial Survey Records Index. I've got my direction to try to put something in place to meet that need.

MPAC has made the offer. It seems like a great offering, because I'll tell you, to build something like this, we went out with an RFI in 2016 and we were into a lot of money to build something like this. So, this seems to me like a great offering. It seems to be a solution that can work for us.

We certainly have an issue in South Central in terms of records that exist there. So, I'm really working on behalf of the Council in terms of trying to implement this. In terms of a done deal obviously it's not, but our expectation is that if we can land something with MPAC in the next 60 days, which I expect we will, we will move forward with this, and we'll move forward with a regulation actually mandating it.

So, from that perspective, in a sense, I think it's close to a done deal. I can tell you there's obviously still got to be a vote on a regulation to make it mandatory. We've done two Survey Monkeys and I can tell you the result of those. So, the first Survey Monkey we had in excess of 80 percent of our membership, said this is a great idea, make it mandatory, get going.

The second one we did we went out with price tags if you recall, trying to get a sense of what people are willing to pay for this, and when people saw the prices, they went hmm, eek, and we went back down to 65 percent, or thereabout in favour. We still had, in excess of a half. Given that this is going to keep the price at a quite reasonable level, my expectation is, when we put the regulation on it, to be quite honest with you, I think it will pass.

ADAM: Okay, and that's the specific part of my point. My issue is that I don't think, there's no way in the world, that any regulation that Council wishes to pass will force me to input and expose my company records onto the Internet. I for one don't. For all the wonderful things the Internet may be, I don't trust the Internet for having any of my personal or company records on the Internet, period, end of story. If I have this program, and I'm willing to buy it in a company that I control, and I put the records into it, and if somebody phones me up and I can research the records, that's one thing, but to have all of our company records, imposed on me, to put on the Internet, there's absolutely no way that's going to happen.

BRIAN MALONEY: So, I guess a couple of comments and then I'll let you--

ADAM: It's a Facebook in a different direction.

BRIAN MALONEY: So, this is a little different from Facebook. First of all -- let me finish. I gave you a chance to speak, now I'm going to take a turn.

So, this is meant to only be provided to surveyors. This is the first difference. This isn't available to the world. This isn't available to the public. This is available to other surveyors to facilitate research.

Secondly, from a security perspective, there's pretty rock-solid security behind this. We're talking about millions of dollars-worth of data, worth way more than your company being exposed on here, that's got intellectual property associated of significant value, and it's not going AWOL. So, there is good security on this system.

If you choose not to do that, I guess you'll have to choose what you want to do in terms of a business. But I'm not going to go there. I'm not going to spend the rest of this meeting discussing whether or not we're doing this. This is about the functionality here that I want to talk about. We can talk about whether we do this. You can go talk to Council. You can talk to them. That's not my business. I'm just acting on their behalf trying to figure out what's going on here. Sorry.

JAIME: I have a quick question about property line. So, was property line developed for this issue or was it already setup ahead of time [unintelligible]?

MIKE: It exists as an MPAC solution, both for their 1,500 employees, their 10,000 commercial subscribers, it's also for a base for delivery of assessment data that serves about 50,000 people, and the reason that this overture was made, was the fact that this is a pre-existing platform that can be customized pretty inexpensively.

Most importantly it's not built just for surveyors. If this goes down for whatever reason, if there's a problem, there's going to be a much broader audience that's going to be on MPAC's case than ours—than the 220 survey firms in Ontario.

JAIME: The other question is to the functionality. I apologize if I'm missing something. So right now, in our office, we have a Project Management System with Pimarc, and the records and our plans, the surveyors can get it online, but our plans aren't connected on the system.

We also do different things like we have [unintelligible]. We do those things with the AOLS SRI very regularly, that doesn't sound right -- quite regularly, and also -- I don't know if I can do this but one of my staff said hey let's do this, and he put it also on Google Maps.

Now unfortunately, I said yeah, go ahead, and he just put it on -- he put an address but he didn't put the legal-- we had a number on there but we didn't put the description on it. So, any part -- it was three platforms, in AOLS SRI, which is to basically give you the name, address, and a geographic description, and on Google Earth. Any of those three can be imported or basically [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: I'll answer that one. We've got Pat here. Certainly, we've had conversations. Our hope is we're going to simplify your life. The way we're hoping to do that is we're intending, with Pat's approval, to interact with Pimarc so that any records you put into Pimarc will automatically come through into the Provincial Survey Records Index database. So now, you'll be able to get it back and see your records, in this particular viewpoint, kind of similar to your Google Earth type thing. There will be no longer a need to put it in the South Central Index because that's here. So, you actually move to one data entry through Pimarc and that's it, done, and it meets all the needs.

JAIME: And probably hopefully alleviate or maybe exasperate, I'm not sure. We're not -- well in my case, Pimarc -- but we're not really attaching our surveys on this.

BRIAN MALONEY: This is purely an index.

JAIME: The only thing I have, that I don't like about the AOLS SRI, aside from people not putting stuff in, is you can e-mail the surveyor, and apologize for the

people [unintelligible], but e-mail the surveyor, and and ask for the record, but I think half the e-mails are old, and so if you're trying to take your chances emailing them and hitting that button and saying [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: That's something that we actually have as part of our use case model when we developed this were the two ways we're going to interact with members.

So, the first is back through Pimarc, or through LSR, or the Ottawa Survey Registry. We'll go back. If you were a participant in those, then that's how we'll access your record, through those.

If you're not then we're going to require an up to date e-mail address, so you're going to have to maintain that e-mail address. That's actually going to be related to your login. So, the intention is when we get a request for surveys, we're actually going to send them back via e-mail, is the way we intend to fulfill the plans where it's a company that doesn't deal with existing repositories.

UNKNOWN MALE: So just to be clear, your records, unless you choose to, because you're with a platform like Pimarc, or Land Survey Records or Protect Your Boundaries, anyways, they're not going to be on the system. All we're doing is putting -- it's an index, period.

BRIAN MALONEY: Correct. Your actual plan, scanning in your plan, is not there. It's just an index that says I have a survey in Lot 1, Plan ABC, period. It exposes it geographically and with some of that tabular information. We have a bit more of a challenge in the Ottawa area because their system is designed with a point, and a scanned image. So, we're going to have to work out whether it's a toned-down image, whether it's partially legible, or how we actually deal with that. We haven't worked those things out.

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: Right. So, we're going to work those details out but the intention is not -- this is purely an index. I need to stress that. We're not trying to get your actual survey plans. That's not the game here. We're trying to facilitate research for surveyors. We're trying to make it easy for you.

UNKNOWN MALE: Who is going to fold these things up, and who is going to manage what you just described in terms of fixing things, getting members looking over the database [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: The ownership is going to be easy. The ownership is going to be you. We're actually going to create a license agreement so it's very clear. That was something that wasn't done with South Central case and it should have been

done because there was lack of clarity as to who owns the database. Is it the association? Et cetera. Our expectation is that you will own the data so if you ever want it back it's yours to take back, but you give a licensed right to the Association to provide it for search purposes. So, if it were ever to be used for any other purposes we would actually have to go back and change the license agreement.

So, we're going to be above board on the license. We're also going to be forcing you to agree to a license on the use of the software as well so you're not out stealing orthophotography and doing something weird with it or whatever else.

So, we're going to try to be way above board on all the licensing rights on this, so it's real clear as to who can do what, and how it works. It's really created as a research tool for surveyors, and that's certainly our intention.

The second question is a little more complicated in terms of who is going to administer this. We know we're going to have to hire somebody in terms of data administration. We haven't got to that state yet.

In terms of correction, our expectation is we're going to turn it back to the surveyors themselves on the correction side of the equation, but there's still the data administration. I see you shaking your head.

The challenge is many surveyors have spent good money already georeferencing the records. Saša spent a fortune on Protect Your Boundaries, actually going out and georeferenced those. So, for us to say we'll subsidize you for the rest of the members, it causes me a little anxiety to gloat and ask for money for that. So, it's something we're going to have to work our way through. We hope that the automated stuff -- there is support that's included for the MPAC deal, for the one-time data load. We think with inclusion of good alias tables we can get a reasonable rate and we can talk more about that later in the presentation. But we know there's still going to be some manual intervention that's required to get there.

So, there is a cost and effort associated with this. The downstream benefits are significant in terms of easing searching for surveyors, and I know it will be more so in some areas. Clearly, if you're in Toronto it's going to be a great thing, I think. If I was a Toronto surveyor I would say this is great. If I happen to be sitting in Timmins, maybe not so much. That is a bit of a challenge that we've got but we also have surveyors practicing all over the province now, and in the old days of I know what's going on in my backyard are not really true. I mean they think they are, but I don't think they are from my perspective.

So yeah, there's a challenge here, but I think this is a legacy we're leaving to our future surveyors, getting this off the ground. On a go forward basis, it's clearly easy to do. It's not much effort. But it's the historic load that's the heavy part and I think we're going to have to really talk about what is the most appropriate way. I've heard enough this meeting that we're going to have to go back and have some

further conversations about how far back we go and how we deal with that. But we want to make it usable.

UNKNOWN MALE: Would it be possible for this committee to consider too the records from the last twenty years would be the most important because that's we use day to day. Once we go back further, we have every single record from Kitchener Waterloo, previous to the 1950's. While we were moving one day we opened a drawer with all these drawings of surveys, probably from the 1870's and there's hundreds of them. Trying to geo-reference them today would be almost impossible. [unintelligible].

I am just wondering if the regulation in general simply states that the Association is going to have a survey record index, but it doesn't say anything else on the matter. The by-laws can come later and say okay, because of the potential stress on some of the smaller firms that have to do all of this work, it must be spread over time.

BRIAN MALONEY: Originally -- and we did include this as our last Survey Monkey which I suspect most of you forgot about because it was about a year and a half or two years ago, we did go out with some timeframes and tried to get a sense of where the membership was in terms of data loading.

At the time we were looking to load everything, so I think we have to look at the whole concept. At the time we had proposed 5 or 10 years. So, it came back that a lot of people were going 10 years is way too long. It should be one year, et cetera. So, we ended up cutting it off at a five-year data load period which is actually synchronized with our first contract with MPAC.

So, five years is likely reasonable. We also did two other things, where we said there may be exceptional circumstances where somebody's got a reason they can't do it, so we were going to give an exemption that Council could use, to give a waiver essentially on that, a time extension on that.

But I think we also now have to look at -- I don't think I want to spend a ton more time on this, but I think we have to look back and see how far back we go with the records. It sounds to me like we need to look at some other models for those really old 1800 records or early 1900 records perhaps.

UNKNOWN MALE: Some of the old records, let's say the past 40 years in the Toronto area. It exploded in the early '50s and '60s in subdivisions in Scarborough and all those fields disappeared, and these properties now, are coming now slowly on the market again for renewal, rebuilding. I think an important aspect of that may be to find out [unintelligible]. I pretty well know what subdivision, in those days, and I fully appreciate it, since I was on my own in the early '80s. They want to put an addition there, there putting the house down. The only records [unintelligible]. The old, old records from downtown Toronto will have some value.

BRIAN MALONEY: So, I think, this is what I plan to do in order to bring some

closure to this particular conversation. I think what we will do as a task force, I will go back and make a recommendation that we can back up with a Survey Monkey. I think we want to look at it by area because I have a feeling it may be different if you're in Toronto or Ottawa versus Timmins, and we may want to look at suggestions from the membership as to how far back we go with those records that are usable. Then we look at some mechanism to deal with how we deal with the historic records, whether it's a blank record that says, for records prior to 1940 in this area contact ABCD and you deal with it. Maybe that's a solution. That's something I promise I'll take back to the task force. We'll talk about it. We'll see if there's some reasonable approach we can take here and we will launch another Survey Monkey which is what I want to do, and get some feedback from you.

Andy.

ANDY: [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: That's a debatable one. So, they did -- and I don't know how serious they were about it. In our preliminary conversations two meetings ago, Andy Wisnowski said, "Can we access this?" and it was really -- remember it's only an index, right? But they wanted to know in case they had evaluation issues associated with an area problem, or what's it adjacent to, then they wanted to know which surveyors to talk to. So, they still would not have access to the actual survey plan, or the survey records at all. They just know that, Annis O'Sullivan Vollebakk did a survey in this lot, so maybe I want to go talk to them. I did raise that with Council, and we haven't gotten into that negotiation yet. So, whether they'll push that or not I don't know.

ANDY: [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: They would only know you did it, Andy. They wouldn't have access to the survey itself.

ANDY: [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: But in any event I don't think they're going to get the actual image until -- so that's not planned on happening. The other thing that was raised -- I did raise this with Council as a question. If this comes up -- and I said I don't know that it will, but it was a very preliminary -- Anthony mentioned it, and they said they would have to think about it. I'm the used car salesman here. I have to go back to the boss and talk to the boss before I can ever agree to anything. I did say we'll talk about it. I raised it with Council. One of the things Council raised was "Are you putting the person appealing at a disadvantage?" If MPAC knows there's all these surveys there, and the public doesn't, because the public doesn't have access to this. "Are you putting them at a disadvantage?" So, we have to think about that as well. There's conversation to be had here. So, there is some potential. I can assure you if MPAC does get access to it, then that's something that has to be included in that license agreement we'll be talking about. We're going to be upfront

on all this stuff. This is not something we're hiding any place, so we'll have that conversation. But in any event, it's only the index. It's not access to the plan itself.

MIKE POWER: It's also worth noting that the request is not a prerequisite to make this available. So, they also expressed to Brian and myself that they intend to go solicit an OLS to join their firm as expert witnesses. So, they still necessarily want to get smarter with the surveys themselves. They want people to go out and have people come in when it's a boundary dispute impact the appeal with the assessment and be able to utilize those who have the same background and education as yourself.

Brian, I was going to get you to bring up one of the layers. I was going to ask about and give her credit for some of her data here. So, one of the things we've done -- what we're trying to do here is make this as robust a research tool as possible and what we're looking for is some feedback from you on it.

BRIAN MALONEY: I'll go back up in my area because I know there's some mining claims as an example up there.

MIKE POWER: So, what we have done is we have helped ourselves to a property [unintelligible] Ministry of Environment with respect to soil and agriculture, and the Ministry of Energy and the Ministry of Environment with respect to landfills sites. The reason we've done that for MPAC purposes is so they can see how much of these properties have had an impact on [unintelligible] but more importantly for your purposes as you look at these other data sets, that says, I am from Timmins this data is of value to me and whether it's a federal or provincial repository is this. Brian indicated for example, maybe some of the First Nations lands and boundaries as an example. Maybe there were other regions that should be incorporated in here as well. The relationship we have with MPAC is that they're prepared to make sure this is customized for your needs on behalf of the association. So, this is the time where you should be saying, "Hey these are the data classes that I have to access as part of my practice so that I can do the research before I go out into the field. So, within reason, if there are data layers beyond those that were written up, this is the time that you want to go to the field, with my practice I need this. He's gone out and he's pulled in some MMND data, if you just get rid of these other two windows.

There's also a bit of an index, and if you double click on any of the dots, for example, what we've done is we have access to the data from the repository and we've also brought in the metadata. So that you can look at, in this particular case, the claim number, the date of the claim, the fact that it's active and in some cases perhaps, if the data is available, who it is who has access to it, surface rights, or subterranean rights, for that matter. The same thing with respect to landfills, quarries, gravel pits, railway tracks, you name it as goes across the province. So, you can pick up any of the other layers that happen to be there, oil and gas wells, quarries, and not only does it give you the metadata, but if you also pull up the

layers I'm showing, it also gives you the ability to filter. I'm only interested in this case it's oil and gas, well beds, licensed only by Union Gas, Enbridge for example. So, you can put some metadata in there to help filter out the other layers, and it enriches the application.

UNKNOWN MALE: The Hydro One registry. They only make their data available for us, and if not, they charge us \$25.00 to search [unintelligible].

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: We're hoping it will be.

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: No, you don't see the plan. This is very similar to that, and it is intended to replace that. Clearly, we don't want to have two systems. We're coming from one place to go search is the ideal world. Sue, you had a question?

SUE MACGREGOR: In terms of feedback, I think you did a subset of data out of the Land Information index system at MNR and I wanted to make sure that medium of data is on that automatically, which gives surveyors the ability to search the records in the Surveyor General's office; a lot easier than working through Lisa or somebody in my office, so there's that. Tied to this, parks, conservation, reserves, developing control boundaries in South Central Ontario. There's 1800 confirmed boundaries in the province that are overlooked a lot. They could be identified as red lights. Surveyors automatically need to know, and it's easy to overlook. One of the questions I've heard back in this corner is, if you can speak a little bit about the tools that are available within the system that might be able to take a farm lot that is broken up into 27 -- 270 parcels by metes and bounds description, and the ability to off-load some of the plans, because if you have a lot, a farm lot, and follow-up with the surveys in that are in that farm lot, it's not a very decent tool, so I'm assuming I'd have an ability to use the street address to autoloading those parcels; autoloading that index information.

MIKE POWER: Yes. So, it's a function of the metadata that's part of what we will be weeding through. And my street address is an available scenario if you don't have one or the other partial [unintelligible]. That's what you want to do.

BRIAN MALONEY: We actually don't have a demo of the loading process today.

MIKE: [unintelligible] On a technical basis worked with MPAC, Callon Dietz, and Tulloch Engineering. And one I can't, come to mind right away...

BRIAN MALONEY: Barnes?

MIKE POWER: Pardon me? Yup. That's right.

Depending on how well the metadata are surveyed, you get about a 60 percent get rate, and of course just as you expected, 60 percent of the most frequent surveys, rather than the older surveys that have questionable metadata. Once we index those records, the firm has the ability to go through that to make sure those stakes were made. They can do it spatially or they can do it from a tabular. Then they end up with also their own instance of the PSRI, so they can go through their own records one by one. As they had time, Terry Dietz had his front office staff do that survey background, they simply went to the records, look at the index, keep that attached to the plan, open the plan, look for a street intersection, went for the map, click on the right spot, and [unintelligible], the ones that are efficient and he did all the ones that were exceptions. The ones that the staff couldn't do, they put into another queue that was to be done by [unintelligible].

So, a very methodical approach to doing it. He didn't do it for the purposes of PSRI. He did it for the purpose of automating the searching in his own office so he could more efficiently find his own records. When you speak to those who have required firms and they've got records in various repositories. What happens when you go for a search? You say, "Everybody go search." There's three or four searches going on because they haven't had the time necessarily to bring the [unintelligible].

Back to your point Sue, there are definitely government repositories that we've learned of that say, "Listen, take my records. Please make them available, please, in some sort of environment that can be searched by the professional body." So even if you were resistant to putting your own metadata in here, the fact that you have access to the tool will make it easier to find records that you previously were never going to be able to find, because they sat in some provincial, or agency—government, can't find it, and would never be available to you.

BRIAN MALONEY: A couple other things we didn't talk about which is this little button here which allows us to go in and use the Google Location Search. So it hits some of the geographic names as an example that Google [unintelligible]. So it's just another tool that drills you into a location. So I went to Sheraton on the Falls and it drilled us down to where we were at when we were trying to look for something. So you click on it and boom away you go. It's Google functionality. It's nothing spectacular, but it's another toolset that's built into this.

MIKE POWER: Up north, you can enter in x, y coordinates, so if that's all you have to go from, it will give you the appropriate location, or a geographic feature location, Sturgeon Lake, for example.

BRIAN MALONEY: What are the other ones? Mike, I can't recall how to get to the other resources here. I want to show that as well.

MIKE POWER: The reference tab.

BRIAN MALONEY: Here it is, other resources. So here are some other resources. These are actually external links. So they're external URLs that kind of live, that link, within this application, and the reason I bring this up is, this is an opportunity to link to some external URLs. So as an example we can link to the AOLS. We could link to perhaps to the practice manual. If we really wanted to we could put a link into Teranet and allow you to do a type search here. So there's a variety of things we can build into this without a lot of effort. I mean they're just kicking you over to another URL, so it's not a big deal, but again it brings your research back to a single home if you're interested in doing that. I'm interested in feedback for things we might want to include within that as well.

MIKE POWER: Hydro One, registry, even databases. You have a link here. You query it. It would pop-up your coordinates and do the search for you.

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible]

MIKE POWER: They still manage their own repository. If they are registered, you can access them through Land Titles. I had a conversation with Teranet the other night. They talked about making available on the back to that end here. So, to that end, via conversation, if you chose to say that some of the resources are making some sense by linking out to them you have the opportunity to buy the records or whatever they have there [unintelligible].

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible]

BRIAN MALONEY: It should still be— we're still looking to have those put in. So this is an index of surveys, as opposed to plans. I mean obviously generally a lot of times a survey will generate a plan. But, theoretically, if you have a survey that put monumentation in the ground, you're doing a fencing survey, whatever it happens to be, you put monuments on the ground, it should still show up in the index.

UNKNOWN MALE: All these functionalities are great, but I guess it cost money of, you know, when it shows in the underlying fabric, from Teranet, all the ones from Google Images or what not, so how would this play out in the long term? Do we have license agreements for a thousand years or anything like that? A fixed price, where we have something for five years and the price goes up a thousand percent?

MIKE POWER: Well I can share with you, the objective from MPAC's perspective is that the infrastructure is licensed to the Association for whatever period of time Brian is able to negotiate. The maintenance cost for the first year is taken care of so we can discuss the maintenance cost. Google charges on a pay-per-view basis, so we have to look at what the number of pages are. The data is going to be stored at a top repository at the server. There are fees associated. Those costs are flow-through costs that the Association, [unintelligible] I'll pay for these costs myself. We'll all buy a server farm. All the metadata will sit in a server. You don't have to use a top

repository.

There will be a modest maintenance cost. We kicked around some numbers. We don't know what they are but they're likely modestly more than the current South Central Regional Group costs are, and we'll have a 1-800 support desk that will support all end-users toward their first year until the Association decides, until they've adjusted in-house. We will provide training. There will be online seminar training for anybody who starts to use it, so they get practical experience. They can have their logo on. For instance, PSRI will make themselves available. They will have their logo on. There is an administrative module. They are those who can enter and leave. They may have different staff who may look at it, or don't look at it. By the same token there is a feedback button in terms of things you'd like to see. Brian, just behind the question mark there's an online manual, and it is enhanced, you can go ask, "How do I enter my plan?", "Find a plan?" so that it will effectively help you with that. There's also some video tutorials that that's been developed that will walk you through it, if you choose not to read, but have the ability to listen.

UNKNOWN MALE: I don't hear any brainstorming yet as to how to input records The legal description. Assessment, roll-numbers. How much data is being asked for? When you talk about this program for the surveyors here, it's going to be mandatory, you should keep that in mind. It's not a voluntary thing.

It's tough to enter legal descriptions I did it for a big company in the '70s into the Survey Records Index. It can be very time consuming.

MIKE POWER: Remember we're not asking that you enter it, as long as you have it in your digital file; just give it your file.

UNKNOWN MALE: How about paper files?

MIKE: That I'm not sure I can help you with.

BRIAN MALONEY: The only thing we're going to do there -- I mentioned it yesterday -- we're going to issue an RFP to look for some suppliers that can assist surveyors, if they so choose to use that because there are some surveyors I've spoken to who say I have no idea where to start. Don't want to deal with this. Give me a name and I'll go deal with them. So we know that there are at least a couple of companies out there that are interested in doing this, so our intention is to put that RFP out and essentially put a vendor of record together. Obviously, we're not going to hire them. It will be up to you to choose, or not choose to use them, but if you so choose--

UNKNOWN MALE: And hire them?

BRIAN MALONEY: Yes, absolutely.

UNKNOWN MALE: That's a big expense.

BRIAN MALONEY: I understand that.

UNKNOWN MALE: That's an imposition. It takes weeks. It took me a month in 1970.

BRIAN MALONEY: All good things cost money.

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible]. So, you mentioned the regulation and the by-law and the Survey Monkey. So, the regulation could be passed by a vote by the membership. So, when I look at the number of surveyors versus survey firms, specifically, at my home. This gentleman noted that there's costs associated. If every member gets a vote, I can be outvoted by the people who work for me, on how I spend my money. So, from that perspective I don't think that's fair, that I should be outvoted by people who work for me choosing how I spend my money. Similarly, I don't think that people in public practice should dictate how members and C of A holders spend their money. This system is really not advantageous to me. But the expenditure of my own money is being dictated by people I can't control. So is there been any thought with respect to limiting the vote process those people who hold to C of A's only who have a vested interest.

BRIAN MALONEY: So, two answers for you. I'll answer it because I've got the answers for you. They're simple, and the first one is in the Survey Monkey that we did, we actually asked people to indicate whether they were C of A holders or not, and interestingly enough, when you look at the metrics, they were very close to the same when we did entire population versus just C of A. So, we did look at that and there wasn't a statistically significant difference between the two which is interesting.

The second piece of the puzzle is there is no way for us to do that because we're governed by the Surveyors Act, and the Act requires how we put a regulation on it, and how we deal with it, and talks. So, the only way we can do that -- and you've talked to Eric and his Legislative Task Force and say maybe there's a need for things that are just business related, to change the Act so that they can be voted on by C of A holders, but again it would require a statutory change. So, at this point in time we have no ability even if we wanted to, to do that.

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible]. As a business owner I don't know if that's appropriate. [unintelligible].

UNKNOWN MALE: Is there a simpler version of what we're talking about? I would maybe suggest [unintelligible]. Is there a simpler version that simply says hey, we need your index? It's going to provide the data, [unintelligible], gather the data, for a fee, start cleaning that data because I would disagree that having a legal description, is needed. So, any access to imagery is purely, let alone an index piece.

So, I would suggest maybe, while people are talking about a wonderful system here, the cost on some C of A people, may be expensive, and for what may be in the public interest it may simply be [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: So, the challenge we've had with that, and that was as you recall the original rollout of the Survey Records Index -- that was a tabular. That was the technology of that day. We tried to go down that road and we tried to deal with -- and I don't think we did a very good job with -- alias tables. So, we had to do all this figuring out of how we deal with all these differing names, because surveyors in their databases, if they have them, name concessions differently, name townships differently, name registered plans differently. So, we tried to pull it together, and it was a nightmare. I can recall I was in Kingston when this came out. We voted to bring it in, and when we saw the amount of work it was to try to deal with all this mess of legal descriptions we said the hell with this, and we cancelled it, and--

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: Absolutely. I think it will be.

UNKNOWN MALE: It's going to be really hard for people. I mean most new plans don't have an address. Why? Because most of them are still unfinished and in construction. When you finish your survey, you release it, here's the things we look at. You don't have an address. Many of the addresses are wrong. [unintelligible] We have to create tools that can look at -- we're looking at an easement for -- I'm just suggesting you may want to -- for all the people that are worried about the expense of placing dots on that, they may want to have the option of maybe we want to go into all of that. Just gather all the data [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: That's the only challenge. I'm hoping we're forward looking here, personally, that we're looking to the future. I don't think the future is a tabular database. I guess I'm tired as a surveyor of being behind the damn 8-ball, because when I look at the functionality that's out there in any other damn industry, they're ahead of us. I'm still embarrassed. We talk about integrated surveys. I'm embarrassed when I look at data and our boundaries are the least accurate damn item on the map. Everything else is positioned more accurately than our boundaries. We're the spatial experts and we can't even do that. Here we are talking about moving backwards in time to a tabular database. Personally, we could do it, I understand that, but I just don't think it's forward looking.

UNKNOWN MALE: That is part of the challenge that we are facing. I get a payback. I'm 50 now. The guys that are 60 or 70 are saying my business is only worth this much and you're asking me to spend 2-3 dollars per plan? In my office when we have access to these plans, 100 to 150 plans a day for one person. So now start doing math on 30,000 plans. This is about giving good feedback. I'm in favour of [unintelligible]. I'm just saying we have to be realistic about the costs. It's tough.

So, I would again just bring up the idea that maybe for what we're trying to do, just share the knowledge about records, maybe something in the middle.

BRIAN MALONEY: The absolute worst-case scenario in my books would be at least on a day forward put them in spatially, and I don't think that gets us very far because the benefit will be down the road 100 years from now. Because unless you go back in time at least 50 years, you're really not getting a system that's of any value. So, I think there is an effort. I hope we can do business with Protect Your Boundaries and get access to your coordinates. You've done the heavy lifting. We're not detracting from you because you'll still sell the records.

We're just going to be another venue to point to you to sell the record. So I hope we can take advantage of those things, and take advantage of the Ottawa Registry that's already put the points on the map, and start to move the ball forward for the province. The good news is you guys have done some heavy lifting that I hope we can leverage to help move it forward. I don't think it's a detriment to you. I hope it's not. We're trying to point them back to you for acquisition of the record which is where your ultimate revenue comes from. I don't know.

UNKNOWN MALE: Let's look at it the other way and say [unintelligible]. MPAC sees real value [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: So, if that's a big stumbling block we can take that off the table. We haven't negotiated anything in that detail yet. It was kind of a, by the way, do you think we can get access to this? If you guys tell me that's a problem, I can tell you right now let's take it off the table. It's not going to stop this from proceeding because they've made a commitment at a senior level that they're going to do this. They're trying to maintain a relationship with the surveyors. They were kind of semi-broke when they moved down with their colleagues at Teranet.

UNKNOWN MALE: [unintelligible]. Members of their board are surveyors.

BRIAN MALONEY: They want to maintain the relationship.

UNKNOWN MALE: Otherwise they charge us for it. They charge [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: So, as I said we're looking for a five-year term. Maybe we need to be looking for a ten-year term. We're also going to have clauses in there that we're walking away with our data. We may lose functionality, but we're going to walk away with the data we need, if we walk away from this.

UNKNOWN MALE: For millions and millions of dollars to get into a position where again, it sounds self-serving, but it works for us. Are we exposing ourselves to liability? [unintelligible].

MIKE POWER: It's a fair question. Anybody who's currently using one of the

repositories or other indexes don't have to change their approach. What we're hopeful of, as Brian says, is that whoever manages that index will facilitate and upload to the Provincial Index. Those who are not members of the Ottawa Registry, who can't get to it, so they can do the search. They'll still come back there to get the plan. But the three of you—they'll have a 100% of the firms using the repository and so, in many respects, this is for those guys who also want to avail themselves of doing proper searching, can't get into your Registry, but if they come here—the other thing that happens here, you can see it yourself, there's a bunch of spatial tools here, and as Brian said, today, perhaps the firms don't have the tools for a spatial practice, but tomorrow, they might suddenly find out that, "Hey, I'm actually not so bad at delivering spatial tools and capabilities." Maybe there's something here that would allow them to expand their practice and do more work for their clients.

The data that you look at here, just as you gentlemen have said, "Hey we've spent millions of dollars managing records." MPAC, trust me, because I know, has spent millions of dollars building the infrastructure and managing it. They're offering it to you, fundamentally at no cost. The maintenance is really cost recovery. They're not trying to charge you one hundred or two hundred thousand dollars after the first year to get their money back. That's not the case.

If we left, which is why we can negotiate pretty easily, you can leave with the index and metadata, so that you can go with your holdings—anybody can go, and re-create the whole darn thing. [unintelligible] Selfishly speaking for sure. The point of the matter for sure is, all firms out there are interested in mobilizing the records spatially. It gives you the ability without having to make the investment, a big investment. Millions of dollars is the actual investment.

BRIAN MALONEY: Go Pat, go.

PAT LEVAC: I developed Pimarc for those who don't know this. So, I'm going to handle the backend, and hand-off the football, for lack of a better word. You're going to do a search, and these are just constructive observations, right? You have different tabs for doing different types of searches, and it looks like you break in a municipal address on a separate tab where you can't combine them with the lot and concession or what have you. Perhaps you don't have the municipal address. You may have the street or lot, or concession. I would think it would be useful to have that.

MIKE POWER: Brian go to single address—single search. Right click. Hit address. Sorry. You'll have to just hit the button up here. You've timed-out. Refresh that. Point.
Keep going.

BRIAN MALONEY: What just happened here? Get on this damn thing, Mike. I'm not a demo guy on this yet. Thanks, Mike.

UNKNOWN MALE: I want to search, “Craig” and Plan 612.

BRIAN MALONEY: On municipality?

MIKE POWER: No, under street. [unintelligible]. Search Plan 612.

UNKNOWN MALE: This is just for usability. You’ve got that on a separate tab. You’ve got to go on a different tab.

MIKE POWER: Remember this is for a different application right now, so that feedback to Brian, “I want my search to be able to do ‘this’”. This is the time to do it. This is the situation with every street in Ontario with ‘Craig’ in it comes up, and if I went into my legal description search, it’s showing me the pieces there, and put in M 612. Whatever.

UNKNOWN MALE: I just pulled that out of the air.

MIKE POWER: I don’t know if there is one.

BRIAN MALONEY: Maybe not.

MIKE POWER: But every plan with M 612 description of the province in it will also come up. Then from that, you’ll go through and select. So remember their objective is to get to a single property, so these searches are intended to do that. But you may instruct Brian and say, I need to be able to come to a more definitive location

BRIAN MALONEY: There it is.

UNKNOWN MALE: You can find the records in the general area that will possibly help us.

MIKE POWER: Absolutely. This gets you to the location. So, the functionality is, get me to the location of general interest. Now let me go and create a spatial polygon or radius from this area of 2 kilometers, or 4 kilometers; or let me now turn on all the spots where records are there; and let me hover over them and see what the metadata of that record is and determine if I want it or not.

Now that I’ve created my polygon and seen all the other dots that represent records, let’s extend my polygon out to include them because I want them on my list. That’s the functionality that’s there right now. But the objective is here, spatially to get you to the area you’re interested in, and then I can look at all the records I want in that area, then delete the ones I don’t want.

UNKNOWN MALE: Now you’ve got your list. You can call it your basket. Now

you want to go and get those records. Some of them you're going to have to call that individual survey firm because they're not posted on any particular system.

BRIAN MALONEY: Our plan is to try to forward an e-mail.

UNKNOWN MALE: Then the rest, you're going to direct them to the different surveyors to purchase those records. So now you can potentially have five tabs open on that browser window. You can find two records here. You can find two records there.

MIKE POWER: The system will automatically generate that. So, once you've created the list view-- just go back on the spreadsheet, Brian.

BRIAN MALONEY: This guy?

MIKE POWER: You look at these records. There's another table over here that says PYB, Pimarc, Ottawa, whatever. They're all here and because that's going to satisfy the needs for these records, as input by the survey firms putting them in. So now when you hit go, it sends the records off -- they're request automatically to you because you're acting on behalf of that surveyor, for that record, and then you're fulfilling it. Again, the ideal scenario is...

BRIAN MALONEY: We haven't figured out how that's going to work with you guys yet, so there's a conversation to be had here in terms of whether it's an API or how we deal with it, so we haven't gotten that far yet. We need to talk to you before we can get that figured out.

MIKE POWER: That's the fulfillment engine on the backend and then the ideal scenario is the price for those records is identified so the surveyor can do his research and know how much it's going to cost him to get everything that in the queue.

UNKNOWN MALE: So now it's up to the batch load. We had this discussion before. Each data set. Each firm's records and what not. Can we not get that geocoded data back and returned to us?

BRIAN MALONEY: Absolutely.

MIKE POWER: So, we have the metadata, and again to the benefit to those of you who are commercializing other people's records, is that, fundamentally, the geocoding, to the degree that you agree with it, it's been done, so the records are geocoded. Perhaps you have seen them and take it as an input and now you can commercialize them as you currently do.

UNKNOWN MALE: So, each individual firm would get whatever is geocoded in the system and geocode records that didn't.

UNKNOWN MALE: There might be a licensing issue there. [unintelligible]

BRIAN MALONEY: Derivative.

UNKNOWN MALE: Let's say we provided the legal description to the system. That system now uses that data, finds it on the map [unintelligible]. That's a licensing issue.

BRIAN MALONEY: That's a good point though. The only problem we would have there would be with PIN because MPAC owns the rest of this data, so they can give us that license, and we fully intend to get that license, I can assure you.

SAŠA KRCMAR: Even the surveyors have to input those legal descriptions for those records.

BRIAN MALONEY: Right. But the problem when you play with Teranet, is Teranet goes back and says if it's a derivative data set, created as a result of our data, then you owe some heritage, in terms of intellectual property to us.

MIKE POWER: It is worth noting that the new Ontario Parcel Agreement gives MPAC a lot of mandate than what we've had before. I appreciate what you're saying Saša.

BRIAN MALONEY: We will make sure that we're clean.

MIKE POWER: Are there any other general questions, any data sets that should be included? Anything that we did not cover off? Obviously, dealing with this challenge, I do understand. Perhaps it is written, or scanned, using the OCR perhaps it can be re-interpreted, [unintelligible] and referenced to the legal description, but anything that gets you to that point versus not getting it at all? I will take it into consideration and we'll look for solutions that make it easier for you to operate and participate as well. The intention is to get that tool set, you don't pay for that tool set [unintelligible], there is some maintenance fee for the Association which will be a small portion.

BRIAN MALONEY: Let me make an offer. If you think of something when you walk out of the room, feel free to e-mail me, and I'll make sure we try not to wait too long because we're going to try to drive this to conclusion in the next 60 days. So we're going to move quickly. The other thing is Sue I'm going to give you a call, and we can talk specifically about some of the data you think would be valuable to putting in there. We'll see what we can do there. If you had any other thoughts and didn't get a chance to get them out to me, certainly get back to me.

UNKNOWN MALE: Just as a small firm we have 2,800 records, roughly 3,000, and we always maintained an Excel spreadsheet to try to keep track of everything.

We decided to upload all our stuff to Pimarc. We made an investment in that software, made an investment in the scanner appliance, and it is no different than any other investment would be in our company, whether it's equipment, a new office, vehicles, whatever that we thought was important, and now I don't even look at my spreadsheet. I just go right into Pimarc and search my own records there. I think Jaime said something to that same effect as well. So that's what works for us. Go with whoever, but to be honest, as an investment, it's paying off.

MIKE POWER: in addition to an investment to Pimarc you would end up with a tool and your records are there, and you could distribute your records to your staff, and say "Here are the records of the surveyors and [unintelligible]".

UNKNOWN MALE: We encourage everybody to get onboard.

UNKNOWN MALE: I support this because we did the same thing. We have Pimarc. We have probably now spent, just in salaries alone, about \$90,000.00 for a dedicated person. We started from the first [unintelligible] just to put all the records in. It is great. If I don't remember [unintelligible]. I can go through it with a street name. It works, and it is an investment [unintelligible] and it would cost us more because [unintelligible].

BRIAN MALONEY: Okay. Well I don't want to get between you and the bar, or you between me, and the bar, so thank you very much for your time, appreciate the feedback, and as I said, if you e-mail me I would be glad to get your comments.

CONCURRENT SESSION: SURVEY REVIEW DEPARTMENT (SRD) FIELD NOTES

TIM HARTLEY: Okay. Can everybody hear me? This turned on? Can everybody hear me? Okay. Seeing as I had the dead-end shift here, 3:00 on the second to last day, I thought there'd be about 30 people to show up. Anyways my name is Tim Hartley, and I'm going to talk about field notes. It's funny. As my career draws to an end, I started making field notes in the very early '70s, so 46, 47 years later I'm still talking about field notes.

I'm not going to keep you very long. I'm not going to talk about anything that's new. You know it all. But sometimes you know with technology we get on a treadmill, and sometimes we've got to step off that treadmill, step back, re-evaluate what we're doing, and start again. So, field notes, like sketches - I hate to say that word - it's a big topic, and the Standards Committee at some point in time - I thought it was going to be next year but probably not - will grapple with that problem.

But right now, I'll tell you what we have, and I don't think there will be too much changing because we do field notes for a reason. We surveyors have been charged with the responsibility of maintaining the survey fabric of Ontario, so we've got to

think about that. We're in a very unique position, and I'm going to discuss why we need field notes, to maintain this fabric and what field notes are.

Our next slide is - the partridge in orange, the deadly partridge in orange. So what does this old English north country, soft tackled wet fly have to do with field notes? Nothing, not a damn thing except Joseph Wallace back in 1842 made a sketch and a description of how this fly was tied and fished. So today we can tie it and fish it exactly the way our great, great, great grandparents did.

That was a time when Robert Stephenson and company were working on their steam engines. I had to work that fly in somehow. Okay.

Field notes are important. We've got two. There's two statutory obligations. Keep this in mind. Regulation 216/10 section 15 says basically, field notes are to be prepared in the field and shall show everything found, observed, and done in the field in the course and relevant to the survey. Just think about that.

It says once again field notes are to be prepared in the field and show everything that we did. The Surveys Act goes on to state - also states that field notes are important. It says we shall make, and keep and preserve exact and regular field notes, and supply them to other surveyors. So, field notes are important in maintaining the survey fabric. This is the law as it stands. It was the law when you received your commission and it is the law today, and it's no different than you don't drive through a red light and you don't rob a bank. That's the law. That's what we have to do.

The field notes are important, and one reason they're important is, since they're done in the field at the time of surveying. They can be used in court as evidence. If you're in court you can refer to your field notes because you did them in the field. You can't do that with a plan. On a plan you can change the boundaries, fiddle with the boundaries of the bearings, or the corners, but there's no method of making sure that you change it in the field. So a plan does not necessarily reflect what was in the field. It certainly should do but it doesn't necessarily. So that's why field notes are important because they're done in the field. They tell us what was done in the field, all part of maintaining that survey fabric.

Recently, I had lunch with a couple of old friends, and we discussed this topic, and since they were older than me, and they were former clients, I shall refer to them as a senior lawyer and a senior provincial court judge. So we had these two regulations, and we talked about them, and they said you know, you make field notes to illustrate the evidence that you used to establish or re-establish boundaries. That's really important. That's what we do. But, when you talk to lawyers they look at it a different way. They said that's the basis but the real part, the most important part of this legislation is silent.

The most important part is that surveyors and lawyers do not make notes for their

client. You make them for yourself, and this judge has been a judge for a lot of years. He says Tim, tell them, you make them to protect your butt. Any questions so far?

Okay. Now this is where I need Ron Stewart. Justice Richmond who was an 1890's something New Zealand Court -

RON STEWART: "Neither words of a deed, or the lines and figures of a plan, can absolutely speak for themselves. They must, in some way or other be applied to the ground."

TIM HARTLEY: Applied to the ground. Ron gave me this probably 20, 25 years ago. It's been over my desk ever since. Now what that says is that a plan or a deed, it's really - it tells us something, but we don't know really what it says until we apply it to the ground. Right? Because a deed or a plan is only an attempt to describe what's on the ground.

So if you look at what Justice Richmond said, and reverse engineer it, look at it in a backwards way and ask yourself "How can we produce a plan without first knowing what's on the ground?" How can we produce - how can we know what's on the ground without having good field notes? So a plan is at best a reflection of what is in the field notes. Now field notes have never been easy to make. It's an art and it takes constant practice to improve on them, but we've got to do them, but the nice thing is now, field notes today are a lot easier to make than they were years ago.

We've got inexpensive 0.5 millimeter pencils. We don't have to make them on little field books, anymore where you've got big graph paper. If our pencil breaks, we don't have to go to the corner of a house and sharpen it on the brick. Why are you laughing? Been there, done that, right?

You probably still carry your pocket knife to sharpen it. Anyways - and we have all this technology to help us. We're no longer turning an angle and figuring out the cosine to get that right angle tied to that building. So, we have all this information. It's easier to make field notes. You can inverse between two points. You got the bearing and the distance, write it down. You can crank an angle to the corner of a building. Inverse get that right angle tie, write it down on the field notes. You look at it, oh, that looks right, oh, that's not 5 feet. That's closer to 20.

All this technology to help us, it's easier to make field notes. So, we've got to stop, step back, and start making notes again. Now one thing we find quite often - and it's kind of scary when we do a field examination - is quite often we'll find evidence that's along the line shown on the wrong side. So, you may find a fence on one side, and the plan shows it crossing the boundary, but there's no field notes. All we have is the raw data file. We have to think, "how does this happen?" I think it happens like this. If I'm standing up and I've got my station up here or whatever, and I go here, and I go fence, that's a 1 meter right offset. No, I think that's a left offset. So,

if you make a page of field notes, and you draw the line, you go oh, I've got the fence on the right side. You've got to look at it to make sure it's right. You cannot rely on punching away on the data collector and having it stored. Another thing - notes will consist of not just the sketch.

Today a note consists of the raw data. It consists of the coordinates. It consists of the photographs. Why not? Everybody's got their smart phone with them. Bango! Here it is along this boundary line, that boundary line. You can download that and attach it to the field notes.

Also, we know if there's no real field notes, one problem we have - bear with me. I'm missing a page. One problem we see, is if it's just the raw data file, what will happen is you look along the line, got the two points, raw data file. You have all this stuff along the line, got a ditch, hydro line, might even have a jog in the property line, so unless you have field notes, where you've expanded that, and you can show what's along the line, it looks as one line on the raw data when you print it out. So how do you check a plan or draw a plan without expanding that? It's very easy to draw a plan and not - when you're checking a plan, not having that computer in front of you to be able to expand that line and see what's there.

So, we find this too. We'll find there's all kinds of stuff missed - the monumentation missed in the plan. It was put in, in the field, but not on the plan because it was never picked up because the fellow checking the plan was only looking at the raw data. He didn't have this field note that expanded the boundary, and showed him or her, what was there.

Bear with me right here. Let's talk about data storage. Back when I was Mr. High Tech, we had Apple 2Es, we had bag phones, and we were just about to get differential GPS. We were right on the edge of technology. We stored everything we had. We were able to store, use our Apple 2E, had Gary Irwin's geometry program, and we stored everything we had on floppy disks, and then suddenly our new computers had different disks, and those floppy disks didn't fit in. So, I remember my daughter making Christmas tree decorations out of floppy disks because they weren't good for anything else.

So remember when we're storing all this data, we've got all this fancy stuff, and we're storing it, and it's there forever, and we don't need a hard copy, got it there, that storage system, that technology is only good as long as it is supported, because someone sooner or later is going to come along with something new, something small, something like this, that I just talk in or look at it and it does the whole thing, and that all that stuff we have on our smart phone now, will not be accessible because that technology will cease to be supported.

Good field notes make drafting and checking a plan much easier. So, I don't know how you check a plan. I don't know how you draft a plan if you haven't got good field notes. So you get your party chiefs to make good field notes. When they come

in at night you can sit down with them while it's still fresh in their minds and go over that survey.

What evidence did you use? How did you do this? How did you do that? Come up with an answer. It's hard to train someone to do that, but we have to do it. You'll make more money if you do, because if you just say pick up everything with the data collector, bang, bang, pick up all this stuff, come back in, download it, and I'll sit down and figure out where it goes, where the bars are going to go - you have to go back.

But if you can train your field staff to make those decisions - and there's not that many legal decisions in surveying. You have to assess the evidence, and do this and do that, but it doesn't take that long. There's not that many ways of doing it, and if you can get them to do that, if the bar is put in the right spot, you don't have to go back. But if you don't put the bars in, you have to go back anyways. You always have to go back. So put them in, in the right spot, you're okay. Put them in the wrong, you have to go back and change it, but if you don't do that, you have to do it anyways. Next one here.

The Council in 2007 updated the guidelines for the preparation of field notes. Now 2007, that was years ago. It's not really. It's only 11 years ago, and this is what the Standards Committee is going to look at. If you look at - this is on the AOLS website. Go on that. You can get it and look at it. Make copies. Give it to all your party chiefs. But if you break it down it's about three or four pages.

There's about 15 relevant points, and when I go through these, I've gone through these for years now, there's nothing I would change. Eleven years, technology has changed, but not all that much. Eleven years ago, LiDAR, GPS, we had all that stuff, smart phones, so what's in these guidelines? Somewhat maybe dated, but it does make sense.

So, the 15 points - the first point is the field notes shall have a sketch. The minimum you have to do, is sketch the boundary. Show the boundary. Show what evidence you found. What did you use to establish your corners? You have to have that sketch of the boundary. Now if there's a house you probably want to sketch that in too but pull the back or whatever— on that detail, you can always just sketch the house in or sketch the pool in and say "see coordinate number such and such" because you've collected them with your data collector. But you need that sketch of the boundary, because that's what you're going to be looking at, when you draw the plan, and that's what you're going to be looking at, when you check the plan.

The next thing - it's hard to get a party chief away. He's always got this, and always got a ruler someplace, doesn't matter. Anyways the next thing you have to have is you have to show all angles and all differences. Now maybe today we're not showing the angle turn. Maybe it's the result of two coordinates, but at least then we can write down the bearing and the distance. It's right there in the data collector, but

anyways, but describe how you did it.

If you calculated a 90° degree angle per such and such a plan, put that in the notes. Set 90° degrees per plan 2, and on the notes page, or second 2, plan 2, 1920 survey by Orville Wilson.

And you want to say where the distances came from. Were they set? Were they measured between two bars? Were they proportioned, where you got them from? And it doesn't take a lot. You'll start taking notes, and in a few weeks your notes will look like the plan.

Use large lettering. That makes sense because why? You've got to photocopy it, or you've got to scan it. You've got to practice your lettering. I still do that. I know Bob Clipsham does too. We talked about this yesterday. We still do our lettering. We're standing by the phone, still practicing our lettering. It's an art, you've got to work at it. You're all laughing because you're pushing buttons right?

You've got to still mention all the monuments, where they were found or set, who set them.

Number five, you've got to locate the boundary features. You've got to show where the fences are, lines of occupation. So, all this stuff has to be in the field notes. Next thing, date of the work, members of party, file number. Oh, why do I need that? That's just a pain. No! The date, yes, we did it this date, it goes with this plan. The plan says the field work was completed on - oh, right, that's the date. Who was in the party? Oh, you were by yourself. No wonder you couldn't measure that.

File number, let's get the right file number on the plan. It represents the same file number on the field notes, so these things do go together.

Next thing, weather conditions. I don't have to put weather conditions on that. That's stupid. That's old fashioned. Except when you're in court. Except when you forgot to pick up that granite, that \$50,000.00 granite patio that your client built on the neighbor's land, and you're in court, and the judge says why did you miss that? Let me refer to my field notes your honor. It was 20 below 0 and 3 feet of snow. The judge says to the complainer, you ordered this in December? No wonder you missed it. Case dismissed.

So, it's good to have the temperature and the weather. A lot of times when I'm trying to work out a survey problem, I'm looking at old field notes. I can't make it work. It was 95° degrees outside, and we all know when it's 95° degrees, the brain isn't working. You make a lot of mistakes. You transpose numbers and stuff like that. So having the weather conditions on the field notes, might just give you an answer 30 years down the road on why something was done, or why something wasn't done.

The next thing, page numbers, number them 1, 2, 3, 4. '1 of 4', '2 of 4', '3 of 4', why? So, we don't miss anything. So, you know you've got all the field notes. You're not missing a page. North arrow, preferably up, why? Because it's what we're used to, and it just makes sense, and it's easier to do. Better just to point the truck facing north. You're laughing. You did that too right?

UNKNOWN MALE: No, that's good. I park mine facing downhill because my battery was dead.

TIM HARTLEY: Also, you want the road name, the widening, daylight. So once again these field notes are going to reflect what's on the ground.

References to underlying plans and surveys, set by such and such a plan too, don't plan until you've got it in the margin or bottom of field notes. Sometimes people put this stuff in the back of field notes. That's not a good idea because what happens is sometimes you forget to turn the field note over and there's all these explanations on the back. It's best I think to put them on a different page of field notes but that's just me.

Is Steve Hook here? Because they do that. They've been doing that for years. Where's Steve Hook? Okay. Labeling, you need to label the property lines, lot four, lot five, label the street limits, northern limit, this is widened, label offset numbers, traverse lines, stuff like that.

List the control points used, if any. If you're integrating the survey or use control points, list someplace on the field notes what control points you used and what are the coordinates? Did you use a benchmark? What was the benchmark? Where was it from? And what was the height?

Fourteen, reference to any - this is - you don't stumble onto this all the time but once in a while you'll need to take some verbal evidence that was given by a local, that has specific knowledge of the site or the boundaries. A lot of times you do something in the country and someone comes out and says, "I remember my dad had a fence along here." What's the origin of the fence? Oh, that was just to keep the cattle in. The real boundary was on the other side. So you can just put that in the field notes too, and it's part of it, it's evidence, it's oral evidence, but it's evidence and you took it.

Also, the last thing, number 15 - we've got to verify all hanging lines. We used to say that in the plans, but we don't see it anymore. Basically, if you're putting a bar in you have to have an independent measurement of that bar, because if you lay out 100 meters, drop the bar, you've got to check it somehow, maybe turn an angle, or pop it with the GPS twice. So, lines that are outside of a traverse, and really most surveys now if they're done with a total station for GPS, how many times do you really do a closed traverse on a small survey? So, you've got to hit those points twice and make sure you have an independent measurement for every bar.

Once again, I said notes may consist of raw data, coordinates, pictures. So, after you've finished the survey, look at the field notes, then look at the property, and look at the field notes again, and as R. J. Mitchell said, Mitchell was the designer of the Spitfire. He said, "If it looks right, it probably is right." And you say to yourself, "If it looks wrong it probably is wrong."

You say, "Oh, that doesn't look right, let's just go out and check it." So before you leave the site, you look at that field note, look at the plan. If it looks right, it probably is, and a good chance you're going to get that plan right.

That's basically all I've got to say, so I'll take some questions. What are field notes going to look like in the future? I'm an old guy. You guys are young guys. How are we going to do this?

We've still got to remember that we need something that was done in the field that shows how we did everything. If you can't think of it, go home, go back to the office, and e-mail it to me, because I will take this, and give it to the Standards Committee when they're starting to review what's in field notes.

Any questions? I was hoping we'd have a lot. Anyways, to sum it all up, remember one thing. It's foolish not to take field notes. Thank you folks.

It took me only 3 weeks to write, and 20 minutes to say it. Go on our website. Go on the SRD website, click on SRD, and on the left handout side it's going to have resources. Click on that and you'll get the field note guideline. There's also a guideline on electronic storage or electronic measuring. It's kind of outdated but it's worthwhile looking at it, but the main thing is Drew Annable who is one of the examiners made a four-page bullet - four pages of bullets on what they checked on field notes. So, get that, print it off, give this and the guidelines set up by the Association to all your party chiefs. This is what - when we look at a survey, we go through and ask ourselves all these questions and it's everything to do with field notes, got why we do it, what the Act and regulations talk about, and it's quite important, and here's Drew. So, I've got - I was expecting 30. I've got 30 copies here, first come, first serve, but get on the website, and do it, and maybe you want to talk about some of this stuff.

DREW ANNABLE: Yeah, I'll maybe fill in a little bit here.

TIM HARTLEY: I like Drew because he's got white hair.

DREW ANNABLE: He calls me grandpa. He says when I go into an office for these field visits, it looks like grandpa's coming with some sage advice. So, this handout is up here, but since we've got a fair amount of time, maybe I'll go through some of the items here that are in it and just talk about them a bit.

Field notes should illustrate the extent of the field investigation for physical evidence. One of the things that we do suggest is that you're not always showing your investigation for evidence, or of found evidence, but also what you didn't find, where your crews have looked for monuments, and could not find them, to record that fact.

We also like to point out that, these are not just things that you should do but also, they are helping you. We like to point out that a lot of this is developing efficiencies that are going to help you and your practice to make the survey go by quicker, but also create a record for the future. So, when your own crews are coming back 3 years, 20 years from then, to pick up that page of field notes, they can see at that point in time they didn't find a monument there. Now I'm finding a monument there, so that - these are some of the reasons as well. Normally, over time, these things have developed for a reason, a practical reason to carry out our profession in a good efficient fashion for the betterment of establishing the cadastre and maintaining it.

TIM HARTLEY: It's been over 20 years he's developed over the life of the SRD.

DREW ANNABLE: Also, in showing the evidence found, two bars will always form a straight line, right? So that these are things we like to point out. You need supporting evidence. Not just the minimum amount of evidence to retrace a boundary, but also supporting evidence that are going to be in support of it, but perhaps conflict of it as well, but don't just rely on two points. These are things that we do see on a regular basis that we're pointing out here as well.

Now evidence also monuments should be placed from evidence. This is a regulated item that is from both sides, so you're not just pushing found evidence and pushing it to establish a monument. No, you need to find evidence on the other side of it to ensure that it's being placed properly, and perhaps you need to take section 55 of the Surveys Act into accord when you're doing that, and maybe some proportioning or whatever is involved.

This moves into the integration part of it, and integration is obviously a regular part of field activity these days. But the measurements you're making when you're integrating a survey should be recorded. A lot of the time that's obviously digital, and trends downloaded digitally, but there should be some permanent record beyond just a digital transfer of that information.

The scale factor should be recorded as well. Many times, that comes from the equipment in the field mat, so it should be recorded on the field notes. Tim alluded to this as well, that the method and progression of the survey should be clearly illustrated on the field notes, and when we say field notes, we're talking primarily about the sketch, although Tim referred to his field note package which includes the sketch, the raw data, maybe a list of coordinates, maybe a list of instructions.

I like to hand this out when I'm doing office visits, I'm not too sure who prepared it,

but it came from somebody who looked at this quite a few years ago. Their total station preparation of field notes, and there was a suggested package that should be contained in that field note, or items that should be contained in that field note package that they list there, and it's still as relevant today as when it was probably produced 20 - 25 years ago.

But that includes the field note sketch, the raw data, list of coordinates, perhaps some notes about some of the attention, condition of monuments can go in the notes. A lot of the time the condition of the monument can be quite relevant because when you get back to your office and doing your calculations, and you're finding a monument is not fitting, you're looking at the field notes and the party chief hasn't said anything about it. So, if they get into the habit of stating the monument looks okay or giving some comments of it, then there may be some hint it has actually has been disturbed.

I like to point out that some of these things also speak so that your CAD people aren't forever getting on the phone bothering the party chief, asking them questions and that, so that if the field notes sort of tell the whole story then it saves that activity.

Excuse me. I'm just reading as - this is the - this comes out of the guidelines as well. This isn't a regulation, but just sort of an efficiency thing. Again, when you're making up your field note paper to create all these prompts, and the guidelines list a lot of them that should be there - things like the name and address of the survey organization, the company file number, the names and duties of the field party, weather, geographic location, page number, the number of pages - Tim talked about that - the names of the streets as they are posted, not what they think the street should be, but have a look at the street sign and write down the posted name of the street as it is.

Because with this day of the 911 kind of thing where you've got street names changing, and coming about, they're the eyes of the ground, so they're telling you what they've seen on the street. Every now and again that creates a bit of an issue. Obviously north point.

The survey equipment used. We see surveys a lot that are just really point sketches, a series of point numbers on the sketch and nothing more. You wonder, was it purely a total station survey, purely GPS survey or a combination of both? So, listing the equipment used will help you do that.

The units of measure - there's still some people doing work imperially, but legible printing. Boy we see a lot of illegible printing and that, so clear as Tim mentioned, this is an art, and an art that needs to be continually worked at.

The party chief needs to understand they're not making these field notes just for today. They're making it for others to look at in the future, but particularly others in

their office. That is the CAD person, supervising OLS.

People have to be able to read their field notes, and sure maybe they're in a hurry in the field or under conditions that maybe not are ideal for printing and that, but it needs to be thought through that other people need to read what they're writing. The coordinate framework, if it's an integrated survey, the coordinate framework that they're working under should be noted as well.

Traverses and traverse points. As I said there's a lot of field notes that are just point numbers and point sketches. You have no idea of the procedures, the progress of the survey. So not only points in the little triangle saying this is my traverse points map, but how did this traverse network work, kind of thing? Tim mentioned it should be either a closed loop, or some way of checking that traverse out in points that are laid out from the traverse map. But certainly, as the parcel gets larger it should definitely be a closed loop because now it's not only the blunders you're looking for but the accuracy areas, and that closed traverse loop should be balanced out in the calculation stage.

If there are hanging lines - Tim mentioned this - the field notes should clearly show the checks that are made, and I think it was Paul Wyman again way back in the SRD presentations that were done about 15 years ago, came up with the number of - I'd like to hand that out too - a number of different ideas for the couple of checks on hanging lines that the party chiefs, if they just get into thinking this way, we like to point some of them out. If you've got a couple of monuments that have been set, and they're easily measured between each other, get a tape out and measure between them. That's a really nice check and I have surveyors tell me they try to tell their party chiefs to do that. They go set a bunch of monuments, and they've got a bunch of monuments that are a meter or two apart and they can easily measure it, but they never take the time to do that, but a great check, it doesn't take very long.

In housing kind of surveys, measuring the walls of the housing provides some independent checks in themselves. One-person crews, cloth tape can do that sort of thing. Even the OLS, this is the other thing while I'm thinking of it, the OLSs themselves should be in the field on occasion checking their crew's work, take a cloth tape with you, do some of this quick checking yourself, but measurements from the corner of the house, to a corner bar, fence post, or something. These things that are easily done in the field, very quick, but are providing a very nice, clean independent measurement. This is long isn't it?

The raw data should be part of the field note package. A lot of times we don't see that. If you're submitting your field notes to any sort of an organization, or they're being sent to another survey organization for their requests for information, the raw data is really part and parcel of the field note package that should go with them. The raw data and the field note sketch should relate one to another so that the full progression of the survey can be understood and realized.

Things on the field notes, terms such as set, held, measured, calculated, measured and calculated. We see a lot of bearings and distances between bars set. Then you wonder, is that something that was actually measured in the field? Or is that just a calculated thing? Which is fine, could be a check, but that's where you pick out terms like if it's measured, then it should be something that's actually measured on the ground rather than an inverse between two points. That's maybe where you might want to reserve the word calculated for that.

The point numbers for field notes as Tim mentioned, the sketch should be showing the boundary or the evidence that went into the boundary, all the features in and around the boundary, the buildings, other vital points, utility lines that are on them. They should all be shown on the sketch, with their associated point numbers.

You might be out picking up some other topographic features which may be of interest, driveways, or certain trees, that sort of thing, that they may be getting a little cumbersome trying to pack that all into a sketch page. If it isn't reserved just through the raw data or something of that nature. So, it's a water boundary, and you're picking up the water boundary, then put on the sketch that points 3,000 to 3,030 water boundary, kind of thing, so that when somebody's going through the raw data they can clearly see not only on the raw data, but the sketch that these are the points that represent whatever it is, water boundary, certain topo information.

Certainly, the origin of monuments, and if they have trouble coming up with that origin, that it clearly be stated on the field notes. Not just saying nothing means they couldn't find it. There should be some notation about that. I mentioned showing the condition of every bar they find.

Fences and other occupational features along a boundary obviously should be shown. Al likes to point out - Al Worobec does our field inspections for us and he likes to point out a lot of the time he's in the field and looking at a boundary, and there's a fence that was clearly there at the time of the survey, and it's plain as the eyes on your face that it's there, and how did it get missed, yet it's not on the plan. How did it get missed?

A similar situation just recently observed some utility lines that are going across our property to a neighboring house, got missed, Al found it, took some pictures of it, and in another situation there's a corner of the property that doesn't have a monument on it, and yet Al's finding a monument on the ground.

You find out that these things - and when you talk to the surveyor about it, it's actually in the raw data, but it didn't get on the sketch. So, when they're downloaded into the CAD machine they're downloaded as just an array of points, and lines, different colors, and all the rest of it, hidden lines over the top of lines. These things easily get missed in the preparation of the plan. So, if there's some warning of it on the field notes, here's this hydro line, it's a warning to not only the CAD operator but the supervising OLS as well, that they see it on the sketch, so they hunt for those points in the raw data.

AL WOROBEK: Drew, I can add another point too. When I get back and I'm doing my summary report that carries onto Drew and Doug here, I'll sort of say - I'll often come up with a Google Street View, or any aerial imagery, and maybe it wasn't there when something was done six months or a year prior, so I can give the surveyors the benefit of the doubt that maybe it wasn't there when they were there, but then I can pull up a Google Street View - so if your drafting people are scratching their head, that's an excellent resource, it's dated like everything, but I don't often go oh yeah, it was there two years prior to the field survey. So that driveway, or fence, or hedge should've been picked up. Like Drew said it is certainly - maybe somewhere there's a point number in the raw data, but because it wasn't graphically illustrated on the field notes, in the field at the time, it got missed by two or three other people that touched the file.

DREW ANNABLE: Here's the microphone so it helps everybody.

REYNALDO ISIP: Reynaldo from MTO. Our system in MTO, every feature has a layer, and has a feature code that when you download it, it can show if it's a bar found, a tree, building corners, anything that you - so it's like field notes because when you download it into AutoCAD it will read all the features and it shows everything that was found on the ground.

If the surveyors did not find, it will just locate, there's a note on the point that no bar found, or no bars, or the condition of the bar is bent or damaged, disturbed. Near the point number there's a code that says bar damaged, or bar bent. I'm not sure, probably most of you using the same system, you have a coding system in your AutoCAD, that will grade all the points and then you download the points. It will show all of the topographical, and legal survey features that are found on the ground. So I think in the future, this can replace the field notes, the handwritten field notes. You can have it, download it, print, it and it's the field notes, because that's the condition in the field.

TIM HARTLEY: All the buttons are pushed.

AL WOROBEK: I agree that the point coding is a very efficient way. We were doing that in the '90s, having Z coding, but that's only as good as the person out in the field going like this, and if the person walks down the street, goes down the road another 100 feet, or couldn't get that shot, had to get it from the next set up, that's what we're finding, that point coding out in the field is where it either fell apart because the fence crossed the line and got miscoded.

So, it boils down to you're relying solely on the point coding done in the field. Yes, their eyes are out there and they're coding it while they're in the field, but somewhere along that, if it's coded in the field, at least if it's drawn graphically, there is a flag that can be raised and doesn't make it to the final plan and in front of a judge.

REYNALDO ISIP: I think you're thinking of the '90s.

AL WOROBEK: No, no, no.

REYNALDO ISIP: 2018, going forward, it is a different world from when we grew up.

DREW ANNABLE: Sir, it's 2018, but I can tell you that Doug and I have been doing these reviews going into offices where the work is being done today, things are being missed all the time.

REYNALDO ISIP: The problem is now people that grew up with the computers. They seldom use their hand to print. That's why the one that prepared the field notes, the legibility is so bad, you cannot rely on them. You cannot train a 30 year-old or 40-year old writing legibly. If he has been doing it - I mean if he has been in the computers for several years, it would be very hard probably.

TIM HARTLEY: But you know what? It's a great skill to have, especially if you're a surveyor, to be able to write. Andrew, you had a question?

ANDREW: [unintelligible].

REYNALDO ISIP: What I'm talking about is, we're still doing field notes, but I think in the future, that will replace - the technology will replace the field notes.

UNKNOWN MALE: I'm sure that's what they said in the early 1900's. You go back and look at stuff done in the 1700's, they're going to change it, well, we're still researching information done in the 1700s, and it's done by field notes. It's a historical record. I don't think that will ever change.

DREW ANNABLE: Getting back to my list here, next question or comment - would you mind using the microphone?

UNKNOWN MALE: They said when they invented computers there would be no more paper.

COLE RAIKES: I got a question, then, when I'm taking pictures in the field I like to write where - the direction that the pictures are coming from, and I wouldn't be able to put that on the CAD.

So, in the field notes if I'm taking pictures, if I have a fence, a picket fence or a wire fence, or sometimes that gets misconstrued by the guys in the field, and people in the office - just says wood fence, or is that a snake rail fence? Is that a [unintelligible] fence?

You take a picture and you have the drawing of the photo in the direction. Even if you label it photo one, photo two, or whoever's in the office doing drafting, they can look at the field notes and say what kind of fence is this? Photo number one, then you have the photos listed, and it makes it easier to draft a plan if you have proper field notes.

If you just have the CAD there's a ton of questions at that stage when you're doing drafting, and a lot of the time the only way you can settle those questions is from the field notes that are drawn.

REYNALDO ISIP: By looking at them.

COLE RAIKES: I was just saying that field notes are always going to be important in my opinion.

DREW ANNABLE: Anyway, moving along here. Where elevations are involved in the survey, we all too frequently say absolutely nothing in the field notes we get and see about how those elevations were derived at, and now, obviously a lot of it by GPS, but there's obviously nothing written down about it, whether there was any verification. We often mention that, not just to depend on the network that you're involved in, but maybe take some information on a published benchmark to verify your equipment and that sort of thing. All of this should be written down.

The plans should be prepared from a current survey and not just partially or fully compiled, unless statutes permit it in certain situations. Sure, you go back to sites time and time again, but the work that you're doing today should have their own field notes and be recorded in today's field notes, not just copied on the old field notes.

They can refer back to the old field notes from maybe a year ago when you were last on the site or whatever, but each stage of the work should have their own set of notes.

We talked about verification of measurement. The calculations that go along with a job - if there's been office calculations to come up and assess evidence and make determinations as to where the bar should be set, that's maybe your ultimate methodology.

If they can be part of the field note package then there should be a sketch that goes along with that and the decisions that were made, which should then become part of the field note package if you're not going to put your method on your field notes. Again, all too frequently, the interests, third party interests on the ground seem to get missed a lot, particularly the utility lines that are overhead. There's a lot of the times there are missed eaves. So, some of this stuff is easily missed needs looking up.

One of the things that catches those quite easily are pictures. We strongly suggest you incorporate pictures as a routine part of the field crew's activity, and that helps with the CAD plan preparation at the CAD stage, and particularly for the OLS checking the site as well, and to look back on, and maybe even part of the delivery can be a picture or two of the site. We sometimes see survey plans that are SRPRs kinds of things with a picture of it incorporated into the drawing of it up in the corner as well.

The origin of evidence, again, we talked about that. Sometimes they may not be able to get the number off the bar, but they know very well it came from a certain survey organization. That can be noted on the field notes. Getting into some, this is getting beyond the field note preparation, but while we're at it, field procedures involved monumentation issues, so we've got this on this handout as well.

Monuments shall be set at every point that defines a corner of a unit of land, and at intervals that are not greater than 150 meters in built up areas and 300 meters elsewhere. So, it's at a corner, not near a corner, but it's at the corner. If you think about the survey being done for members of the public, if you were having a survey done you're paying big bucks to have that survey done. You walk out - you expect to see a monument on your corner.

Witness monuments can only be set - they can only be set because there's an obstacle on that corner. That's the only legitimate reason for a witness monument, but the field notes should record what that obstacle was, and that clearly should be displayed on the plan.

The other times - I think we get to that here. Of course, a quarter, number of the angles of the unit of plan should be a cut cross, rock bar, rock post, or standard iron bar. Should have - corners made under competent authority should be marked by a cut cross, rock post, standard iron bar. That's corners of regional township surveys, crown land surveys, your lot corner ties.

If you're going to re-establish that as opposed to copying it from an underlying plan or if it's part of your survey, it has to have an SIB added, not an IB. There's times when you have to put SIBs in and that's one of them.

UNKNOWN MALE: One in four doesn't apply to an SRPR though right?

DREW ANNABLE: An SRPR is a plan of survey, so that one in four rule comes with all plans of survey. You don't have to put - the SRPR does allow you to not have to mark - add monument, the rear lines -

UNKNOWN MALE: The rear lines can be one in four, can it be four IB?

TIM HARTLEY: If that was on the original plan, like a modern planned subdivision, if it's all iron bars, yeah. You don't have to go beyond what was on that

plan of subdivision.

DREW ANNABLE: One line, monumenting one line on easements with parallel sides, but they must be again, cut cross, rock bar, standard iron bar, and the one side needs to be a monument and not just this one here at this time and the other side the other side, the same side being monumented.

Now with the SRPR, while we're at that subject, if it's a commercial property - I'm surprised how many people don't realize this— condominiums, apartment buildings, industrial commercial properties and that have to be fully monumented SRPRs.

TIM HARTLEY: Plan of surveys.

DREW ANNABLE: Yeah, we say they all have to be a plan of survey, but the residential SRPR is a plan of survey with special monumentation allowances.

Witness monuments, when you do have to set a witness monument, no closer than a meter to the corner. The purpose of the witness monument is nit because whoops, we put the bar in the wrong spot, and we saved ourselves going back. We're going to call it off 0.3, 0.2, whatever, that it has to be a reason for a witness monument, an obstacle on the corner.

Route surveys require SIBs or cut crosses, et cetera, at their corners. In a route survey, like as in a street - if you're doing a reference plan where you have to give up a part at the front for a widening, that's going to become a part of the route, so all the corners of that part you're making for the widening have to be SIBs, not IBs, or daylight triangle that you may be creating as a condition of the severance.

You may be surveying the private lands beside the route, but you're surveying a line that it part of a route. So, the rules become involved, in those situations.

The other times for noting in the field notes where a SIB cannot be used, where the regulations require an SIB, but for various reasons a full four footer can't be put in where you have to resort to a plastic bar and SSIB. It is an acceptable replacement, but only under conditions where a four-footer could not be put in, and none of those is where I don't want to spend the money on a four-footer. The field notes should be recording what reason that was that you could not apply the regulation monument in those situations. Buried utilities are a fully acceptable reason, but the field notes should be recorded, that buried utilities are known or suspected so that plastic bar perhaps was set.

Finding a disturbed monument on a corner that you're surveying and leaving it as such is not doing the public any favor. You should be pulling that disturbed monument out and setting your own monument on the corner, again the public having every right to expect that you're surveying their property and leaving a monument on their corner.

If you're finding a monument on the corner that you cannot agree with and you want to call it a witness so far this way, and so far that way, you're not doing the client any service. They expect that monument and think that monument is on the corner, but you're telling them really not. You're expecting that they understand that. We suggest you carefully record where that monument was, whose monument it was, and that sort of thing. You remove it and you put your own monument on the corner that you're defining.

DAVE WILEY: Excuse me, Drew, Dave Wiley. So, you're suggesting if I find and disagree with a fellow surveyor's monument that's at a corner that's in good condition that I pull it out and put my own in, in that corner?

DREW ANNABLE: Yes. You might want to talk to them first about that.

DAVE WILEY: If there's no indication that this monument was put in as a witness, or that it's been disturbed, or for any other reasons than it disagrees with my survey - so I'm to instruct my party chiefs that if they come across somebody else's bar when they're doing their survey that they pull up that bar and put in their own?

DREW ANNABLE: I'm not suggesting it's a willy-nilly kind of thing to do. If you're disagreeing with it, you need to get to the bottom of why you're disagreeing with it, but in the end, your client is paying to have a monument set at their corner, and if you have a legitimate reason for disagreeing with it, we're not doing the public any favor by putting two monuments on the corner.

DAVE WILEY: I'm certainly not suggesting that. I'm suggesting that it's not as simple as pulling the bar out and putting in our own. I've seen that in the past where a party chief has come along, came across with bars that disagreed, pulled them out, put in their own, without any consideration of, anyway, due process to checking with the other surveyor, to see what's going on, see if there's a conflict. So, I think that has to be viewed with a fair bit of caution.

TIM HARTLEY: You have to have better evidence. Let's not argue trivialities. If it's just a few centimeters, agree with it, because the court doesn't argue trivialities. Someone put that bar in and put it in with their best intentions, so unless you've got some really good evidence -

DREW ANNABLE: Because it's something if you come across a monument, a correct replacement, or a monument that has been placed with due diligence by another firm, I think it behooves us to at least view that very carefully, in light of our own survey before we disturb that.

UNKNOWN MALE: Agreed. There's situations where you may be using the same evidence but you're finding the monument in a location that doesn't appear like - perhaps it is - I think we've all heard stories of construction companies pulling a bar

out, then doing the work, and then putting it back in the ground, so it could be those kinds of reasons as well.

DREW ANNABLE: The traverse that you show in your plan when you have a natural boundary that you are tying into a traverse you created - first of all you have to do that to create a closed unit on your survey. So, you have to do that. That traverse is going to allow that closed unit. That traverse has to be a monumented traverse.

In these situations that we talked about where for instance you're finding a disturbed monument on the corner, and pulling it out and putting your own in, pulling it out and straightening out the other surveyor's bar and putting it back in the corner is not what we're suggesting. You're now putting back into a corner that's your opinion, so that should be your bar with an open square symbol on your plan that you're putting on that corner.

I guess we're getting - that's pretty well the extent of this handout. Doug, were there any other things you wanted to mention?

DOUG REITSMA: Actually, I'd like to take a bit of a different route at this late in the day and maybe put you all on a bit of a guilt trip. I've been doing this, for 10 and a half years, and Drew's been doing it for 6, and we both had full heads of hair when we started this, and it's all because of your field notes, so smarten up, I want my hair back.

UNKNOWN MALE: I just have a couple of questions for Tim. The first one is that last slide, that statement on there, you haven't cited your source for that. I was just wondering if that was Orville Ralston, or JJ Newman, or the Dalai Lama?

TIM HARTLEY: [unintelligible].

UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah?

TIM HARTLEY: Me.

UNKNOWN MALE: Oh! So, I can cite that in the future, Tim Hartley, 2018?

TIM HARTLEY: You can carve it in stone.

UNKNOWN MALE: Perfect. The other question is a really important one for those of us who are approaching retirement. Oh, you're not listening. Sorry. This is just a really important question for those of us approaching retirement. Are you going to teach us how to tie that fly?

TIM HARTLEY: It's like taking field notes. It's an art form. That fly is simply a bit of Pearsall's silk tied around a hook with the breast feather of a mottled English

partridge.

UNKNOWN MALE: Follow that, Travis.

TRAVIS HARTWICK: Travis Hardwick from Pakenham. Three things. Number one, thanks for the very thorough and complete review of the notes. I certainly appreciated it. It was a good talk, and the time you put into it. The second thing, I'm just wondering if maybe Al, or Drew, or Tim, you have a list of maybe the top three pet peeves that you see on field notes, then maybe the converse of that, have you seen a set of field notes that are like an "Aha!" moment and something you can share with the group saying, this isn't in the regulations, this isn't what you need to do, but this is a pretty cool idea that other people have done?

TIM HARTLEY: Actually in just simple points, because we've done this for a five year period, you've all had a peek at what Drew and I have been doing as far as reviews, and maybe you all know this individually, and maybe not collectively, is that if you look under that field procedure heading, there's always those first three points, and they deal with administration details, and they deal with the illustration and definition of your evidence and features, in the coordination of that, and the method that you used and the verification. That's it in a nutshell, and we reiterate those things and then we talk about those details, so I think if there's main points, that's the main points of field notes, period.

DREW ANNABLE: As those of you that have gone through the reviews know that we have an evaluation system that we break out. The four segments of the review are the research, the field notes, field procedures, the plans, and the correspondence, but it was this segment under field and field notes, and the field procedures which tends to drive up the evaluation points. I guess Travis, the field notes - there are the exceptions. We see some greatly drawn and prepared field notes, some of them actually coming from MTO. There's Marvin in the back.

And I think it's perhaps because of the technology that's available today where not as much needs to be written down, but field notes are not done to the same quality I think in the general sense as they used to be in the earlier days.

I mentioned this to Tim the other day. Back at AGM in London, those of you that are a little bit longer in the tooth may remember when Bob Coad was the Surveyor General, we had at the AGM Bob Coad's firm's records, and his dad's before him, and people of that era where they had these small pages, books for doing the field notes, it was a work of art. It was even smaller than that. The work of art, the amount of information that they were able to get in those small pages very clearly, and concisely drawn in that, and understandable, and that was an art. That's one of the things, it is just the sketchy, sloppy way, they're put together is far too common and needs to be addressed.

When we talk to OLS's in the office visit about this frequently they say we're all the

time hammering our party chiefs about it, but party chiefs are worth their weight in gold anymore, and they know it, and you don't have a hammer to hold over their head, so you need to convince them of the value of starting off well, preparing their field notes well, how it's adding to the efficiency of the operation, and sure it may take them a little bit longer in the field to do it, but by the time you get to the end of the job it's really adding to the efficiency in that. So, help them to realize why they're making - because they're only thinking for today. They're not thinking about 10 years from now, somebody looking back on their field notes or anybody else thinking about them. So that's part of it.

TIM HARTLEY: This brings up another question. There's an old saying. Field notes align to make a plan easier. There's an old saying that an engineer can do something for a dollar that any fool can do for two. So, if you're making those field notes, make them detailed, good notes. It's not that expensive but it really saves you a lot of money down the line.

AL WOROBEK: Just to carry on with what Travis was saying, I've seen all kinds of spectacular field notes. I've seen field notes in jobs where the crew had gathered all kinds of wonderful evidence, but they forgot to look up, and there was a major hydro line running inside the limits. But yeah, there are some really good field notes out there that make me like, oh my gosh, I wish I could do these.

But like Drew was saying, all too often, really I think you've got to consider giving your drafting people magician pay because I truly do not understand how you can look at these field notes, and look at a beautiful plan, and that plan looks beautiful until another surveyor 20 years down the road comes along and says hey, they must have joined some long line work here because that fence is definitely not on the side of that line, or whatever.

Then sometimes on the, some water boundaries, if there's a creek or something traversing the property, and the field crew's perhaps not sure whether it's navigable or not navigable, it's just noting it on the field note that there's some type of stream, entering one side of the property. You don't necessarily have to stop and tying in all the stream, but if at least on the field notes it showed the general area where it crossed the line or where it exited, sometimes those are the things that can come in handy.

DREW ANNABLE: Things like creeks are a form of an easement really so they should be noted in the field notes that they exist no matter what they go through to pick it up, but it is something that should be noted on the field notes.

This is a fairly concise list, although it is four pages long, but we'd like to suggest that you have your internal party chief seminars, off hours, whether you do it once a year or whatever, but you take a list like this and go over it. It's a matter of selling your staff, of the benefits of this kind of thing. I hate to keep repeating it, but they're the ones doing this work for the most part. I realize there's probably people in the

work who do everything themselves and that. You're welcome to these lists. Unfortunately, I guess we've only got [unintelligible].

TIM HARTLEY: It's on the website.

DREW ANNABLE: It's on the website and that, but these are nice concise lists to use for that kind of purpose, so go ahead and use it. I'm sorry sir. You were -

DAVE WILEY: That's okay. Dave Wiley from Ottawa. I just have a general comment that ties in field note production as well as our digital world and field drafting, using automatic equipment nowadays. I've found that a lot of times field crews will be downloading their pick-up and walk away from their pick-up with no comment on it. My belief and what I've tried to implement over the years was that the field crews, when they download they have to review that download and do any corrections. I'm sure everybody has had numerous instances where the crews have done a coding error and they haven't made a comment on their notes about that coding error, or they've just forgotten about it, but if they download it, and it's a legible download, not coordinates, but the actual field pick-up, then they can correct their own download, and that's attached to the file - because oftentimes there is missed coding, or something wrong, or a left offset, instead of a right offset that the crews know about and remember but they haven't commented on. By commenting on their download after they printed it off, that gives them an opportunity to put that information there.

TIM HARTLEY: So, if it looks right, it probably is right.

UNKNOWN MALE: The download should be recognizable, so you can identify the methodology that goes on, where they've been setting up, where they're pointing, what they're picking up, and that sort of thing. It shouldn't just be a page of Greek, and apologies to people of Greek heritage.

TIM HARTLEY: Anyways, thank you all for coming. I think it's Scotch time right now. You can grab some of those.

UNKNOWN MALE: You said these are on the website?

TIM HARTLEY: Yes. The SRD portion of the website.

End of recording.

--- Whereupon Day 2 of the conference concluded,
at 5:00 p.m.

Friday, March 2nd, 2018 – Niagara Falls, Ontario

--- Upon resuming, at 8:30 a.m.

BUSINESS SESSION:

RUSS HOGAN: Okay, let's see here. Okay. The standard measure is in place and the meeting can now reconvene. I want to remind you to silence your cell phones - hold on, we haven't started yet. Okay. I want to remind you to silence your cell phones and other electronic devices. Open Forum will commence, following our reports, and after coffee. Please take note that motions must be in writing, with a mover and seconder.

Present the motion in writing to the Resolutions Committee, Anna and Nancy. Penny and Julia will be available to work with you in typing up any motions that you may want. We will then have them projected on the screen, prior to any vote. Voting will be by show of hands. Now, we have reports. First up, President. I've got to tell you, I'm going to warn you, that what I have to say this morning is exactly the same thing I know I've been saying the last two days.

You've heard about these things through other presentations and seminars, but bear with me anyway. I've also been told that you've got to hear things about 12 times before you remember you've heard them.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT: CLOSING REMARKS

My term as President is now over. My, what an experience. It's been a good experience. Challenging, at times, but always very rewarding. As I reflect on the year, I'm surprised at how quickly time passes.

I'm humbled by how challenging it is to accomplish everything that needs to be done. When I first decided to volunteer for Council back in 2010, a key driver for that was our demographics. I'd just seen Blain's first breakdown, which everybody now has memorized, of our demographics, and it concerned me, and it still concerns me. I know I've heard from a lot of other people.

There are some who don't think there is any issue at all. There's those that think, yeah, we've got to watch it, but it's not a big issue. But, I'm one that thinks that we've got to be really careful, at least for the near future, that we do everything we can to maintain enough surveyors to service the public. When I became President, I stated that we need to promote and grow our profession. We need to continue to

raise awareness of the profession, and employment opportunities in surveying, in order to encourage students to pursue a career in surveying.

It's not the only issue that impacts our association, however I do believe it's one of the most critical. Though the number of surveyors who've joined the association in the last few years is very encouraging - especially this year, 17, which is great - our overall numbers continue to decline. On the positive note, we've got the number of articling surveyors has increased considerably.

I believe that this is largely due to the efforts of the Public Awareness Committee and the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee. One of the things we have noted recently is that not all students who start their articles complete them. Why is this? We're not really sure. Unfortunately, there are no exit interviews undertaken when a student terminates their articles, so at this time we can only make assumptions about their departures.

I would like to see AERC - and we've had this conversation recently at Council - we'd like to see AERC formulate and undertake an exit interview with a student who chooses to terminate their articles, so we can start to find out what the issues are or if there are barriers that we can address. Is it a reflection of their work experience? Or, is it that they really didn't understand what it was like to be a surveyor until they got into their articles?

Thinking back to our keynote speaker - I was trying to remember the term he used? I think "post-card description," or something? Everything looks pretty rosy until you get there, and it's not what you thought it was. I think we need to do a good job to ensure that students understand, before they get into the articling process, that they really understand what they're getting into.

I would ask that all articling surveyors and survey companies give their articling student meaningful work and do everything they can to help the student to become engaged in the profession, and to want to become an OLS. Our Strategic Planning session was held at the end of March, and once again, developing new members was one of the top priorities. Along with that, there was legislative and regulatory changes, marketing strategy, and succession planning.

That rounded out the top priorities. You've heard about most of these over the past couple of days, but I'd like to recap just a bit. As part of the effort to developing new neighbours - new neighbours, hold on. I didn't get a lot of sleep last night. Sorry.

As part of the effort to developing new members, the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee has been working to increase the number of secondary schools that offer the Specialist High Skillss Major surveying certification program, as well as promoting surveying as a profession to guidance counsellors at school boards. These are both very important initiatives, but they need your help. They need your help in approaching school boards, making presentations to guidance counsellors,

and supporting the teachers delivering the SHSM program. Please volunteer. I understand that complete presentations with notes are available to any OLS who can take the time to discuss their profession with a guidance counsellor in your school district.

York University, Lassonde School of Engineering has a Geomatics Engineering program and we also have the Geomatics Science program there now. The AOLS went to work with the university to promote both those programs in an effort to increase the number of students entering geomatics. As we saw the other day, their numbers are pretty small. Certainly, they are a small fish in a big pond, when it comes to both engineering in the first place, but also York itself.

So, we need to do what we can to help them increase their numbers. In addition to that, the AOLS obviously wants the students in those programs to become Ontario Land Surveyors. Blain and I have both met several times with representatives from York to try to identify opportunities for us to interact with students and make our pitch for the profession. I know Maureen has done a lot of work in this respect and continues to.

Blain had the opportunity to attend one of the classes at York, to talk about AOLS just within the last month, and I understand it was quite successful. Blain and I also had an opportunity to meet a few of the York students last night. I'm not sure if others were at the Hard Rock Club and had the opportunity to talk to those students a bit last night, but they are quite enthusiastic, and it was great to see such a strong turnout of students at our AGM.

Legislation and Regulation Task Force was formed to review legislation regulations that affect the association. Eric gave us an update on what's happening there. What we're trying to do is to identify any amendments necessary to keep our legislation and regulations current and effective. Work is well underway. The goal is to make changes that have a positive impact on everyone. The surveyor, the association, and the public.

When the work is complete, the recommendations will come, for the proposed changes will be presented and discussed with the membership. As you've heard, it will take some time to work through the process, but I'm sure that you will be hearing more throughout the year, and hopefully we'll be able to get out to some of the regional groups to generate more discussion there.

Developing a marketing strategy to increase awareness of the value land surveyors create for society, and the attractiveness of the profession as a career, was seen an ideal initiative to undertake collaboratively with our sister associations across the country. To facilitate this initiative, the AOLS organized and hosted a one-day workshop led by Ken Wong, professor in marketing at Queen's University.

The workshop was attended by representatives from most of the provinces, the ACLS, and Professional Surveyors Canada. At the end of the day, all the representatives in attendance agreed that improving our communications with government, industry, and the public is a strategic priority, and recommended that our land surveying associations form a national working group tasked with a goal of developing a joint public relations strategy for land surveying.

Although we, the Association, have struggled to move it forward, there continues to be a desire by the majority of the organizations to collaborate on an initiative of this nature. It is my hope that we'll be able to move forward in 2018. Another initiative related to marketing is undertaking of a salary survey. Obviously, a key factor for anyone trying to decide on a career path is good information about salary and long-term earning potential.

To ensure that we have accurate and up to date information about the remuneration that surveyors receive, we are preparing to undertake a salary survey early in 2018. We're working with representatives from a number of the other associations across the country to develop the survey, that will be sent to surveyors across Canada. I encourage all members to take the time needed to respond and to provide accurate information. It's in the best interest of our profession.

Having a succession plan in place for senior AOLS staff positions is important for the efficient and effective operation of the association. The demographic of the association's OLS staff is no different than the demographics of the membership as a whole. They're nearing retirement. The manager of the Survey Review Department, Tim, as you've heard, will be retiring this spring. And, as you've also heard, Bill has indicated his intention to retire at the end of 2018. I keep hoping that we can change his mind, but he seems pretty set.

The combined talent and expertise of these staff members will be sorely missed. On a positive note, our Executive Director has agreed to a contract extension, which will help to mitigate the challenges that may arise from these pending retirements. The Executive Committee is working closely with Blain to manage these changes, and to ensure that the AOLS office continues to function effectively.

Other important issues. Professional Standards Committee spent considerable time - and we've heard this, too - and effort the last couple of years, reviewing the use and misuse of sketches. They submitted their recommendations to Council in late 2017, and there's been a few back and forths, and we still haven't landed that one, unfortunately. They've recommended that the existing guidelines for sketches be updated, and that's been the thing that we haven't really seemed to have solidified, I guess, is what those changes will be.

But, they are also recommending that the expectations imposed by the guidelines be communicated to our members. That we have educational sessions regarding sketches, and that sketches be subject to review by the Survey Review Department. I

commend the work done by PSC, and I agree that the education of our members, and review by SRD, are key to eliminating the misuse of sketches.

As you heard the other day, the board of directors of ODCC has recommended to Council that the business of ODCC be wound down, and the corporation be dissolved. The process to dissolve the Ontario Digital Cadastre Corporation is currently underway. I'd like to commend Bruce Baker and all of the Board of Directors, and everyone else who was involved in ODCC in any way. I'd like to thank everyone for the time and effort they put into making ODCC a success.

As a gesture of appreciation for the efforts expended by the ODCC, and in the interest of maintaining good relationships with surveyors, MPAC has offered to build a survey records index application, at no cost to the association, and provide access to multiple layers of data, including assessment and ownership mapping. The AOLS will be required to pay a relatively low annual maintenance cost.

This is an excellent opportunity for the association and brings the implementation of a province-wide survey records index one step closer. Attending the other provincial association meetings provides an opportunity to share information and to gain a different perspective on issues that challenge the survey profession across Canada. A lot of the issues and challenges that we face in Ontario are the same in many other provinces.

The Presidents of the other associations are all enthusiastic about not only sharing information, but also collaborating to tackle these issues together. This isn't something new. I'm sure you've heard this from other Presidents in the past, but it is truly remarkable how energetic and enthusiastic surveyors are all across this country. As I mentioned before, I was able to bring two Ontario initiatives to the Presidents Forum for consideration, those being a national marketing strategy and a national salary survey, and both were met with positive response. I believe that undertaking these sorts of initiatives on a national scale will provide better results for all surveyors in Canada. Although some issues take longer than expected to resolve, much has been accomplished over the course of the last year. I'd like to thank Council and all the committees and task forces for their time and efforts to move our initiatives forward.

Finally, I'd like to acknowledge and thank Council, Executive Director Blain Martin, and all of the AOLS staff for their hard work and commitment for the betterment of the Association. Without the efforts of every one of them, we would not be able to meet the expectation of both the membership and the public. It has truly been an honour to serve as President, and I thank everyone for the support you have provided throughout the year. Thanks.

Next up, Al.

FINANCIAL AND BUDGET REPORT

AL JERAJ: Good morning, ladies, and gentlemen. My name is Al Jeraj, and I'm your Finance Councillor for this year. This presentation is slightly longer than the speech I gave on Wednesday, when I thanked everyone for their support in my bid for Vice President, but not much longer.

This morning I will be presenting the 2017 financial statements, the 2018 budget, we'll have a look at our investments, and I will speak briefly about the current fee bylaw, and our plan to move forward.

Based on the audited statements, which I'm sure everyone has read, the Association made a profit of \$164,000 in 2017. So, I see what's going on, you guys are just holding your applause until the end of the presentation, that's great. Thank you.

Some may notice that the audited statements and the statements prepared by staff differ slightly, but that's just due to the way items are allocated. This year we plan to work with staff and our auditor to ensure both statements are more closely aligned. Having said that, the net result is the same.

In previous years, we had presented each category to the membership, compared it to the budget, and explained the reason for the difference if one existed. Instead of doing that this year, I'm just going to highlight the major items that explain why our actual profits exceeded the budget.

There's a big green arrow and a big green button. I should have taken Andrew's training course.

As you can see, within revenue there are two categories in which the actuals were significantly higher than the budget. Those were revenue from book sales, in which we made a profit of \$51,000, and interest from our investments, which netted us a profit of \$31,000. On the expense side, there are a few categories in which we spent less than we had budgeted.

Those were Council approved projects, we had a budget of \$100,000 and we spent about \$8,000. The Constitutional Challenge, which had a budget of \$85,000, and we spent about \$21,000. The website maintenance, that had a budget of \$20,000, but we didn't spend any money this year. Computer services, which had a budget of \$40,000, we spent \$15,000. That's due to the fact that the Association switched service providers. We went from a break/fix model to a monthly maintenance model.

The copier lease had a budget of \$18,000, and we spent about \$9,000. That's due to the fact that Lena re-negotiated a contract with our supplier. Lastly, the credit card charges, we had budget of about \$40,000, and we spent about half of that.

So, all those factors contributed to the bottom line, which is why the profits were higher than planned. That's it for the financials. I'm going on to the 2018 budget.

Similar to the previous budgets, this one is not very sexy. There are no wild departures in any of the categories.

For revenue and fees, on the revenue side, the fees and licenses are based on the fee guideline for 2018. The SRD budget is similar to what it has been for the past two years, so there are no big changes there. The survey records index was kept the same as 2017. Credit card convenience fee was based on the actuals for 2017.

Cost-related activities which include the AGM are in line with our 2016 actual values, since we've moved back to our normal format for the AGM. The recoverable cost from legal and constitutional challenges are based on the actual 2017. The continuing education revenue didn't change much from last year, and the budget for cost recovery from discipline hearings didn't change.

The budget for other income was set a little higher than past years, and that's based on the current performance from our investments.

On the expense side, salaries have gone up a little bit just to mirror CPI and cost of living. Office admin expenses are set higher than our actual, as we intend to update the website this year. Survey Review expenses are in line with the expected revenue, so that's basically a wash. Similarly, for the survey records index.

The building expense is more or less the same as what we had budgeted for 2017. Discipline remains unchanged from last year. Committee expenses are also relatively the same as our cost related expenses, which you'll see reflect the 2016 values. Again, due to the fact that this year we return to the normal format for the AGM. Some of the highlights for the budget for 2018 is the development of the website.

We have a budget of \$50,000 to develop that. We plan to move to a different platform that will allow for greater security and for mobile access. Council approved funding was set at \$100,000 again this year. I know in the past we haven't used that, but this year I anticipate we'll be dipping into that fund. I know one of the committees already has identified a need for that, so I expect that money to be spent. As you can see from this slide, we expect a modest profit of about \$57,000 at the end of the year.

On to investments. As you've heard, in our previous years the AOLS made a move in 2014 to invest our money. Julie Brough with Logan Wealth Management has been our portfolio manager. Since our original investment in 2014, we've realized a profit of \$377,000.

So, we made \$164,000, we're up in our investments. The 2018 budget is looking good, so we're in good shape, right?

Well, let's look at our general operating fund. At the end of the year, the unrestricted fund had a balance of \$302,000, but the discipline reserve fund and the building fund respectively had a balance of about \$2,500 and \$444. Assuming we transfer our profits of \$164,000 into the unrestricted fund and replenish the discipline fund and the building fund to their budgeted amounts, we're left with a balance in the unrestricted fund of about \$216,000.

So, I think today we're in good shape, but I emphasize that word today. Looking toward the future, I see the following challenges. We expect a decrease in our membership. I don't know if you guys have seen, but there's a demographic slide that keeps going around. We have some challenges there. We're coming to the end of a CPD cycle. We have a significant number of our members over 70.

A lot of you when you were polled on Wednesday, were planning to retire in the next five years. We have a record number of articling students in the system, but we've heard not all of them go on to get their licence. Over the next few years, we can safely anticipate a reduction in general revenue. We have to maintain existing service levels. Staff need to get paid, committees still need to operate, the building will need repair. We need to replenish and maintain our fund reserves.

We could face potentially high expenses related to discipline. In each of the last two years we've spent over \$200,000 each year. Will this trend continue? I don't know, but I think it's important to plan for that potential. Same with the constitutional challenge. This year we saw relatively low activity, but that could change going forward.

Recruitment initiatives. Increasing our membership is arguably the most important issue we face as an organization. Funding initiatives to accomplish this will be a priority and needs to be accounted for. Similarly, for marketing or PR initiatives.

Succession planning. Russ just mentioned Bill is retiring in 2020. And Blain in 2030. When that happens, we have to replace them. We may need to hire special recruiters. So, to plan for the expected drop in revenue and to meet these challenges, I have developed a table that proposes a modest increase in our fees, about 3% a year over the next five years.

This is just proposed. In order for this proposed fee increase to take place, the members have to vote on a fee by-law by mail-in ballot. Any questions? Can I go back? Has everyone had a look at this? Great, we'll move forward. Sorry, just kidding.

DAVE WYLIE: Hey, Dave Wylie in Ottawa. In the 2017 review, you had identified projects as budgeted at \$100,000, but \$8,000 was spent?

AL JERAJ: Yep.

DAVE WYLIE: What was the difference? What was not initiated? Or, was that just a guesstimate, and nothing happened, nothing went through?

AL JERAJ: The \$100,000 is for Council-approved special funding. In the past, Council has really relied on the committees to come forward with any special projects that they would want to do and apply for that funding. To be honest, Council, in my opinion, hasn't really marketed or encouraged or advertised, that well enough, maybe. I know going forward that we will, and we expect that money to be spent.

DAVE WYLIE: And the 3% increase, you figure that's necessary?

AL JERAJ: I think so. Based on the challenges that I had outlined, the expected drop in revenue, definitely. The reason why I kept it at 3% is that's what we had done between 2017 and 2018, so I just carried that forward.

DAVE WYLIE: How do our fees equate to the other provincial fees? To the other jurisdictions?

AL JERAJ: I haven't done that analysis, so I couldn't tell you.

DAVE WYLIE: Thanks.

AL JERAJ: Anyone else but Travis? Travis.

TRAVIS HARTWICK: Yeah, Travis Hartwick from Pakenham. I was just looking at the survey records index. I see that it's running at an \$11,000 loss, so I take it that's a Toronto SRI?

AL JERAJ: Yep.

TRAVIS HARTWICK: I'm just wondering why. Why's that still running at a loss, or why it is running at a loss?

AL JERAJ: The thing is running at a loss because they are just not paying into it, I think.

TRAVIS HARTWICK: Okay, so people don't pay into it, so why are people using it and not paying for it? I think Council has to do some more to chase the people that are in that SRI, and make sure that they pay on time. It's been an on-going issue year after year. We send invoices out in the middle of the year in July, then we chase everybody. It's mandatory that they use it, so it should be mandatory that they pay for it.

AL JERAJ: Agreed.

UNKNOWN MALE: Can I get you to go back to the investment slide? I'd like to perhaps have that explained a little bit better. In light of the good performance in the last few years, depending on what these investments are, are we not - again, under your challenges - expecting this year to be ... it won't perform as well, considering what potentially might happen with market trends as a whole?

Again, depending where our investments are, as most who are in investments now would understand, that this year, is a year that you're going to see these investments perhaps diminish, as opposed to increase at the rate that they have in the last three or four years?

AL JERAJ: Good question. Like I mentioned, we have Julie Brough, she's got a crystal ball, and tells us that we're going to be doing good - no, I'm just kidding. You want to answer that one?

BLAIN MARTIN: Is this mic on? It's okay now? So, as Al said, we do really rely on Julie, and she was out here. Her expectation is that 2018 is not going to be a bad year. It's not going to be the same gains as we had in 2017, and we can see that even up till now we've had a little dip, but she's not expecting a lot of change in 2018. Looking forward to 2019, I can say that she's a little worried about 2019.

That's sort of where we are with those investments. She comes in to Council, and she gives a presentation to Council on what's happening in the world and what's going to impact the markets. I think we're in really, really good hands with her.

AL JERAJ: She looks at the portfolio regularly, and she does make adjustments to it, to decrease our exposure to risk.

PAUL WYMAN: Paul Wyman, Kitchener. I find myself in the very unusual position of suggesting that maybe you could be a little more aggressive with the increase in fees for retired members. You know, as a retired member for the last few years, we get a pretty sweet deal. We receive many of the same services, in terms of the quarterly and attendance at the meeting and so forth, at \$100 a year.

I see that you're increasing it more or less in a percentage way, but if you look at the net dollar increase for license members over the term of your review, it's close to \$300. If you look at the net increase for retired members, it's \$10. So, I think you could be a little more aggressive, particularly as we see more members retiring, using that option, and not maintaining their license.

I would have liked to maintain my license, but when you have no income or income tax deductions or that sort of thing, from a business income, it makes more sense to drop down to the retirement category. I think at \$100 a year, that's a pretty generous

fee. I could easily see you going to at least \$150 over the next couple of years, as a target. I don't know how many retired members there are. I don't know if that has much financial impact, but every buck helps.

AL JERAJ: Thanks for that, Paul. I just noticed a mistake on my slide. The retired members are actually on the top of the row, and the licensed members are at the bottom of the row. Any other questions? Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Al. Before we go on to the next report, Bob Morrow of the Investors Group has donated two, best seats available, for any Mervish Production, this season or next, or any upcoming Shaw - Niagara on the Lake, or Stratford Theatre Production. It will be a value of somewhere between \$200-\$500 depending on which production is selected. He's offered this up, and whatever we can raise from it would go to the Educational Foundation.

I'm not sure how to handle this because it's sort of just dropped on our lap, but my thought is - and I know we've done this before, we've had auctions during the meeting - but my thought is maybe we'll try something like that, an auction. Now I'm not going to do it right now, but I'd certainly like everybody to think about it. If we can, and we can deal with it pretty quickly, say right after our coffee break a little later. Maybe we'd be able to raise a little bit of cash for the Educational Foundation.

So, it's just a head's up, and think about it. Okay, next report from Sue MacGregor, Surveyor General.

SURVEYOR GENERAL'S PRESENTATION

SUE MACGREGOR: Thanks, Russ. I don't think I've ever heard a financial that was actually humorous, so thanks very much, Al.

Normally, I try to do a little bit of a presentation, so it reflects a little bit of what my office does. I'm not prepared for that this year, so I just want to probably cover a couple of highlights in the report. When you look at this report, the first thing that I'm struck with is that there's a tremendous amount of work that is done by a very small, dedicated group of people in my office. I'm very proud of them. They are very professional. I've heard over and over again this week that you all appreciate them as much as I do, so I just want to shout out a thanks to my staff.

This year, our work continues to be dominated by Indigenous land claims. That tends to take up the most of our time and effort. I hope everyone got a commemorative map. That was another product of our branch. It wasn't a product of my office, but it's certainly a document created to celebrate the history of Ontario. That is a big thank you from MNRF to you, who had a large part in the development of the province.

Please make sure that you take a map home with you. If you examine it under a microscope, you'll see that there's a lot of hidden gems, in and around the border, and throughout the map. This year we had another request for a municipal re-survey under the Surveys Act, so we've done two in the past and we are facing another one.

Municipal re-surveys typically are done over large geographic lines, so a whole concession, a whole township boundary. It's a fairly lengthy process, but it gives you an alternative to the Boundaries Act, where you're really after a lost line or boundary corner or township boundary concession line.

We also did a lot of work around the Mining Act Modernization. If you're a Southern Ontario surveyor, it's not going to mean a lot to you, but Reg. 768 was a very, very old regulation. It's probably hadn't been updated in over 50 years. With the Mining Act Modernization, the claims have gone to a cell-based system. So, you can click on a claim, or open a claim after you pay your fees, based on a grid square in the North.

When that claim needs to go into operation as a mine, or go to lease, at that point in time surveys are conducted. So, a new regulation was written under the General Regulation 45/11, that will come into being in April. Basically, the regulation points to the Crown Survey instructions. The Crown Survey instructions have been updated to reflect the new requirements for mining surveys. That was sent out to the membership at the end of December 2017.

Michael Marlatt recently retired from MGCS, and he was re-hired part time by my office. We give Michael some really cool research projects. If I haven't said it before, my office does really cool work. There's three vacancies, we can hire you. Michael's working on researching the Ontario, Quebec boundary right along the length of the Ottawa River. Anybody that understands how that provincial limit was created, it basically follows the center line of the shipping channel on the basis of a Shanley Plan.

Shanley was a - I'm not even sure he was a surveyor - but it was a plan created. No one can find this plan. We've been to the Archives of Ottawa and Toronto. We have copies of the Shanley plan, but the Ontario copied version is different from the Quebec copied version, so now we're faced with trying to determine where the center line of that shipping channel was, on the basis of documents that don't match. It's a really interesting, cool project that he's working on.

COSINE is getting a much needed facelift. You'll see some activity in that domain. Also, I wanted to point out that five federal departments are actually undertaking a strategy with respect to navigation timing and position. I think you've probably seen a questionnaire from AOLS to provide input. Your input will support, or feed, that initiative to ensure that we have a good robust active control system across Canada.

I would encourage you to provide that feedback. I think that's a really important study for Canada. The last thing that I would point is that we were very fortunate to be able to host the Canadian Geographic Names Board this year. It was the 120th meeting. It's really interesting, we take geographic names for granted here in North America and the Americas. On the world's stage, though, naming is vitally important to so many functions of a civilized society.

We heard stories from our representative at the UN, who was explaining to us that there are countries that have five names on one geographic location, so they really don't know where to send the emergency relief people. They don't know how to get the police there. They can't open and operate a business because they don't have these standard tags to geographic locations. Place to place navigation is a challenge. So, we're very, very fortunate. It's so interesting to kind of have your eyes opened on a world-wide basis, to this issue. One of the major topics that were being discussed at this meeting was how do we reclaim Indigenous names across Canada. We most definitely want to respect the Indigenous heritage of Canada, but how do you take something that's so deeply embedded in the settlers' culture, and try to turn it back to Indigenous, or the first name, for that feature?

It's a very interesting conversation. It's not over by any stretch, but it is kind of one of the more cooler things that I get to do in my job. I think I'll end it there. If there's any questions, I'm happy to take them? No? Great. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Sue. I will say, I have heard many, many good comments about both you and your staff in the last few days. So, good job. Next up, for a very quick report, Executive Director, Blain - oh, excuse me. Steve, we have a job for you up here. If anybody was wondering whose phone rang a few minutes ago.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

BLAIN MARTIN: I'm feeling a little like Joe Young a couple of years ago, but this was not planned. Wow, that was interesting. And, Russ turned around and looked at me, at my phone. So, I am going to ... my report, as Russ said, is going to be pretty short. You have the written report. I'm really not going through all the stuff that's in the written report, and you'll see it later.

I want to do, really, four things. The AGM Sponsors, I always like to recognize them. The second one is demographics, we always want to look at the demographics, don't we? AOLS staff, I like to recognize them. And, I want to tell you where the next future meetings are. So, sponsors to begin with. These are all the sponsors that we had. I'm not going to go through the list, but I do want to highlight the event sponsor part, Mark Sampson.

He gave us a fabulous talk at Convocation Lunch yesterday about professionalism, and he is the ultimate professional. He not only has the ability to get up and give that talk to us, but he contributes \$10,000 to our meeting. He does it on all sides.

The other sponsors are great, too, but I really want to highlight Mark, so if we can have a round of applause for them all.

Thank you, thank you. Ah, my famous slide. I'm actually not going to talk about these numbers. We've talked about them enough. What I want to say is that there is some light at the end of the tunnel. Russ and I were, last night, in the Hard Rock Club. It was too late for me. The Advil has just kicked in, and then my phone went off. Russ and I were at the Hard Rock Club, and there were about 15 students from York over in the corner.

So, Russ and I walked over and jumped in the middle and said, "who are you, what are you about, glad to have you here, we want you in the profession," all those sorts of things. I stayed and talked with them for a little while. It was actually great talking to them. They all knew Maureen. Maureen actually does a fabulous job with those students, so for her, thank you.

It was kind of interesting. One of the students - Vince was his name - he had hair down to about here. I said, "Yeah, Maureen, she was one of my classmates." - and I always tell this story, "Maureen. She was one of my classmates, but she'd never sit behind me in class." He just walked right into it and said, "Why?" I said, "Well, because my hair was longer than yours and it stuck out to about here." I could see his eyes saying, "Oh my god, I'm going to lose my hair!"

But, it was great to see those students there, and great to engage with them. Next slide is about staff. I always talk about the staff, and of course I really think we have a fabulous staff at the AOLS office. You see some of them here making this event run. I'm not going to go through all the names because we've done that a few times, Russ. I get a lot of thanks, I get people coming up to me saying, "Blain, you've run this great meeting, it's so good again, it's good every year."

It's not me, it's the staff that actually makes it work. So, for all of the staff, another round of applause, if you don't mind? Thank you. Each year I always highlight one of my staff members. Last year I did Bill. This year I want to highlight Lena. She's actually amazing, and she's standing back there. We look at my demographic slide and we see the increase in the number of articling students, the number of evaluated students, how many of those go through every year.

She deals personally with every one of them. And, as Bill said yesterday at Convocation Lunch, multiple languages. She communicates with them. They just walk in, and she brings them in to our Association. In that respect, her workload has at least doubled, I think it's actually tripled, but she's also the Office Manager. So, she keeps that office just running along. She's instrumental in setting up the Annual Meeting.

She's walking around, she's saying, "Russ, you don't have the card, here's the card." Every time there's a problem, Lena solves it. Her work is appreciated by all those in

the office, and by all the AOLS members. So, Lena, thanks so much for being who you are and helping us so much. I saw Bill Webster this morning as we were in the elevator, and he said, "Blain, Blain, where's the Annual Meeting next year?"

I said, "Well, I've booked it for the next four years." "Oh, huh." Lena has actually booked these meetings, too. Next year it's at the Westin Harbor Castle, downtown Toronto. They finally convinced me to be back in Toronto again. It's at a beautiful site. It's going to be a great meeting. Year after that, in Hunstville. After that, in London. And then back at the Westin in Ottawa.

These have all been booked, they're all locked in. I gave Ovalina, who's the contact at the hotel here, I gave her this list because I'm kind of hoping that she comes back to us for a proposal for 2023, because this is actually a great venue for us. 2030 eh, AI? 2030 I think may be a bit of a stretch. I think it's going to be two more years. I say that because I called Eric a couple of weeks ago.

This all happened in the same day. I called Eric, and Eric said, "Blain, yeah I'm all ready for the AGM. I'm just sitting here in Myrtle Beach, having a glass of scotch, looking out onto the golf course." I said, "That's kind of nice. Here I am, just slaving away trying to make this AGM work." An hour later, I call Brian Maloney. Is Brian here? Brian said, "Blain, I'm all ready for the AGM. I'm just on the ski-lift out in BC." Hmm, okay. All in the same day.

I call Russ an hour later, "Blain, I'm just sitting in front of the fire at the cottage." What is the matter with me?! My conclusion really is, Russ, it's been a great year. Thanks very much for being President. You've been fabulous. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Blain. Yeah, like everyone else that gets involved with the association, thank you. Next, Bill Buck is, like, third-last Annual Report.

REGISTRAR'S REPORT

BILL BUCK: Again, as most others have said, I'm not going to read through my report. I've condensed most of it down into a very few slides, and I forgot to put my copyright symbol on these slides, so they've already been passed around by many other people. Most of my job, if you will, centers around two committees really. The Academic and Experience Requirements Committee and the Complaints Committee.

Those are sort of two opposite ends of this position. Obviously, the AERC is the happy end, if you will, the Complaints end is not so much. I'll just go quickly through these slides again. We've increased the number of academic evaluations dramatically. Since 2010, you can see they've gone steadily upward. We're still on track. Even this year, the January meeting I think we had maybe 13, 14, something like that.

I expect we'll be in the same range as last year going forward, and that's a tremendous increase. Similarly, with the articling applications, they've gone up dramatically. Big shift in and around 2014, and I don't know whether that relates entirely to the change we made in the articling process, but I think that's one of the factors to consider. Again, we're pretty much on track for 2018 to do a similar number of articling applications.

I think everybody knows we're up to - I've got 89 on this slide. I think there's been 88 floating around. The number varies depending on the number of applications that we have at each meeting, and the number of people that drop out and so on. Right now we're at the 88-89 range. We have six applications to approve in April, so we'll be up to 94. As you can see, that's almost three times as many as we've had only a few years ago. As Blain said, it's a tremendous amount of change in the amount of work that we have to do just processing all of these applications.

I put this chart in the printed report. I think that the interesting thing about it is that we've been on a steady downward slide in membership, as you can see, but it's levelled-off just the last couple of years. We haven't had the same drop in membership. We did have quite a few of CofR members drop out, but it seemed to be compensated by the number of licences. Again, as you can see down near the bottom, the number of articling students has gone up.

So, I think it's good news going forward. There's a lot of work to be done, obviously, in recruitment to keep our number at least to where it is now. To me, I think it's good news.

Complaints, on the other end of it, we were a little higher than average this past year. The average really didn't change much. Over the last 18 years, really since I've been here, the average is about 14. We've had some really good years where there were almost no complaints, and some not so good ones.

I struggled with this last night as I was trying to get to sleep, about what I say today because this report is pretty dry stuff. I guess if you look at the overall report, you can see there's a number of different committees and things that this position deals with. It doesn't speak really much to the soft-skills area. I do spend a fair bit of time talking to mostly members of the public. Sometimes our own members. That's, I think, part of the job that doesn't show up so much in my report. But, I thought I should just say something because there may be somebody in this room that might be interested in this job, and might want to know a little bit about it. You can certainly feel free to give me a call if you want to know more about it. I think it's a fantastic job. It's a different job. It's working for a self-governing organization and is something unique.

It gives you opportunities to deal with the management of the whole operation. It gives you opportunities to deal with the public. I find that most of the inquiries that we get, mostly they just want to know, "What's this all about? What is this

surveying all about?" Sometimes I wish more of our members would explain themselves to their clients, but instead they call me and say, "Blah, blah, blah." Mostly they either just want an explanation of what's this all about, or in some cases when they're really upset, they mostly just want somebody to listen.

I generally just keep quiet, listen to them rant for a while, and try to explain things a little bit. I find, in the end, most of them go away, maybe not happy, but at least understanding. It doesn't end up in a complaint situation. That's a good part of the job. A lot of people, they think of me as a survey cop. Well, there's a little bit of that in the job, but not much. And cops, for the most part, deal with public situations. They want to help the public. That's the good part of the job. The bad part of the job, it's not so bad. So, that's all I really wanted to say. I don't know if anybody's got any questions about my report, or the job? Happy to answer. That's it.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Bill. Tim Hartley, Survey Review Department.

SURVEY REVIEW DEPARTMENT REPORT

TIM HARTLEY: Thank you. I'll be short and sweet because no one ever wants to hear what the Survey Review Department has to say. The Survey Review Department operates under the inspection program of the Surveyors Act. The department is totally funded by the \$16 sticker fee. The budget for 2017 was roughly \$575,000 and we had a revenue of approximately \$622,000. Out of this, we paid the salaries of an administrative officer, Sheila Lavina, an assistant examiner, Herman Bernardo, myself, Tim Harley, the manager, a part-time OLS field examiner, Al Worobec, and two comprehensive review consultants, Doug Reitsma and Drew Annable, all the office expenses and the allocation for the use of the facilities and general administration.

Of the four OLSs involved, two have been on Council, and two are past Presidents. We're constantly trying to improve our operation. We're starting to get digital. We've had a couple PDFs of the digital plans that will be registered in the Registry Office, so we're having to set up a system to store these. So, we're going to have two systems for a while, a paper system and a digital system because not all plans will be digitally deposited.

We have a new SRD Committee. Pretty excited about that. It consists of Marvin McNabb, is the chair, Andrew Mantha is the council rep, Dave Raithby, Gabriel Laframboise, Robb McKibbin, and Julia Meldrum Smith make up the rest of the membership. 2018 will be the year of change. I'm going to be retiring at the end of April. That's when we need to hire a new manager, and we need to hire two new comprehensive review trainees in order to replace future retirements. I think this is going to be pretty exciting because when I was in business, it seemed like every ten years you had to reinvent yourself.

If we get some new people in, it gives us a chance to review our policies and process and reinvent ourselves for the next five or ten years. I've really enjoyed my stint as manager. Whoever applies for the job, it's really exciting. It's just nice to be able to still meet and talk to your colleagues. So, I'd like to thank everyone for their support and input. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Tim. I think you've done an amazing job while you've been running that department. You've done an amazing job running that department. I'm not sure why you're even thinking about leaving. Okay, next we have a presentation from Public Awareness Committee, Natalie Vibert is here. If any of you are not familiar with Natalie, she's a new surveyor. Got sworn in yesterday, so welcome, Natalie.

PUBLIC AWARENESS COMMITTEE PRESENTATION

NATALIE VIBERT: Hello, everyone. PAC is the Public Awareness Committee. They're chaired by Michael Matthews, our fearless leader. Grant Lee is our marketing and communication consultant, as well as our Vice Chair. The committee is rounded out by 13 other members sprinkled around the province. They're not picky on who's on the committee. I've only had my license for 22 hours, and I'm already up here.

The overview. Starting out, PAC approved the 2017 Public Awareness Plan. Its implementation included the creation and production of promotional coasters I'm sure you saw out in the lobby. As well as the design and production of the new "good boundaries make good neighbors" roll-ups that are used at all the AOLS exhibit booths. PAC also assisted with the distribution of the Great Lengths book to schools and local libraries.

Lastly, PAC worked on the concept for editing the Specialist High Skills Major (SHSM) video. As you heard before from Chris, the Specialist High Skills Major is a reach-ahead certification for high school students that lets them focus on a career path that matches their skills and interest, while earning credits toward their high school diploma.

Some of the events that we attended this year. Bob, Michael, and Eric staffed the AOLS exhibit at the Ontario Good Roads Association Conference in late February. The AOLS staffed an exhibit at the URISA Ontario's Be Spatial event in May. This is an annual industry training program and expo showcase that attracts GIS and IT professionals, as well as professors and students from throughout Ontario. Likewise, the AOLS had a staffed exhibit at the Realtor Quest in May.

Lastly, Maureen staffed the AOLS exhibit at the Ontario School Counsellors' Conference in November. There, she spoke to about 75 teachers and counsellors about the Specialist High Skills Major surveying certificate program. Many of the

counsellors showed a lot of interest, taking brochures and copies of our career posters.

Articles that have been written. One was on the Specialist High Skills Majors. It was submitted to Monograph, which is the journal of the Ontario Association of Geographic and Environmental Education (OAGEE). There was an article in InSight about AOLS sponsorship and members that attended the local GoGeomatics Back-to-School socials. One was in Kingston and one was in Thunder Bay.

PAC also supported the Survey Monument Taskforce for an article on monument protection in the Milestones magazine. There was another InSight article touching on a member's participation in the GIS event, and his presentation to grade 9 students. The theme of the booth was "A future and career as an Ontario Land Surveyor" and the motto was "Choose your path, make your mark." The organizers of this event split students into smaller groups of approximately five students, and they rotated them through various booths every five minutes. By the end of the day, 14 lightning career talk sessions were made to 91 students. This was a great opportunity to promote the AOLS, and to spark interest in future careers of OLS's.

Ongoing projects. A draft flyer content on title insurance versus a survey. A draft article on monumentation for Association of Ontario Road Superintendents. And, a draft article has been worked on for The Blue Line, which is the OPP publication about boundaries and access over private property and law.

So, what you can help with. PAC can't do it alone. Consider a presentation to a local high school. As other presentations have said, PAC can supply video and slide decks, which make a 45-minute presentation to a local high school class not too hard. If presentations aren't for you, bringing public awareness and advocacy opportunities to PAC's attention is a tremendous help. Unlike everyone else, I'm not retiring, so thank you, I'll see you next year.

RUSS HOGAN: That's great, Natalie. We look forward to seeing you again next year. We've made a donation in your name to Project SHARE. Next, Continuing Education Committee, Tom.

CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE PRESENTATION:

TOM PACKOWSKI: Thank you, Russ. Continuing Education Committee is a non-statutory committee of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors. The CEC is one of 19 committees and nine task forces struck by Council of the Association. There are currently eight members of the committee. We're looking for another member, so if any of you want to join the committee, it's an active committee. Those that sign-on usually stay with us for quite a while. It's an interesting committee and it does influence how the Association moves forward.

Throughout 2017, we met six times by teleconference and we had one meeting at the Association offices. The aims and the objectives of the CEC are outlined in the terms of reference manual prepared by the Association. There are ten points in that.

The one that seems most relevant to me is to promote member educational programs developed by organizations, and organizations other than the AOLS. Our primary function is to select continuing education topics suitable for formal activities as required by the Association in the continuing professional development program.

For this, we direct members to organizations such as Geo-Ed and their registered education providers, Professional Surveyors Canada, and recognized authorities on specific subjects including Four-Point Learning and presentations by Ron Stewart.

After canvassing the membership, we have identified about 60 different topics. We subdivided them into manageable groups, including condominiums, technical expertise, business practice, law, and the ubiquitous miscellaneous, just to name a few. This year the CEC voted on and made recommendations to Council for suggested changes in the regulations governing continuing professional development.

We'll wait and see how Council feels about our recommendations. We're also attempting to migrate the CPD input from the Association to Geo-Ed, but we've met a snag, and that will have to be something that's still ongoing. So, you'll continue to do your CPD inputs to the Association. On that, I would encourage you to submit your CPD hours as soon as possible so that if you find yourself short, there's still time for you to acquire what you need in order to complete your obligations.

Upcoming seminars this year include LandPro. LandPro will be holding their annual conference. This is their third year. It will be on March 28, 2018. I've highlighted some of the topics that are particularly applicable to us, including land development in non-OMB times, development law updates, Ontario condominiums in the new court standard of review, and municipal planning challenges for 2018. So, that's on March 28th.

Four Point Learning will be hosting the Fifth Boundary Law Conference on the complex and ever-changing treatment of water boundaries. That will be on Monday, April 23rd. The topics will include common law repair and rights, hierarchy of evidence, dynamic nature of earth, changes in legislation pertaining to Crown ownership of beds of waterways, efforts to create certainty within the Surveys Act, and the artificial distinction between boundary and title. Four Point learning will also be hosting the Introduction to Canadian Common Law course. This course can be attended in person, or you can attend it remotely from anywhere in the province.

Class will begin on April 16, 2018. I took this course, and I can tell you, you just won't look at things the same way once you've taken this course. Some of the things

we hear and read about in the news and so on, it's directly affected by the common law. The Introduction to Canadian Common Law is a great foundation for that.

Topics include basic organization, structure, and underlying legal principles of the Canadian legal system, the relationship between courts and tribunals, the legal process, the use of decided cases to determine facts, issues, legal principles, and binding outcomes, the legal reasoning process as an approach to forming a professionally defensible boundary opinion - and I think this is something particularly applicable to us in cadastral surveying - techniques of communicating information to a client in a manner appropriate to the profession and relative to the context of the client itself.

And, the last one that we have coming up, although I don't think the date has been determined, is the tutorials for the electronic registration for plans. That will be a brand-new thing for all of us. We tried it, at least as far as the examination goes, and it's relatively smooth, it works well, so I encourage you to do that.

The next one is more of a personal opinion. Our current regulations stipulate the minimum number of hours required for professional development as follows, 36 formal hours and 66 professional hours over a three-year period.

I want to focus on the formal hours. Currently, formal hours are relatively easy to get. We can attend many of the webinars that are available from the Association, we can attend regional groups, and of course there are other ways of getting this. I want to encourage the membership to participate that way. But, can we meet the spirit of our code of ethics? Or, are we satisfied with meeting minimum standards?

When I look at the complexity of water boundaries, for example, and I see the seemingly disparate decisions that the court makes, can we learn what we need to know and maintain the level of proficiency that will meet the needs of the public by webinars alone?

When it comes to continuing professional development, we can choose between the free and the easy way, or paid content, rigorous structured intensive learning with assignments and feedback to the work that we do. I'm asking you, which one will you choose as a professional? Consider this, currently as licenced cadastral surveyors in Ontario, we have exclusive jurisdiction regarding opinions on boundary matters. Our opinions are considered to be expert opinions by the courts.

For those of you who have had the distinction of appearing in court as an expert witness, you know the fact that you are an OLS is usually reason enough for the court to accept what you have to say. You can only do that, I think, by attending the courses that are made available to us. These are rigorous courses, and they demand effort by us. But, we did this all along when we were getting our licence. So, I want to encourage you to continue your efforts at continuing professional development within the code of ethics. Thank you very much.

Before I leave the stage, I should ask, are there any questions? Okay, thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Tom, and we've made a donation in your name to Project SHARE.

TOM PACKOWSKI: Great. Thank you very much.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. Blain and I are both sitting up here, and we're thinking, "What a huge turnout!" It's been an amazing turnout this week in the first place, but for a snowy Friday morning, this is really good. I guess I was figuring that I would come in here and there wouldn't be anybody here because everybody left because of the snow or something. That's not the case. I'm starting to think maybe what it is, is we're snowed in and you couldn't leave or something.

Anyway, it's great to see everybody still here. Hopefully we'll see you here after coffee. We are running wonderfully early, but I've got a couple of things. I keep forgetting to mention the name badges. You know, the plastic name holders? Unless you really want to take them home as a souvenir or whatever, please think to drop them off at the registration desk before you leave the hotel. They get reused next year and saves the environment a little bit.

The other thing is, what are we going to do with these two seats to a production? You know what, we're a half an hour early right now. I was going to try to squeeze this in after coffee. I think what I'm going to do is try to get you folks to show how generous you are - oh, who is that guy? I don't recognize him, he doesn't have an ugly shirt. So, \$300 from our new President, Dan Dzaldov. What happened to everybody else that likes ugly shirts? C'mon!

Helmut, \$400, that's great. Anybody else? \$400, that's very generous, but certainly we can be even more generous. Is there any chance? Maybe I should tell Steve to close the door, don't let anybody leave, I see everybody snaking out over there. If they really want coffee, they're going to have to pay. \$400 is very generous. Is there anybody willing to go any higher? I'm not going to prolong this. Thank you, Helmut, thank you very much.

That is fantastic. Okay, we are going to take a break. I don't think we're going to take an hour-long break, though. I would like everybody to be back in here at 10:45, then we will get into Open Forum. We've got a few things at the end of Open Forum to sort of close our meeting, and you can get on your way.

Thank you very much.

--Upon Resuming at 11:00 a.m.

OPEN FORUM - Part II

MALE: Cowbell!

RUSS HOGAN: I'm going to be disappointed because I'm not going to be able to use this again after today. So, I may use it as much as I can in the next whatever hour, or whatever it is we're here. Okay. Welcome back, everyone. Wow, there's still lots of people here, and that is great. That is great. I'm going to remind you the one last time to silence your cell phones.

Okay. Oh, and before we get into that. Has somebody lost a Visa debit card? It says Scotia card. It's just the number, no name. No signature. Sergeant-at-Arms found it. And it was found it in this room just before coffee, so. So, if anyone's missing one, it's here.

What's the number? Anyways it's - if you've lost a card, we've got a card. Okay. We will continue with part two of Open Forum. As mentioned earlier, motions must be in writing. Must have a mover and seconder, and must be presented to the Resolution Committee. Voting by show of hands – voting will be by a show of hands. You may speak on any topic you wish at any time. Except once a motion has been presented, I will limit the discussion to the topic of the motion. If a motion presented fails to receive a seconder, it will be dropped from the discussion.

I will remind you the proceedings are being recorded, and that if you wish to speak, you're to proceed to a microphone. We've got two of them here. And give your name and town or affiliation. Open forum will end at or before 11:45 to allow us time to adjourn the business session. The floor is open.

NORM SUTHERLAND: Norm Sutherland. Petrolia. Mr. Chair, I have one observation, and one suggestion. We, as Ontario Land Surveyors, have a responsibility to communicate effectively on a daily basis. That would be one-on-one with a client, appearing before a group, small or large.

Recently, I joined Toastmasters International. And it has helped me considerably. I have seen people that shook in their boots before addressing an audience. And within six months, the change was amazing. Sometimes, it's as simple as learning how to use a microphone effectively. And I, as you can see, at any age you can always improve.

The meetings are usually an hour long. Very reasonable cost. And they're located in almost every community. It's something akin to the workshops, or workshop, on writing that Charles Wilkins carried out. Excellent. I would like the opportunity to further that. So, anyway, it was just a suggestion to help us all to do a better job. And I would make one disclaimer. I have no financial interest in Toastmasters International.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Norm. Comment?

HELMUT PILLER: I'm Helmut, Toronto. This will be my last act of tormenting this assembly. I have a motion. Next year, I will continue. Everybody will be safe for a year, where Resolution Committee? Mr. Chair, you –

RUSS HOGAN: Anna? And - and Nancy, if she's around. Okay. Well, that's interesting. I have a script that I read. And I've said the same thing a number of times. Helmut was listening. Did exactly what I said to do. And then, we were going, "Oh, wait a minute. What's happening?" Anyways. Helmut has agreed just to - to step back for a moment, while we get the - his motion digitally, so we can project it on the screen. So, in the meantime, if - if anybody else would like to come forward. If anybody's got any comments or anything they'd like to discuss. Travis.

TRAVIS HARTWICK: Travis Hartwick from Pakenham. Thanks, Mr. Chair. Just a question maybe to the membership, not a motion or anything. But recently, a couple of the firms in the Ottawa area have had a couple requests from the Freedom of Information Act. And basically, it's - it's, for us, it was old Surveyor's Real Property Reports that were filed with the city from the early 2000s. And we don't release copies of our old plans. That's a business decision that we made. So, basically, the - the people that were looking for the information went to the City. Was directed to the privacy people. And filed an application.

So, we were told by the privacy people that we do have to release that information. Or, actually the City released the information. We appealed. And that - that appeal was defeated. So, I just - just wondering if - if this is unique to Ottawa. It seems to me that it's - it's the SRPR - the Surveyor's Real Property Report is a contractual agreement between two private parties. But now it seems to be getting into the municipal domain.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks for that information, Travis.

TOM KRCMAR: Tom Krcmar. Thornhill. Recently, a bulletin was issued by the Association dealing with monumentation of plans that signatures need to be put in on a plan. And if a signature is on a plan, the bar - the plans need to be monumented fully. Recently, I had to convince a client that a 300-lot subdivision plan at its very preliminary stages needed to be monumented if I had to sign the plan. And it's never been the case before. And clients really do need a signature when going to submission to the region or the city. And, I'm finding that monumenting a plan, so that I can put my signature on the plan, for this submission, seems a little bit too much. Because their preliminary plans are very preliminary. Things will change all the time. But we're putting bars in for my signature to be put on the plan for these submissions. And I'm hoping we can revisit this bulletin. So, that maybe we can get the - because the bulletin just came out without speaking with the membership. And I'm hoping that we can revisit that bulletin. Because, I can't be barring every plan just for my signature to be put on that plan. Especially, when the contention is that there's 300-lot subdivision plan that I have to put bars on the ground. So, I'm hoping

we can revisit that bulletin. Dan's looking at me like, what are you talking about? But I've read that bulletin a few times, and that's what it's stating. Unless I'm not seeing it right.

DAN DZALDOV: I guess since you called me out, I'll - I'll respond.

TOM KRCMAR: Right.

DAN DZALDOV: I guess there was a bit of a look of confusion because the bulletin was by no means whatsoever new policy, or a change of policy. It was a reminder that when you're signing a plan, you're saying that the plan is complete. And all the monuments are in is one of the items.

My understanding is that before my time involvement with Council, deferred monumentation was something that was discussed. And it didn't get to the next stage. But the bulletin is just reminding everyone that you have to set the monuments. And you cannot - you cannot sign plans without setting monuments first.

TOM KRCMAR: I hear you. I hear you. I understand it's a reminder. I'm just wondering if we can revisit this, because at - at a very preliminary stage of a subdivision plan, to sign it. Roads move. Lots move. Everything can change, as - as you know when you're doing your subdivision plans. Because I know that we're in the same area. It just feels - it feels like too much, at preliminary stages. And - and as you know, city and - and region would like to see a signed plan that says a surveyor has looked at it. That we know that this is in good standing. I'm not saying that you guys made a new policy. I'm saying, can we revisit this policy and see if maybe we can change something. I see Blain here shaking your head. I - that's fine.

BLAIN MARTIN: Yeah.

TOM KRCMAR: I just wanted to see if maybe the membership had anything to say about it as well.

BLAIN MARTIN: Yeah. Yeah, Tom. I was shaking my head. No, no.

TOM KRCMAR: No.

BLAIN MARTIN: I think there may be other vehicles that you could use. Maybe a letter could accompany that plan. I think Dan's right. When you sign a plan of subdivision, it really should be complete. You're signing - you're putting a signature on there that says that it's - it's finished. Maybe there's a different vehicle you can use to do it. And, you know - if other people want to -

TOM KRCMAR: You know, I'm - I'm barring a subdivision plan. And then, that subdivision plan changes. Those bars need to be pulled out. It's just an extra cost on

clients now. Just that we're sort of clear, I understand that once it's signed - that that is something that you guys have - are reminding us. I'm just saying that now I'm moving bars. I'm pulling bars out for a 300-lot subdivision plan, or - or even small reference plans to go out there and put bars in the ground, and then they change their mind, it's just added cost on clients. And - I - I just thought that the bulletin came out without maybe a further discussion. And I wanted to throw it out so that people could discuss it.

BILL BUCK: Tom. When you're - when you say you have to sign these plans. Do you have to sign the surveyor's certificate? Or can you just sign it without that certificate? 'Cause it's really - that's really the issue is - when you sign the Surveyor's Certificate, you're saying you comply with all the acts and regulations. If they just want a signature, which to them indicates you've looked at the plan. You know.

TOM KRCMAR: On - on the plan?

BILL BUCK: Yeah.

TOM KRCMAR: I don't know where else to sign the plan except for on the certificate space.

BILL BUCK: Well, what about just - don't put the Surveyor's Certificate on it, and just put a line and put your - your signature on it. Would that satisfy the client? That was one - one option.

TOM KRCMAR: I - I suppose so. But it doesn't feel like a whole subdivision plan then.

BILL BUCK: But if it's going to change, then your final plan, of course, would have the right certificate, and -

TOM KRCMAR: Maybe. I mean, the letter is a possibility. But letters and plans get separated as well. It's - it's - I, you know, I just wanted to throw it out there. And I wanted - I wanted some discussion to be had on it. Thank you everyone.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. Thanks.

HELMUT PILLER: Helmut Piller, Toronto. We have the same thing in the city with reference plans. The City Committee of Adjustment wants a signed reference plan. So, we take the - the certificate out. And just sign it. And they're happy with it. So, they don't look at the certificate. Half the people don't look at the - well, half. Most of them don't look at the certificate. And that would solve the problem. That's how we do it and - and there's no problem.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. Are we ready to project that motion? Okay. Wow. Helmut. Helmut, are you ready to present your motion please?

HELMUT PILLER: I have a signed copy here, so –

RUSS HOGAN: Yes.

HELMUT PILLER: It's all legal, Mr. Chairman.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you.

HELMUT PILLER: Do I have to read it out? I think everybody –

AL HEYWOOD: Yes, please.

HELMUT PILLER: I do have to read it out? Alright.

AL HEYWOOD: Yeah.

HELMUT PILLER: Moved by Helmut Piller. Seconded by John D'Amico. Whereas the standards of performance are clearly defined by the Surveyors Act and the Surveys Act. And whereas, there are a number of licenced surveyors producing plans disguised as plans of survey. And whereas after lengthy and thorough debates by this assembly, therefore, the Council of Ontario Land Surveyors has respectfully requested to instruct the Registrar at the first opportunity to send a letter to every licenced member informing the continuation of such practices will be prosecuted as a breach of the code of ethics for incompetence and professional misconduct, with the warning approved by Council.

I don't think it needs a lengthy explanation what we articulated here. It has been debated and kicked around over the last couple of days thoroughly. Again, I attended, you know, the Open Forum. The first one. I attended the presentation of the change for the sketches. I attended the session yesterday morning, and certainly I am coming away with the clear picture that this is not a - the change to the sketches is not a welcome issue, or welcome plan by this membership. And it - further it would add a product that we don't need because we already have planner's survey, or - or Surveyor's Real Property Report. We can add any additional information to it. And some people - some of my colleagues titled it, pardon me, "Surveyor's Real Property Report and Topographic Information," or the other way around. And that is sufficient. You don't even have to articulate it. It is on the plan. It satisfies the - the needs of the client.

Some of those sketches omit certain, which I consider important information, particularly if there is a construction planned. Or there is, well, primarily on these in-fill houses, new construction. But everything is shown, including fences. Because once the client, or the contractor, starts to build, and they beat - or anybody marks out the property line - the fence is in a different location. It creates a problem for the people, because generally owners look at fences and say - I'm up to this - this up to

here is mine. This on the other side is yours, which in most cases, doesn't - isn't the case. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Helmut. Just one - I had a question for clarification. Your second whereas, it says, "Whereas there are a number of licenced surveyors producing plans disguised as plans of survey." Is - you were talking about - you were - when you were discussing it, you were talking about sketches? Is one of those -

HELMUT PILLER: It - it seems to fall under the broader aspect of sketches. I - I get the impression this is what the - or this is directed to - they're not sketches. They have all kinds of designations from illustrating topography. To sketch of topography. To topographic information. To all kinds of things. However, it is a survey. It shows the boundaries in many - pardon, in many cases it shows monuments. It shows bearings distance. It shows distances from - from features to the boundary.

So, this, in my opinion, is what I label "disguised" as a plan of survey. The public takes it as a plan of survey. And as I've elaborated before, we had several instances where people came to our office because there was an issue with it. And the first thing we look at it and we say, "Well, you know, you don't have a plan of survey." They say, "What do you mean? I made you a survey. A full plan of survey. Well, they didn't read the fine print. Is it - is it their responsibility? It's our responsibility. We are providing a survey. And if we use these kinds of tricks to get people to pay us good money to be told that you have nothing.

We had one case just recently in downtown Toronto, where the client really was interested in the location of - of a fence. It goes way back to the mid-40s where they divided that property up. The surveyor they engaged did a topographic survey. And showed all kinds of things that they didn't need to. Obviously, the surveyor did not engage with that client to articulate what the need of that client is. Client doesn't know. Client really has an issue that there is a boundary. That they have a boundary. That there's a fence. Now, one - one party said. My - my property line goes over here. The other one says, no it goes over there. That was totally missed. We did the survey without cost. Because I felt terrible for that client, who have paid \$1,900 and to have to pay another \$2,000 for us to do it. I said, "Look, this is embarrassing. We do this for free."

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. Thanks. Anyone else? Absolutely. Okay. Thanks. Helmut, our parliamentarian has just pointed out that your motion can request Council to consider, but it can't direct Council to actually do - do this. So, I think there needs to be a slight modification.

HELMUT PILLER: Mr. Chairman, to replace "direct" to "consider."

RUSS HOGAN: Yes, so I would think that it - we would have to say that therefore, the Council of the Ontario Land Surveyors has respectfully requested to consider instructing the Registrar etcetera.

HELMUT PILLER: Yes. I mean, I thought I had the wording down because I remember several years ago, a similar motion was presented, and we had to amend the wording.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. We're going to get that added-

HELMUT PILLER: Yes, thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: That minor amendment. Yes, go ahead.

RODNEY GEYER: Rodney Geyer. Alliston. Further to Helmut's request to consider, can we also consider including a letter to go to the Professional Engineers Association, and the Architects. Because we find that they're some of the bigger culprits as far as providing something that appears to be a plan of survey. And of course, they're not licensed to give opinions on boundaries, yet they seem to. Can that also be included in that consideration? Or do I need - sorry do I need to?

RUSS HOGAN: That - that I guess would be up to the mover and seconder. And it was pointed out Helmut that we all - where is - John D'Amico was the seconder. Is John in the room here? Are you - are you good with that minor amendment that we were talking about? Adding the word consider?

JOHN D'AMICO: Yes.

RUSS HOGAN: Helmut, you've been asked, I guess, if - if you would consider another amendment.

HELMUT PILLER: I believe it is really our responsibility to police our own membership. To go to another party and ask the architects, or professional engineers, or anything else to carefully scrutinize the documents. That they get a proper survey. I don't think that is proper. In other words, we are asking them to police us? So, I understand what it is and I - I have discussed it. And we have educated several architects that we work with. And they are aware of it. But we just - by their own recognizance and will are they looking at it and rejecting it. Simply, do not engage surveyors that produce that kind of a product.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. So, perhaps if you'd like, you could present your own motion specifically to speak to your concern.

RODNEY GEYER: Could you put that back up again? The motion?

RUSS HOGAN: Oh, this is the motion. Okay. I just want to read the motion as amended there. So, the last therefore - "Therefore, the Council of the Ontario Land Surveyors has respectfully requested to consider instructing the Registrar at the first opportunity to send a letter to every licensed member informing that the continuation of such practice will be prosecuted as a breach of the Code of Ethics for incompetence and professional misconduct, with the wording approved by Council." Okay. Is that - is that satisfactory, Helmut? That amendment? And John? Thanks. Okay. Go ahead.

JAMIE LESLIE: I was going to consider another amendment. Sorry. I would - that second line, the "whereas there was a number of licensed surveyors producing plans as disguised," I think that should just be "products." I think when you start putting "plans" and then, "As plans of survey," there could be a legal confusing issue. So, I - I don't - I think, personally, that producing "product disguised as a plan of survey" is a much better term. And that's just, if you wish to consider that. Thanks.

HELMUT PILLER: So, as a matter of fact, we - I - well, John and I pondered this wording. We didn't - we weren't quite sure. Perhaps, producing documents? Or - we couldn't really come up with something that - it is a plan. You know - it's still a plan. But it's not a plan of survey. So, I'm - I'm not sure - you know, I'm open. John and I are open to - to changes and amending these to make it more clear, so there is no confusion.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. So, the - Jamie had suggested changing "producing plans disguised as surveys" to "producing products disguised as plans of survey." That could cover a lot.

HELMUT PILLER: It could cover a lot. "Products" is such a wide-ranging term.

RUSS HOGAN: Right.

HELMUT PILLER: You know, what is a product? I'm thinking in a narrow term of somebody looking at this - this particular piece of paper. But document is fine. I mean, for our internal purpose to understand it. I don't think there would be any confusion. I - and I don't believe it will go outside this assembly or outside the Association's realm anyways.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay.

HELMUT PILLER: So, I - I -

RUSS HOGAN: You'd leave it - you want to leave it the way it is then. Okay. That's fine.

HELMUT PILLER: Okay.

RUSS HOGAN: Yes, go ahead, Saša.

SAŠA KRČMAR: Yeah. I - I know what Helmut's trying to do. But I'll tell you, in the spirit of innovation, 'cause that's what I'm - I'm really trying to do. And, you know, moving the profession forward, and meeting the needs of the public and what we're trying to do. And again, we're in - we're in a discussion mode at this point.

One of the challenges we've had is we've created a product where we just wanted to stake out a boundary for people. Particularly for fencing, or for whatever. So, on our - on our website, we would offer the service of staking out a boundary.

But what's funny is people would pay us for the service. We'd come out. We'd put points in the ground. But then, they ask us. We need a piece of paper. I go, "Okay." So, now I have the paper dilemma. If I give them the receipt, it's not enough. If I give them the field notes, 'cause they stand on their own. As an association, we accept field notes as a product. No problem. They can't read the field notes. And most of the people that do the field notes probably don't make them in such a way that they're really helpful to the user as a consumer. So, I want to do a sketch. I want to give them a sketch. The instant I get into a sketch, now I've got to set a bar in the back, a bar in the front. Re-establish the front line. Re-establish the back line. And tell the consumer that their one property line is going to cost \$2,800. And all I want to know is the x and y not the z.

So, my worry, with these types of things, is that I just want to give a piece of paper. I do my research. But I can't give a piece of paper, because in the context of what we're talking about here, that piece of paper requires full accordance with a sticker. Full accordance with the survey regs. Full accordance with everything. So, in the context of all this discussion, I would suggest that the traditional products that surveyors are creating need to be reviewed. And we have to have an open mind. And as professionals, we have to be able to do the right thing to be able to continue to have a value to society. Including giving some kind of piece of paper that they can now take to their lawyer or anybody to prove that they've done something. So, I'm just adding that to the - to the mix of what Helmut is suggesting.

HELMUT PILLER: Mr. Chairman, if I may reply to that. Obviously, Saša missed my dissertation on that yesterday. And I don't know if it was in the session or in the Open Forum, but I did explain that we have the same issues. And this is really, has to be a discussion and clarification with the client to make clear to him what we are doing for him. If there is a - and I repeat myself. If they simply want to - if they are in agreement with the neighbour and just simply want to align stakes so they can put the fence in the right place. No problem. If there's a potential conflict, then we do a one-line survey. It's a plan of survey, monumented at both ends. A plan given a sticker on it. Certified so they have a document.

And if they simply want something as a record in case, you know, somebody questions it, I take the field note. We do prepare field notes. We don't just code. And

- and certify it up as "This survey was prepared on a certain date." My signature. And I - I seal it. And that gives them the documentation. And everything is there in place. So, you know, the research has to be done regardless. Even on a one-liner, we do the registry office search to make sure both pins reflect the same description, and there's no conflict. So, I don't think this is in - in - what I'm - what John and I proposed is in anyway detrimental to carrying out that kind of work.

RUSS HOGAN: Can you - can you speak into the mic? There you go.

BOB MOUNTJOY: Bob Mountjoy, Brampton. Helmut, you know what the word "disguise" means, but I don't necessarily know what "disguise" means. I think what you're driving at is that anytime we do a survey, which is related to the boundary, it should be fully to the regulations. And fully - in full compliance with all the regulations. And "Plan of Survey" is a regulated term. And it is required to conform to all regulations. But anything else that isn't labelled as a plan of survey - that's where the grey area is. So, do you really mean that you're - you would like to stop the practice of doing a sub-regulation survey, which appears to be a plan of survey, instead of being in full compliance whenever you're dealing with a boundary. Does that make sense? So, really - just what do you mean by the word "disguise?"

HELMUT PILLER: By the word "disguise" I mean that this product is given to the client. The client looks at it. There's a surveyor signing it at the bottom. There's a little bitty print that this is not a plan of survey. It cannot be used for this. This is a disguise in my world. So, I'm - I could also - we could also use the word misleading, which may be even more appropriate than disguising. But, you know, if we do - if we do a survey, then it has to be done properly. I mean, unfortunately, the office of the surveyors - city survey in Toronto - also produces these kinds of plans. That are not monumented, but it is a survey. We have obtained them. We have relied on them. They are research. I don't know whether or not, plans are surveys.

This city survey's office has produced plans of surveys through the millennials - and good solid surveys. Is it so they can save \$16 on a stake-out? Is it to keep it out of it? And you have nothing to hide. It's not a disguise in your case. Because it's not for the public use anyways. At the best, another surveyor such as us get it as part of the research material. And I don't have an issue with that. As long as it doesn't go into the public domain, and the public then has this and says, "Well, here is my boundary." See? There's nothing there - on there to define the boundary anyways from a layman's point of view. Because they - they wouldn't know what to - you may have coordinates on there. If you don't show any ties on there. You do show distances and bearings. Suffice your - your requirements. Fine, I don't have a problem with that. But if it gets to the public, and the public then gets involved in this. And perhaps has a dispute over this. Then, it becomes an issue.

BOB MOUNTJOY: Well, that is a completely separate issue from the wording of your motion today. We've talked about that in the past. And we will discuss it again during the sketches discussions. But, I'm trying to help here clarify what it is you're

actually trying to control. And I think you're trying to control, or trying to make certain, that any piece of paper which purports to be a survey and deals with a boundary or ties to a boundary should be in full compliance with the regulations. Is that what you're saying? Okay. Can we amend the, can we remove the word "disguising" then, and change it around to say, to the effect that anything that is purporting to be a survey, or appears to be a survey, or deals with boundaries, be conducted in full compliance with the regulations and is signed and stickered. Can we do that?

RUSS HOGAN: Hold on. Okay. Go ahead.

KENT CAMPBELL: Kent Campbell, Mississauga. Yeah. Just to - I have nothing significant to say. Just some wordsmithing. And I've just - I was just - when I read this, I'm thinking that the second "Whereas" should be "there is a number of licensed surveyors producing plans of surveys disguised as other products." So, I'm just wondering if the mover and seconder would be willing to make that amendment?

DAN DZALDOV: I'm just going to - just sorry - I just want to - I wanted to jump in and just - I agree with the amendment. I think that's your intent, if you - if you look at it. But I just wanted to bring a little bit more focus. Because I find, I'm sorry, I didn't introduce myself. Dan Dzaldov, still VP. I think as Council, we're charged with the responsibility of protecting the public. I have no doubt that the members when dealing directly with the public, when they - when they - follow proper procedures, regulations, code of ethics, etc. That one on one relationship, they can explain to their client what they're giving them.

My biggest concern is what happens with that product later on. I've seen many circumstances where a surveyor has explained to their client, I'm giving this to you for a very specific purpose. And that's why I'm not doing an SRPR or a plan of survey that satisfies your need. But it looks like an SRPR. It looks like a plan of survey. And then, of course, whether it's a week later, six weeks later, or six years later, it ends up in somebody else's hands, who relies on it, and it looks like a plan of a survey. And it looks like an SRPR. And they act on it. They see building ties. They see fence ties. They see survey monuments. Either some of those or all of those. And they go ahead, and they don't understand, and they use it.

Our job is to protect the public. And sometimes, that's protecting the public from themselves. From not understanding what's there. And I think that puts a little bit more focus into the matter. Because I do believe - I'd like to believe that everyone, at least the majority of our members, would explain the situation properly to their client. And they wouldn't try to mislead them with - with a product other than a SRPR or a plan of survey, just trying to cut corners. Just thought I would add that.

RUSS HOGAN: Anna?

ANNA AKSAN: Anna Aksan, Toronto. I - I want to speak for the motion. And the - I think it is, it is a no-brainer to..

RUSS HOGAN: I think just move a little bit closer.

ANNA AKSAN: It is a no-brainer for us to be able to tell 'a survey', from 'not a survey'. So, those semantics. I'm not sure whether they should be the focus of the discussion. And what I want to say, that we are bound by the Surveys Act and we are bound by the Surveyors Act to serve the public the best to our ability. We don't have Sketches Act. We don't have Sketchmakers Act. And until we get them, I don't think, I don't think we should allow products like that.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you.

ANNA AKSAN: Thank you.

PAUL WYMAN: Paul Wyman, Kitchener. I'm - particularly as a retired member, I don't really have strong feelings for, or against the motion. I was just going to say that I don't think we should get too tied up with the precise wording. It's only a recommendation to Council. And I'm sure at the end of things, Council, if they do choose to send out a letter. It's going to be very worded - carefully worded and - and thought through. And we don't need to go through that process, here. I think the intent is clear. And Council can move forward.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. Helmut. Helmut?

HELMUT PILLER: Well, I thank all my fellow surveyors for helping me out here and clarifying this. I think Paul laid it to rest, perhaps, but if we want to do another amendment, we can change the words around a bit? Yeah. But I agree with Paul. In the end, it will be you people who say what should be said. So -

RUSS HOGAN: Okay.

HELMUT PILLER: So, if it's all right. Let's leave it and move on.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay.

HELMUT PILLER: Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Drew. One last...

DREW ANNABLE: Drew Annable, London. A consultant with the Survey Review Department. I don't want to speak to the motion, but I would like to make a comment on Saša's comment if I could. Saša suggested he wanted to provide his client with a piece of paper. And I would just like to say that we are all the time advising within our comprehensive review process, from the Survey Review Department, that that's a project that needs a piece of paper. It's called a report. A

written report that he can be telling in a written fashion - telling his client what they asked him to do. What he delivered. Which is staking up a fence and that. So, that should satisfy providing the piece of paper to his client.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. Go ahead.

PETER WILLIAMS: Peter Williams, Orangeville. And on a lighter note, I'd like to say that I was really astounded when I realized I've been surveying for 50 years. And I got a pin. And I think you should notify surveyors that are qualified to do that. To let them know, so they'll come. But anyway, I only came here to get PD points, quite honestly. But having said that, I really enjoy it.

And I want to say that, you know, my first passion is surveying. My second passion is piano. I'm a pianist. And I - I got a seven-foot Steinway grand when I sold my house in the country and moved into town. And it's - it's the joy of my life now. And I know that age shouldn't disqualify you from anything. I watch a show on PBS. This pianist came out, he was 90 years old. He needed help to get on the stage. He gave a brilliant performance of a Mozart concerto and a Chopin Scherzo. It was absolutely astounding. I realized that age doesn't prevent you from doing anything. And again, what I'm doing now - I am studying German. And you go onto Babble.com. And - and I want to go to Germany because I want to get into the roots of music. And having said that, danke schoen. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you. I just need to remind members to - we've got a motion on the floor. Please stick to the topic of the motion. But thank you Peter.

TRAVIS HARTWICK: Travis Hartwick, Pakenham. I seem to be talking a lot today. I'm not sure why, but - so, I guess I just have a question in - what does this motion do that's not already done by - by the Registrar? To me, if - if something is brought to the Registrar's attention, that doesn't match regulation, I would like to think that the Registrar, you know, takes some sort of action to prevent that from happening again. So, I guess I'm just kind of failing to see what this motion does that's not already being done. Maybe - maybe the Registrar can talk to that, I'm not sure.

BILL BUCK: So, you're asking me why I haven't done anything at this point?

TRAVIS HARTWICK: No, no. What I - I would never suggest that, Mr. Registrar, at all. I'm just saying, if examples of this have been brought to your attention by other OLSSs, I would think there would be a review of the product. And then if it didn't match - or didn't comply, then - then some action would be taken to make sure that there is - to make sure that there is, you know, compliance in the future.

BILL BUCK: And I guess that the problem is - and I've been getting examples of - various examples of - of this type of thing. Whether they're called plans, or sketches, or whatever they're called. And I think we all realize that Professional Standards has been looking at this whole situation for three or four years now. And I've honestly

been waiting for some sort of a decision to be made on - on this topic. And I don't think we're there yet. So, that's why when I received these plans, I haven't taken any action. Because I'm not sure what action is appropriate yet.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. I guess, at this point, I will call the - call the question to motion. By show of hands, can I see all in favour? Opposed? There's quite a few hands on both sides. Okay. I need a couple of volunteers to - to do a count for me. Hmmm? Anna and - well, but I don't see Nancy here. Oh, Nancy. I didn't see you there, Nancy. Could I ask for you two to attempt at least to do a count? And I'm going to call the questioning again. So, again, if you could raise your hand, and keep them raised, so that we can get a count.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: She spoke in favour of the motion. She should not be -

RUSS HOGAN: Sorry, Anna. Yeah. You spoke to the motion. So, can I get someone else, who hasn't spoke to the motion to - what was that? Okay. We're - how about these guys. So, raise your hands and keep them raised while we do a count here. So, all those in favour. Okay. Thanks. Okay. All those opposed. Please raise your hand, and keep them raised. Nancy?

NANCY GROZELLE: Thank you. So, the numbers are 49 in favor. And 61 opposed. And we didn't ask for those who were not voting. I'm not sure it's relevant. Did you want a number? Because there are people that did not raise their hand.

RUSS HOGAN: I should ask if anyone is abstaining.

NANCY GROZELLE: That would be 21.

RUSS HOGAN: Pardon me?

NANCY GROZELLE: 21.

RUSS HOGAN: 21. Okay. So, 49 -

NANCY GROZELLE: 49 -

RUSS HOGAN: 49, for. 61, against. And -

NANCY GROZELLE: 21.

RUSS HOGAN: 21 abstained. Okay. So -

NANCY GROZELLE: Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: The motion has been defeated. Okay. I - regardless, I think there was some good discussion. And I'm happy about that.

HELMUT PILLER: Just as a closing then, Mr. Chairman. So - so, to speak, The Gong Show will go on, then?

RUSS HOGAN: Anna.

ANNA AKSAN: I want to make light of it. A sketch a day keeps liability away.

RUSS HOGAN: Bob?

BOB MOUNTJOY: Bob Mountjoy, Brampton. There was a point came up in the beach discussion yesterday - was it yesterday morning? During the, during presentations to the assembly. It had to do with the time period 1940 to 1951, during which there was a statutory amendment which controlled, or changed the rules slightly for the way plans - plans and subdivisions along the beaches were to be shown. The committee appeared to be enamoured with that as a solution. That particular scenario where the statute had been changed and it gave a clear - a clear method for dealing with the problem. But that was only during that time-period. And I don't think that example should be used as the controlling example for how to deal with this situation. And I don't think the idea, that it is a viable solution should be carried on, should be carried forward. It was reversed 11 years later, of necessity. And therefore, should not be used as a valid example of how one should deal with the situation of beach boundaries. That's what I had to say - I just wanted to put that on the record. And for - for future discussion.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. Thanks. Adam, did you want to say anything?

ADAM DOMAGALSKI: And now you all know what it's like to run a Beach Task Force. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. We have just a couple minutes left in our Open Forum. Go ahead, Kent.

KENT CAMPBELL: I only had one, just one question, and some comments afterwards. Mr. Buck, when did you become Registrar?

BILL BUCK: When did I become Registrar?

KENT CAMPBELL: Yes.

BILL BUCK: August the 14th, 2000.

KENT CAMPBELL: So, you will have been Registrar for 18 years –

BILL BUCK: On August the 14th, yes.

KENT: I believe that underneath our, even previous Secretary, Treasurer, everything else that you could consider all the different designations over the years. I don't believe the position of Registrar has ever been filled longer than you.

BILL BUCK: I think you're right.

KENT CAMPBELL: And - and I would just like to comment on that. I - just over the years - there hasn't been enough - I don't know enough - I can't think of the exact word. But Mr. Buck, you've done an excellent job in this last 18 years. And there hasn't been enough recognition I think given to that today. Because this is your last - your last day - or your last AGM as an official Registrar of our Association. And I'd like to ask the membership to maybe give some great applause to this man, who I believe is a charlatan, because I've seen his writing skills. His soft skills. And I don't know any engineer that has that.

BILL BUCK: Thanks, Kent. But I'm still retiring.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. Yes, sir.

CATHERINE FITZGERALD: Thank you. Catherine Fitzgerald. I'm the President of URISA Ontario. And with permission of the chair, just a few words?

RUSS HOGAN: Yes.

CATHERINE FITZGERALD: Thank you. First of all, I wanted to - on behalf of URISA Ontario, thank you all for the welcome to your conference at this event. And specifically, to thank Blain, and Maureen, and Al, and Nancy, who have made me feel so very welcome here. I must say, there's very few conferences that I go to where you sit down at a table and right away someone introduces themselves and asks you how you're enjoying the conference. So, thank you all. It's been very welcoming.

URISA Ontario is an association of volunteer geospatial professionals. And I did want to take this opportunity to just quickly announce some events we have coming up that you would all be very welcome to attend. First of all, we're having coming up May 1 to May the 3rd, our annual BeSpatial conference, which includes a one day workshop on LiDAR and the use of LiDAR. So, we've captured it all, now what? We have also coming up in Thunder Bay, an event on April the 25th. That'll be our first event up there. So, we welcome all of you to consider that event as well. Again, thank you for having us. And it's been a wonderful experience. Thank you.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you. Thank you for coming.

SUSAN MACGREGOR: Can you hear? Is this on? Sue MacGregor, Surveyor General, Peterborough. One of the things that I neglected to mention in my report this morning is that the Ontario government has made a pretty bold move to make

all agencies, boards, and commissions representative of women by 40% in I think 20 - 2020? Or 2021. That is commissioned public bodies. Those are agencies of the Crown. LCBO. That sort of thing. It doesn't apply to this group, because we are self-regulating. Having said that though, I think it's very apparent still, that we are underrepresented by females. And I'm just - like, I think we're a very welcoming group, but I'm wondering if we can have more of a discussion or focus or thought put into how we can be more welcoming to women.

I don't know if you have any ideas or any thoughts that you can pass onto me, or maybe it's a case of - of helping your staff be more welcoming to women. I've got lots of stories about what it was like for me to go through as a young articling surveyor, and I don't know whether the next generation is feeling any better about it than I - than I went through. I don't think it's deliberate, I think the men in this room are - are very honourable people. But I - somehow, I think we have to address the gender inequality. Our organization, our association will be much stronger when we are diverse, and well-represented by all facets of society.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Sue.

BLAIN MARTIN: I just wanted to speak about Dave Horwood's presentation yesterday where he talked about the StatsCan data. And where they get the salary information. He did some research after the presentation and sent me an email last night. And said that StatsCan get all that data from us. That the firms fill in a form for StatsCan, about what the salaries are in their organization. And that's what it's based on. So, he said, Blain, if you could talk a little bit. Get the firms, the C of A holders, when they fill out that form, to take some time, and fill it in carefully and give the right information, as opposed - because it's a very important form in terms of StatsCan producing the data and sending it out. So, if you could, when you get that form, and you have to - you have to fill it in - please be careful and put in the right salaries instead of just having it as another government form that we have to - have to fill out. He said sometimes we are our own worst enemies.

RUSS HOGAN: Okay. Thanks, Blain. Okay.

UNKNOWN MALE: One second. Actually, I just filled out one of those wage - it wasn't even a wage survey. And I don't know how many other people get these things. But they ask questions like how much work you're going to be doing, are you hiring, stuff like that. But I've done a couple - I don't recall them asking the wages.

RUSS HOGAN: I don't either.

UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah. I - so, when I heard that, I was sort of shaking my head and I was asking the other people up here. And I don't know who else has done those things, but maybe I'm wrong - but I don't recall them asking me how much we

make and that. I - I'm just basing that on an email I got last night. So, it's something we should look into.

RUSS HOGAN: We can look into that. Try to understand it a bit better. Okay. That's it. Open Forum is done. Precious here is getting heavy, I'm afraid. Thank you, everyone, for a very stimulating Open Forum. I want to take a few minutes just to thank our out-of-town guests for attending our meeting. It was a pleasure to host you here in Niagara Falls. I hope you enjoyed your stay, and I don't know why I'm getting weepy, it's just - there's no reason for it here. I feel like Dave Parkhill. Anyway. I hope you enjoyed your stay here, and that we provided you with a fruitful learning experience. At this time, it's a tradition on tour to invite the most senior member of the group, of presidents, to come forward and say a few words on behalf on the delegates. Ladies and gentlemen, Brian Brown, president of British Columbia Land Surveyors.

BRIAN BROWN: Thank you, President, soon to be Past President Russ. I take the term most senior member, unfortunately it fits in too many ways. I would like to say thank you very much to both Russ and Vicki for being exemplary hosts. Shown us a good time. I had the opportunity to know Russ and Vicki a little bit over the last year. It's amazing how you always hear it from past presidents, when they're on the tour, they get a whole bunch of new friends, it's true. You really do, very good friends. I would like to thank the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors for the invitation to come to visit you. It's been very rewarding. Your discussions have been very interesting. Certainly, your land title system is very different than ours. But it's also similar in its own ways.

Trying to make a few notes, and I'm not good at that. Anyhow, I extend the invitation to Dan to come to Whistler for our meeting in a week and a half, two weeks. Hopefully, you'll have as good a time as I've had here. I'm pretty sure you will. And it's been a pleasure to be on the tour with Russ, and hopefully, we will not lose contact. Thank you very much.

RUSS HOGAN: Thank you, Brian. Yes, thank you Brian. And best wishes for a successful meeting in Whistler next month. You sure you want to go? You got a business to run? I got nothing to do. Okay. And to the rest of you, good luck. And very best wishes for the remainder of your tenure as president.

RUSS HOGAN: It's truly been a pleasure and an education to spend time with you all. There, that's gone. Al Heywood is this year's Chair for the Annual General Meeting Committee. Al would you please come forward and give the AGM report.

AGM COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

AL HEYWOOD: Thank you, Russ. Like Russ, I'm surprised to see so many here on a Friday. I thought I'd be giving a demographics about the ages 50 to 69 that don't like to drive in a snowstorm. But most of you are still here. So, I don't have to do a

demographic report. I would like to do a little shout-out to those that helped me on the committee.

Steve Balaban I kind of coerced into being the Sergeant-at-Arms. He graciously accepted. I did get a few complaints about the crop that he hit a few people with. Especially - especially during this week when we had a day that was anti-bullying day, so. So, anyway. Thanks Steve. Thanks Ron Berg. MTO, St. Catharines for your help with the exhibitors. And Roy Kirkup, as well who looked after the hospitality suite, and did a lot of the heavy lifting with the cases of beer, which were a few. So, I did just want to read to you very quickly, one of the things that we supported this year was Project SHARE, which was a local organization. I'll just read you a very quick excerpt from an email I got. This was from the Executive Director of Project SHARE.

The generosity of your attendees is much appreciated. 110 local families ask us for help every day with basic needs and we will apply your donation directly to homelessness prevention. Also, we give out 2,000 pounds of food per day, so the items collected in the barrel are certainly a big help. Hope you enjoy your visit to lovely Niagara Falls.

So, now, why I'm really up here. To report the numbers, we had a huge attendance, actually. We had 387 OLSs, 45 articling students, 27 retired, 9 associate members, 2 lay counsellors, 1 honorary member, 80 exhibitors, 92 non-members, and 120 accompanying persons, for a total of 770 that had at one point attended the meeting. So, thank you very much. Hope you enjoy the rest of your stay.

RUSS HOGAN: Wow. Those are some big numbers that's great. Shawn Hodgson will take the reins for now as - and is our Chair for the 2019 AGM. We look forward to you hosting in Toronto next year. Shawn.

SHAWN HODGSON: Well, good morning, everyone. Russ just said almost everything I was going to say. I would like to start off by thanking Al for hosting a great AGM this year. I have some big shoes to fill. We'll be at the Westin Harbour Castle from February 27th to March 1st. I'll also be looking for volunteers for my Operating Committee and Sergeant-at-Arms, if anyone wants to volunteer please come approach me. Other than that, have a safe drive home. And we'll see you next year.

RUSS HOGAN: Thanks, Shawn. Okay. Well, on Council, and especially during my term as president, I've worked and gotten to know the OLS staff. You've heard this from me before, but I can't say it enough about the support from these people. I want to recognize their efforts for our association. All of the staff pulled together to make this meeting a success. Can the following please stand. I know not everybody's still here. Blain Martin, Executive Director. Bill Buck, Registrar. Maureen Mountjoy, Deputy Registrar. Lena Kassabian, Office Manager. Julia Savitch, Program Manager. Penny Anderson, Member Services Coordinator and Webmaster. Joyce

Tenefrancia, Administrative Officer. Vladimir Oppenheim, Bookkeeper. Tim Hartley, Survey Review Manager. Al Worobec, SRD Field Survey Examiner. Sheila Lavina, Administrative Officer, and Herman Bernardo, Plan and Field Support Clerk. Please join me in thanking them for their work throughout the year.

The end is in sight. Okay. Yes, please don't forget to leave your name badges behind when - when you're leaving. Leave them out on the registration desk. Blain or Bill, are there any other announcements? You sure? Okay.

That concludes today's agenda. Ladies and gentlemen, would you kindly stand for the removal of the standard measure. Sergeant-at-Arms, would you please remove the standard measure? The 2018 Annual Meeting of Ontario Land Surveyors is now adjourned. Thank you. Congratulations.

--- (Applause)

--- Whereupon the Annual General Meeting Concluded
at 11:50 a.m.

PHOTOGRAPHS



Sergeant-at-Arms, Steven J. Balaban, OLS



Sergeant-At-Arms, Steven J. Balaban, presenting the Standard Measure at the Opening Ceremonies



2017/2018 Council

Back, left to right: Miranda Paquette, George Wortman, Peter Lamb,
Gavin Lawrence, Eric Ansell, Patricia Meehan, Al Jeraj, Susan MacGregor

Front, left to right: Andrew Mantha, Trevor McNeil, Murray Purcell, Bill Buck, Russ Hogan, Blain Martin, Dan Dzaldov

Missing: Peter Meerveld and Kathleen Gowanlock



New OLS Members

Back, left to right: Andrew Kayuk, Robert Wood, Ignat Girin, Mark Girin, Aisar Bheri, Armin Akhlaghi, Saeid Sedaghat, Navid Najjarbashi, Athiththan Kanaganayagam
Front, left to right: Juzer Noman, Keene Maulion, Shafic Rahman, Natalie Vibert, Farzad Salehi, Maaz Malek
Missing: Justyna Ziemlewska and Robert Pearlman



Keynote Speaker: Eric Termuende, founder of NoW Innovations, and Lead Content Strategist for True Calling Canada”



Jason Wilband at the Open Forum



(Left to Right) Blain Martin, Sergeant-at-Arms Steve Balaban and Lena Kassabian



The Dzaldov Family

(Left to Right) Ophir Dzaldov, Nili Dzaldov, Brooke Dzaldov,
Incoming President Dan Dzaldov, Shawna Dzaldov,
Goldie Kestenberg and Harvey Kestenberg



Mark Sampson, Senior Vice-President of Commercial Insurance for Arthur J. Gallagher Canada delivers the Charge to the New Surveyors.



Vice-President Al Jeraj with his wife Samra
at the President's Dinner and Dance



President Hogan presenting a citation to Eric Ansell
for service as a member of Council



President Hogan presenting a citation to Hugh Goebelle
for service as the Chair of the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee



President Russ Hogan (left) presenting a citation to T. Murray Purcell for service as a member of Council, President, and Past President of Council



Monique Ibey (right) accepting the Centenary Award on behalf of her sister, the late Henriette Verhoef



President Hogan presenting the Centenary Award to Tony Roberts



President Hogan presenting the Centenary Award to Desmond R. Rasch



Outgoing President Russ Hogan (left) presenting the chain of office to the Incoming President Dan Dzaldov



Incoming President Dan Dzaldov (right) presenting the Past President's Gavel to Russ Hogan



President Russ Hogan (left) with
Incoming President Dan Dzaldov (right) wearing the chain of office



Shawna Dzaldov (left) presenting a gift to the outgoing
President's wife Vicki Hogan (right)

Surveyor General's Report
2017 – 2018
Susan F. MacGregor, OLS, Surveyor General
sue.macgregor@ontario.ca
Mapping and Information Resources Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
© Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2017

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) continues to achieve positive results on several pan-government initiatives including climate change, business growth, digital government and the modernization of public service delivery.

MNRF priorities include supporting forestry, guiding land use planning, managing aggregates, leading conservation, strengthening biodiversity and minimizing the impact of invasive species.

The Mapping and Information Resources Branch (MIRB) is an essential partner in the management of Ontario's natural resources, enabling resource management decisions that are supported by the best possible advice, data and information through leadership in surveying, geomatics and information management.

Accomplishments

The Office of the Surveyor General (OSG) includes two units: Crown Land Surveys and Parcel Mapping and Georeferencing.

OSG provides professional legal surveying, mapping and georeferencing advice and services to a number of clients including:

- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF)
- Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation (MIRR)
- Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM)
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MMA)
- Ministry of the Attorney General (MAG)
- Municipalities
- Surveying and mapping industry

Survey and Mapping Work

- Reviewing and approving Crown Location Plans of Survey
- Providing professional survey advice and supporting the MNRF in court and tribunals
- Supporting First Nations land negotiations by mapping and reviewing land claim areas

- Reviewing Reserve Boundary Confirmation Plans
- Preparing Regulation Plans for planning areas, local services boards and provincial parks
- Maintaining Crown parcel and other cadastral and administrative data including the geographic township and lot fabric improved datasets

In 2017, OSG

- Provided advice on land issues within 20 First Nation reserves and communities
- Responded to over 1,900 requests for comments and/ or cadastral survey opinions to MNRF staff, other ministries, surveyors and lawyers
- Commented on 47 Land Titles Applications and two *Boundaries Act* Applications
- Received and reviewed 280 Crown Locations
- Processed over 970 requests for survey plans and records
- Completed five Perimeter Survey Instructions and prepared over 20 mining claim descriptions
- Prepared 12 Provincial Park Plans
- Scanned nearly 12,000 vital records
- Issued 11 contracts with a total value of \$184,000

For more information e-mail: rob.martin@ontario.ca or visit our website.

Progress on multi-year projects:

- Municipal Survey Decision #884 issued, now under appeal
- Municipal Survey Hearing in Strong Township commenced
- Support to AOLS:
 - Regulatory change initiatives under the *Surveyors Act*
 - Beach Task Force - provide clarity and training to members
- Support to with MIRR on 20 files including:
 - Discussions on the Treaty 3 flooding claims potentially impacting over 50 Reserves
 - Wikwemikong Islands Claim in Lake Huron
 - Algonquin Land Claim
 - Attawapiskat
 - Mississauga Highway Flooding Claim
 - Nawash (Treaty 82)
- Support to MMA on the proposed “Growing the Greenbelt” legislation by providing regulation plans to describe areas which are proposed to be added or removed from the existing area
- Work with Niagara Escarpment Commission to update the boundary descriptions for the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area of Development Control
- Support for regulatory amendments under the *Mining Act* which will enable licensed prospectors to register claims by selecting pre-set cells from an online grid reference frame that covers the province. The regulation governing the survey of mining claims has been updated to reflect modern survey practices and incorporated into O.Reg 45/11 General.
- Progress on the Vital Records Project to preserve survey documents. These records, some dating back to the mid-1780s, are kept in a climate-controlled room. The OSG continues to digitally scan these records to curtail further deterioration and allow future generations to access, use and disseminate. More than 13,000 records have

been scanned this year bringing the total scanned/restored collection to 61,800 records.

- New Crown Survey Instructions that incorporate new requirements for mining surveys
- Historical research on the interprovincial boundary between Ontario and Quebec along the Ottawa River

Geodetic Activities

The COSINE (Control Survey INformation Exchange) database is the official source for provincial, federal, and municipal control survey information in Ontario. The current COSINE Online was launched in 2015 to better meet *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (AODA) requirements.

A new data model is under development which will move the database from an ORACLE environment to an ESRI-based platform within the Land Information Ontario (LIO) infrastructure. In addition, a new user interface will be released in 2018 that will allow:

- Mobile access for smart phones and tablets
- Improved map display and search functionality
- User-friendly report format
- Feedback tool to report destroyed stations, etc.

Approximately 1,000 station records were updated by:

- Revising approximate map coordinates of benchmarks using Google

StreetView and aerial photos

- Updating destroyed stations
- Transcribing text descriptions from reference sketches into reports
- Adding detailed station maintenance notes and ‘last visited’ dates

In 2017, OSG worked with the City of Burlington to address issues with the city’s NAD83 (ORIG) control network. This co-operative effort involved over 900 horizontal control stations. OSG also worked with the City of Peterborough on a GNSS/GPS horizontal control project involving approximately 30 stations and a new digital levelling network for the city. Consultation occurred with several other southern Ontario municipalities on horizontal and vertical control survey projects which they intend to submit to COSINE in the future.

MTO also contributed projects along numerous highways resulting in the following control stations and benchmarks being loaded into COSINE:

- 592 new NAD83-CSRS control points
- 167 new NAD83-Original control points
- 74 new CGVD28 benchmarks
- Six projects along King’s Highways 7, 11, 15, 17, 64, 101, and 144.
- Four projects along 400-Series Highways 401, 404, 406, and 410
- Four projects along Secondary Highways 533, 539, 560, 575, and 600

- 15 levelling routes re-adjusted into CGVD2013 and published

In support of Height Modernization in Ontario, 15 MTO Precise Level Routes were re-adjusted into CGVD2013, reviewed and loaded into COSINE for publication. Other MNRF levelling projects are being prepared and the levelling route data reviewed for ties to first order Canadian Geodetic Survey benchmarks that can serve as constraints for re-adjustment to CGVD2013.

In 2016, approximately 20,000 first (and some second) order benchmarks whose heights have been computed by the Canadian Geodetic Survey in relation to the CGVD2013 vertical datum were published through COSINE. Work on a transformation methodology to convert vertical data (or data with a vertical component) from CGVD28 to CGVD2013 is proceeding. (The method being tested is based on “differencing” the two geoid models associated with CGVD28 and CGVD2013). So far the results of this approach appear promising.

In 2017, Geodetic staff attended the annual Canadian Geodetic Reference System Committee (CGRSC) meeting in Ottawa. The CGRSC includes geodetic representatives from each of the provinces and the Canadian Geodetic Survey of Natural Resources Canada.

For more information e-mail: morgan.goadsby@ontario.ca

Geographic Names:

The Ontario Geographic Names Board met three times and considered 53 names cases resulting in 21 new names and three name changes. The remaining cases were either denied or deferred.

With the assistance of MNRF staff, the Board continues to look for new opportunities to engage communities, businesses and Ontarians about geographic names through MNRF’s social media channels.

To comment on current names proposals visit our web page or follow MNRF’s Twitter and Facebook pages.

Geographic Names staff handled over 400 naming requests and are updating language and Indigenous names policies in conjunction with Natural Resources Canada and MNRF’s Indigenous Policy and Communications staff.

MNRF’s database contains more than 57,000 official names for water and land based geographic features. To find official names on a map visit our website and click on the link “Find official names on a map”.

OSG, hosted the 120th annual meeting of the Geographical Names Board of Canada in Peterborough last September. Representatives from all provinces, territories, Natural Resources Canada and other Federal Departments attended the three day meeting. The dominant theme of the meeting was Indigenous Naming. A First Nation Elder, Professor Emeritus of Trent University and a residential school

survivor was the keynote speaker and addressed the importance of Indigenous naming in Ontario and Canada. Another speaker highlighted the growing importance of Indigenous naming internationally through the United Nations. Work continues to inventory MNRF's extensive historical records, including information on more than 200,000 geographic names, maps and correspondence files dating back many generations.

For more information e-mail: morgan.goadsby@ontario.ca or visit our website.

Foundation Geospatial Data

The Mapping and Information Resources Branch (MIRB) also delivers geomatics and information services to MNRF, other ministries and Ontarians. Foundation geospatial data for Ontario includes:

- Roads
- Water
- Utilities
- Wetlands
- Elevation data
- High-resolution imagery

Much of this data is available for direct download from the Land Information Ontario (LIO) website.

Use the interactive Make a Topographic Map application to view the best available data and imagery for Ontario.

For more information e-mail: lio@ontario.ca

Ontario Road Network

The Ontario Road Network (ORN) contains information on more than 275,000 kilometres (kms) of roads across the province and is maintained by all three levels of government.

In 2017, more than 47,000 kms of roads were added or updated to the ORN. The ORN is fundamental to Ontario's emergency response systems. The data is used by the federal government to update Canada's National Road Network, the Statistics Canada Road Network and to improve Canada's census geography.

For more information e-mail: lio@ontario.ca

Ontario Parcel

The Ontario Parcel Agreement between the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, and Teranet Enterprise was renewed for an additional ten years. The Ontario Parcel is a province-wide, standardized database that contains nearly 10 million assessment, ownership and Crown land parcels.

For more information e-mail: carla.jordan@ontario.ca

Ontario Imagery

Land Information Ontario coordinates partnerships to acquire current high- resolution imagery for the province.

The partnership approach provides significant cost savings to all parties. Partners typically pay less than 20 percent of the total cost of acquiring the imagery. A number of surveying firms have taken advantage of a subscription option available to private sector organizations. Organizations contribute a minimum \$1,000 contribution to an acquisition and can select imagery on an as needed basis for up to three years after the imagery is delivered.

The imagery is multi-spectral with a resolution of 16 cm for southern Ontario and 20 cm for north-central Ontario. Ground control is established for each project area resulting in a horizontal accuracy of 45 cm “on the ground” for southern Ontario and 50 cm for north-central Ontario. Stereo data is also available to partners at no additional cost.

The 2018 project partners are finalizing plans to acquire imagery for over 40,000 km² in south central Ontario. Partnership opportunities are still available.

These products are available for purchase:

- Southwestern Ontario (2015)
- Eastern Ontario (2014)
- South Central Ontario (2013)
- Central Ontario (2016)
- North western Ontario (2017) – available spring 2018

Elevation data generated from these imagery projects will include a 40 cm digital surface model point cloud and a 2 metre raster digital elevation model. These products are available as open data.

As new imagery becomes available, it can be viewed on the Make a Topographic Map application.

For more information e-mail: imagery@ontario.ca or visit our website.

Strategic Directions

Government has been considering a number of initiatives to ensure Ontario continues as a strong economy in Canada. Some initiatives that flow through the Office of the Surveyor General will clearly have impacts on the survey industry. A desire to improve Indigenous relationships have accelerated land claim negotiations, resulting in survey work. The new mining act with cell-based staking of claims will impact mineral exploration triggering surveys when mines move into operation. A multimodal transportation study for the north, northern agricultural studies, and strengthen planning activities under four plan review will no doubt impact land development activities in southern Ontario. I hope the survey industry is able to respond to the demand.

On the Geodetic front there is some exciting activity within the Federal Government to develop a Position, Navigation and Timing Strategy. While early days, the goal may be to achieve 3 cm position accuracy across Canada. MIRB will support that activity within Ontario.

Land Information Ontario continues to move forward with its 2018-2022 Imagery Acquisition Program. This public-private partnership program will repeat imagery acquisitions made across Ontario in the 2013 to 2017 program.

Private and public sector organizations can still join the new partnership and reduce imagery acquisition costs. Contact imagery@ontario.ca for more information. MNRF is working to continue partnerships with the federal government to improve provincial elevation data. MIRB is also collaborating with municipalities and conservation authorities across Ontario to better manage and use LiDAR data.

Efforts to develop and implement a succession strategy for the Office of the Surveyor General, have proven much more challenging than anticipated. I would encourage others to take this activity seriously to ensure Ontario is adequately served.

Susan F. MacGregor O.L.S.
Surveyor General
susan.macgregor@ontario.ca

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

J. Russell Hogan, OLS, OLIP

My term as President is almost over and as I reflect on the year, I am surprised at how quickly time passes, and humbled by how challenging it is to accomplish everything that needs to be done.

When I became President I stated that we need to promote and grow our profession. We need to continue to raise awareness of the profession, and the employment opportunities in surveying in order to encourage students to pursue a career in surveying. This is not the only issue impacting our Association; however, I do believe it is one of the most critical issues we face.

Although the number of new surveyors who have joined the AOLS in the last few years is encouraging, our membership numbers continue to decline and our demographics have not changed significantly. Three quarters of our membership is over the age of 50.

On a positive note the number of articling students has increased and currently stands at 88, a number we haven't seen in over 20 years. This is largely due to the efforts of PAC & GRLC to raise awareness of our profession.

Unfortunately, not all students complete their articles and a recent analysis indicates that close to 50% do not follow through to become Ontario Land Surveyors. Why is this? It seems to me that the most difficult part of becoming an OLS is meeting the requirements to article. Unfortunately, there is no exit interview undertaken when a student terminates their articles and we can only make assumptions about their departure.

We need to understand why such a high percentage of students do not complete their articles and determine what the issues or barriers are that are so that they can be addressed. Is it a reflection of their experiences at work? I don't know but I would ask all Articling Surveyors and survey companies to give their Articling Student meaningful work and do everything they can to help the student become engaged in the profession and want to become an OLS.

Strategic Plan Initiatives

Our annual Strategic Planning session was held at the end of March with most members of Council participating, along with representatives from some committees and Regional groups. In addition to Developing New Members, Legislative and Regulatory Changes, Marketing Strategy, and Succession Planning were identified as the top priorities.

As part of the effort to "Developing New Members" the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee (GRLC) has been working to increase the number of secondary schools that offer the Specialist High Skills Major (SHSM) Surveying Certification Program. GRLC are also coordinating efforts to get our book, *Great Lengths – A Celebration of the Surveyors of Ontario*, into secondary schools throughout the province. The book is an excellent vehicle to help raise awareness of the profession to secondary school students who are planning for their future careers. We now need to get it into the hands of students, teachers and in particular, guidance counselors. After trying a few different approaches, the best approach seems to be to speak to the Guidance Consultants at the schools boards. These individuals can then distribute the books and other information about career opportunities in surveying to the guidance counselors at all of the secondary schools in their district and can help facilitate surveyor presentations if requested. The Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee needs your help in approaching the school boards, making presentations to the guidance counselors, and supporting the teachers delivering the SHSM program. Please volunteer. A complete presentation with notes will be available to any OLS who can take the time to discuss our profession with the Guidance Consultant in their school district.

York University has both a Geomatics Engineering program and a Geomatics Science program and the AOLS would like to work with the university to promote both programs to increase the number of students entering Geomatics. The AOLS also wants the students in these Geomatics programs to become Ontario Land Surveyors. There are many job opportunities for graduates and we need to ensure that they know about the surveying industry and its great career opportunities. Blain

and I have met several times with representatives from York to identify opportunities to interact with students and to make our pitch for the profession.

The Legislation/Regulation Task Force was formed to review the legislation & regulations that affect the AOLS and identify any legislative amendments necessary to keep them current and effective. Work is well underway. The Task Force has completed its own review, undertaken a jurisdictional scan and is in the process of gathering input from AOLS committees. The goal is to make changes that have a positive impact for everyone – the surveyor, the Association and the public. When this work is complete, recommendations for proposed changes will be presented to the membership for discussion.

Developing a marketing strategy to increase provincial and national awareness of the value land surveyors create for society, and the attractiveness of the profession as a career, was seen as an ideal initiative to undertake collaboratively with our sister Associations across the country. To facilitate this initiative the AOLS organized and hosted a one-day workshop lead by Ken Wong, Distinguished Professor in Marketing at Queen's University, School of Business. The workshop was attended by representatives from British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, the Association of Canada Lands Surveyors, and Professional Surveyors Canada. At the end of the day all of the representatives in attendance agreed that improving our communications with government, industry, and the public is a strategic priority and recommended that our land surveying associations form a national working group tasked with the goal of developing a joint public relations strategy for the land surveying profession. Although we have struggled to move forward, there continues to be a desire by the majority of organizations to collaborate on an initiative of this nature, and it is my hope that the AOLS will be able to move this forward in 2018.

Another initiative, related to marketing, is the undertaking of a National Salary Survey. A key factor for anyone trying to decide on a career path is good information about salary and long term earning potential. To ensure that we have accurate and up-to-date information about the remuneration that surveyors receive we are preparing to undertake a Salary Survey in early 2018. We are working with representatives from a number of our sister associations to develop a survey that will be sent to professional surveyors across Canada. I encourage all members to take the time needed to respond and provide accurate information. It is in the best interest of our profession.

Having a Succession Plan in place for senior AOLS staff positions is important for the efficient and effective operation of the Association. The demographic of the Association's OLS staff is no different than the demographic of the membership as a whole. They are nearing retirement. The manager of the Survey Review Department will be retiring this spring and the Registrar has indicated his intention to retire at the end of 2018. The combined talent and expertise of these staff members will be sorely missed. On a positive note, the Executive Director has agreed to a contract extension, which will help to mitigate the challenges that may

arise from these retirements. The Executive Committee is working closely with the Executive Director to manage these changes and ensure that the AOLS Office continues to function effectively.

Other important issues

The Professional Standards Committee (PSC) spent considerable time and effort over the last couple of years reviewing the use and misuse of sketches and submitted their recommendations to Council in late 2017. Their review included numerous examples of sketches produced by members as well as the responses to a member questionnaire on the use of sketches. The committee is recommending that the existing Guidelines for Sketches be updated, the expectations imposed by the Guidelines be communicated to our members and that sketches be subject to review by Survey Review Department (SRD). I commend the work done by the PSC and I agree that education of our members and review by SRD are keys to eliminating the misuse of sketches.

In the summer, MPAC renewed the Ontario Parcel Agreement with Teranet, and Ontario Digital Cadastre Corporation (ODCC) was informed that it would have no role in maintaining parcel mapping for MPAC. This was very disappointing news for everyone involved. As a result, the Board of Directors recommended to Council that the business of the ODCC be wound down and the Corporation be dissolved. The process to dissolve the Ontario Digital Cadastre Corporation is currently underway. I would like to commend Bruce Baker, all of the members of the Board of Directors, and everyone else who was involved in ODCC in any way, for the time and effort they put into making the ODCC a success.

As a gesture of appreciation for the efforts expended by the ODCC, and in the interest of maintaining a good relationship with surveyors, MPAC has offered to build a survey records index application at no cost to the Association and provide access to multiple layers of data including assessment and ownership mapping. The AOLS will be required to pay relatively low annual maintenance costs. This is an excellent opportunity for the Association and brings the implementation of a Province Wide Survey Records Index (PWSRI) one step closer.

Across the Country

Attending the other provincial association meetings provides an opportunity to share information and to gain a different perspective on the issues that challenge the surveying profession across Canada.

A lot of the issues and challenges that we face in Ontario are the same in many other provinces and the presidents of our sister associations are all enthusiastic about not only sharing information, but also collaborating to tackle issues together. As mentioned above, I was able to bring two Ontario initiatives to the President's Forum for consideration: a National Marketing Strategy, and a National Salary Survey, and both were met with a positive response. I believe that undertaking these initiatives on a national scale will provide better results for all professional surveyors in Canada.

Although some issues take longer than expected to resolve, much has been accomplished over the course of the past year, and I'd like to thank Council and all of the committees and task forces for their time and effort to move our initiatives forward. Finally, I would like to acknowledge and thank Council, Blain Martin, Executive Director and all the AOLS staff for their hard work and commitment to the betterment of the Association. Without the efforts of every one of them, we would not be able to meet the expectations of both the membership and the public. It has been an honour to serve as President and I thank everyone for the support you have provided throughout the year.

Thank You,
Russ Hogan,
AOLS President 2017

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT 2017 Blain Martin, OLS, CLS, PMP, MBA

The Executive Director is the senior staff officer of the Association, responsible to the President and Council of the Association. In addition to formal roles as Secretary to Council and Treasurer of the Association, the Executive Director implements decisions of Council, promotes the welfare and image of the Association, promotes liaison between all segments of the Association and other organizations, government bodies and the public and ensures the efficient day-to-day operation of the Association offices.

This report will cover the period from January 1st 2017 to December 31st 2017 under the general headings of Administration, Strategic Planning, Membership, Government Relations and Public Relations.

Administration

The Association's staff complement for 2017 included a total of 12 staff members (including 5 Ontario Land Surveyors). In addition, we have 2 Ontario Land Surveyors on contract to assist the Survey Review Department (SRD) with the Peer Review Program. This past July marked my 8th anniversary in the position of Executive Director. I have enjoyed the role immensely.

During 2017 there were not any changes to the staff compliment. The complete staff list is as follows:

Blain Martin, OLS	Executive Director
Bill Buck, OLS	Registrar
Maureen V. Mountjoy, OLS	Deputy Registrar
Lena Kassabian	Office Manager
Julia Savitch	Program Manager
Penny Anderson	Member Services Coordinator and Webmaster
Vladimir Oppenheim	Bookkeeper / Accountant / Controller
Joyce Tenefrancia	Administrative Officer
Tim Hartley, OLS	Survey Review – Manager
Al Worobec, OLS	Survey Review – Field Survey Examiner
Sheila Lavina	Survey Review – Administration Officer
Herman Bernardo	Survey Review – Examiner Assistant

As I did in the past, I would like to provide background on each member of the staff and what their current responsibilities are.

Blain Martin has been Executive Director since July of 2009. Like Maureen (a classmate), Blain is a graduate of the first class ('76) of the Survey Science program at Erindale College, University of Toronto (UofT). Subsequent to this, he continued his education and received a Master of Engineering degree from UofT and an MBA from the Queen's School of Business.

Blain's career straddles both the Cadastral and the Geographic Information Management sides of the Association, which brings a unique perspective to the Executive Director's position. He is striving to achieve his primary goal of the betterment of the profession by getting involved in projects that protect the public, enhance the perception of surveyors by the public, bring in new members, and develop a collaborative approach between existing members.

Blain subscribes to the African proverb that says, “If you want to go fast, go alone; if you want to go far, go together!” Blain believes a collaborative approach of “going together” is tremendously important for the betterment of the profession and our overall success will only be achieved by everyone working together. This has become even more important during 2017.

During the course of the year Blain worked on major initiatives that reflect his view on collaboration. The first project is the delivery of the Historical Book, “Great Lengths” to all secondary schools in Ontario to promote the profession to guidance counsellors and in turn to secondary school students. This is not finished and will continue during 2018 and with many Ontario Land Surveyors helping across the Province. This has turned out to be a huge endeavour which appears to be widely supported by the profession. The other projects include collaboration on a national marketing initiative, working on a national salary study for professionals and technical people and becoming more involved with politicians.

Bill Buck joined the AOLS as Registrar in August 2000. Bill is a graduate of the University of Toronto Civil Engineering (Survey Option) class of 1969. Along

with being an Ontario Land Surveyor he is a Canada Lands Surveyor and a member of the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario.

His principal duties include supporting the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee and the Complaints Committee by preparing their agendas and minutes and ensuring that all correspondence emanating from these committees is processed expeditiously.

During 2017, Bill supported the AERC with processing academic evaluations and articling applications as well as assisting with examinations, the annual lecture course, and presiding over the Convocation luncheon. He also prepared the agendas and minutes and processed the files for Complaints Committee meetings.

Bill also participated in discipline hearings, dealt with several referrals from the Survey Review Department, provided administrative assistance to the Fees Mediation and Registration Committees, participated in the Professional Standards Steering Committee and responded to numerous inquiries from both members and the public. He also attends Council meetings, participates as an observer at CBEPS Board meetings, acts as liaison to the Office of the Fairness Commissioner and conducts Registrar's Investigations as required.

Maureen Mountjoy is a graduate of the first class ('76) of the Survey Science program at Erindale College, University of Toronto. In 1978, she was the second woman to become an Ontario Land Surveyor. She has been the AOLS Deputy Registrar and the Editor of the Ontario Professional Surveyor magazine since the fall of 2000.

She is also the Secretary and Chief Administrative Officer of the AOLS Educational Foundation and works closely with the Colleges and Universities whose students benefit from the awards generated from the Foundation. Maureen is a non-voting member of the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee (AERC), a member of the Public Awareness Committee (PAC), the Geomatics Recruitment and Liaison Committee (GRLC) and the University and College Students Liaison Committee (UCSLC). She attends many trade shows and career fairs to promote our profession and works closely with faculty and students in the Geomatics program at York University. She is the AOLS representative on the York University Geomatics Engineering/Geomatics Science Advisory Committee.

Last year, Maureen continued to work with Secondary Schools to develop teacher and student resource material for the Specialist High Skills Major (SHSM) "Introduction to Surveying" course, which was first launched at RGSS. The goal of the GRLC is to promote this course province-wide. This year Maureen continued working with the SHSM lead at the York Region District School Board to present a hands-on workshop to technology teachers who have an interest in teaching the Introduction to Surveying course at their schools.

Lena Kassabian has been with the AOLS since August 2005. As Office Manager, she ensures the AOLS office is running smoothly and the staff and members' expectations are met in a timely manner.

Lena is deeply involved with the AERC. She is responsible for processing evaluations and articling applications for students seeking their designation as an Ontario Land Surveyor. She meets with prospective candidates and engages them in the process in a positive fashion and ensures that all applicants receive the necessary materials. She takes great joy in helping local and foreign candidates achieve their goals.

Lena also scouts out locations for Annual General Meetings, Council Meetings, AERC events, the Geomatics Picnic and other meetings and seminars. She negotiates contracts for these events and organizes them.

Lena is also the key organizer of the Association's Annual General Meeting.

Julia Savitch has been with the AOLS since July 2011 as Program Manager. She has a Bachelor of Business Administration from the Schulich School of Business and has completed her MBA from the same school.

Her responsibilities include working with Continuing Education Committee to develop courses for our members and managing CPD; Website Committee; AGM Planning & Operating Committees, and all the commissions of the association. She also tracks the implementation of our annual Strategic Plan.

Julia is the editor of AOLS In Sight e-newsletter and the organizer of our monthly webinars. She also manages our social media presence on LinkedIn and Facebook.

Julia enjoys working with our great volunteers - committee and task force members, Regional Group Executives, Council, - as well as enabling communication and information sharing between various stakeholders of the AOLS.

Julia would like to encourage all the OLS members to participate in continuing education activities on a regular basis throughout their CPD cycles – and their careers, and to remember to submit their CPD activities as they go. She also welcomes suggestions from all members for newsletter, webinar and seminar content and encourages them to get involved in AOLS social media outlets.

Penny Anderson has been with the AOLS since June 2012 as the Member Services Coordinator and Webmaster. She is certified in Web Design and Development from Sheridan College and is currently working on her Information Systems Management Certification at Ryerson University.

Her role involves managing the Membership Database, Scheduling Membership Dues, and updating website content. Penny is the channel for Members' information changes, REACH Bulletin Distributions and assistance to Members on

how to navigate the website and setting up membership accounts online.

Penny also provides support to the Executive Director in generating demographic reports and assists in taking the minutes of Council meetings.

Since joining AOLS, Penny has also pursued further education at Ryerson University to obtain a Certificate in Information Systems Management. If you decide to visit Penny at the office, you may also meet her forty pound, four-legged companion, Barkley, who occasionally resides under her desk. On some of their days-off, she and Barkley volunteer at the Humane Societies and SPCAs.

Joyce Tenefrancia is the Receptionist and Administrative Assistant. She joined AOLS on June 20, 2016. Joyce is your first point of contact with the Association. She is the AOLS Administrative Officer at reception, answering the telephone, checking and responding to emails, opening the mail, and generally meeting and greeting those who come into the office.

She supports almost all the AOLS staff, and various committees, specifically the AERC and Complaints Committee. Daily, she acts as service conduit for a variety of stakeholders. The OLS membership and extended community is important to her.

If you don't know which staff member you should be contacting, contact Joyce and she will send you in the right direction!

Vladimir Oppenheim has been with the AOLS since 2010 as our Bookkeeper / Accountant / Controller. He is responsible for financial wellbeing; for all processes of recording accounting information, analyzing its components & producing monthly financial statements for a management. All these steps are vital for us not only in order to know our current financial performance, but also necessary for forecasting future activities and making them financially feasible.

Vladimir also does all year end procedures including preparation of various tables, schedules & reports needed for auditors in preparation for annual Financial Statements. As we want to manage our funds wisely and gain interest on investments, we have a number of investment portfolios. Recording of accrual interest revenue is done by Vladimir based on quarterly financial reports and adjusted in annual financial statements.

Liability Insurance, although handled by our Insurance broker is getting into our accounting system since we are contributing yearly to Claim Reserve Fund. We are also involved in the whole process as we receive premiums paid by members prior to paying the portion to the Insurance broker.

Other current operation handled by Vladimir includes among others payroll, reconciliations with banks & government bodies & preparation of annual reports for Revenue Canada.

Tim Hartley joined the Association Offices as the Manager of the Survey Review Department (SRD) in early September of 2013. Tim is a graduate of the '79 class of the Survey Science program at Erindale College, University of Toronto (UofT). Tim brings a wealth of experience from his many years in private practice and from his involvement in Association activities.

Tim manages the Office remotely using current communications tools such as Skype and GoToMeeting. During his tenure as manager Tim has visited all the regional groups and always emphasizes the educational importance of the SRD.

Tim, the SRD staff and the consultants at the Survey Review Department are constantly trying to improve the operation of the department. More of the correspondence with the membership is being done electronically. Each issue of the Ontario Professional Surveyor now has an article written by either Tim, Doug Reitsma, Drew Annable or Al Worobec about the review process or how to eliminate reoccurring surveying problems that have come to light. A review is somewhat subjective but the consultants constantly check each other's work to try and eliminate any bias.

Al Worobec joined the Association Offices as the Field Survey Examiner of the Survey Review Department (SRD) in early January of 2014. Al is a graduate of the '84 class of the Survey Science program at Erindale College, University of Toronto (UofT). Al brings a wealth of experience from his many years in private practice and from his involvement in Association activities, most recently as the 2009 President.

Sheila Lavina has been with the AOLS since March 2010 and has worked as the Administration Officer. In September of 2014 she transferred to the role of SRD Administrative Officer. Since she has moved to the department, changes were made and implemented to the administrative process. SRD requests are now emailed to firms ensuring prompt and cost-efficient delivery. Sheila acts as the liaison between the SRD and the participating firms. Other duties consist of ordering and maintaining supplies, coordinating meetings and assists in planning day-to-day operations. Sheila's main responsibility is to make sure activities between the firms and SRD are organized and completed within the time allotted.

Sheila works closely with the consultants within the Survey Review Department. She is dedicated to serving our AOLS members as well as the members of the public. Part of her dedication is ensuring that all meetings of Council and Committees are scheduled, and reminders are sent out prior to each meeting. This has really helped with ensuring that all participants regularly attend scheduled meetings.

Herman Bernardo has been with the AOLS since November 2010 as the Survey Review Department Examiner Assistant. His responsibilities include coordinating deposited plans by OLS / Firms received from Land Registry Offices, as well as reviewing Comprehensive Reviews supporting documentation for missing material.

Herman assists the Field Survey Examiner with field examinations, so he is often out in the field, working in the fresh air all over Ontario. He also fulfills the logistic needs for the field operations.

He is also our go-to person whenever something needs to be assembled, disassembled, moved or fixed in the office.

In addition to the two items mentioned previously, I want to highlight a few of the staff accomplishments over the year.

Bill, Maureen and Lena have been here the longest and each of them contributes incredibly to the operation of the office. They provide role models of dedication to all staff.

Julia and Penny have each provided services to the members in ways that continue to increase our efficiency and enhance our communication. When I first took on this job, Council was quite insistent that communication should be sent to the members on a regular basis and I struggled with that. My “communication” seemed to consist of intermittent emails about topics that were important. Julia was hired in 2011 and took on the role of sending the newsletter every second week. Since the fall of 2011 not one issue of the newsletter has been missed and many surveyors have told me that the content is marvelous.

This year Julia continues with the monthly webinars as another communication vehicle. We have had one each month and the feedback on each was very positive. We use Survey Monkey to assess that feedback and everyone that responds says they want to attend the next one. Julia administers the Survey Monkey Questionnaires and the results of all are available on our website.

Penny is instrumental in operating our website and with Julia’s help they interact with a web developer on a continuous basis. This platform has become a great source of information for our members and for the public. Penny also works tirelessly on the internal database. This database is really the life blood of the whole organization. In my view the data base has never been in better shape than it is now and this is thanks to Penny’s work.

The staff at “1043” all put in a tremendous effort on behalf of the members. The Association is certainly here for public protection and all take that role seriously. We also believe that working with our members and making the Association strong is another way that we protect the public.

This year I would like to highlight the work of our Office Manager, Lena Kassabian. We have seen an amazing increase in the number of evaluated students and articling students and Lena deals personally with every one of them. In this aspect her workload has at least doubled.

As Office Manager she maintains the efficiency of the office along with being instrumental in setting up our Annual General Meeting and other offsite meetings. Her work is appreciated by all those in the office and by all the AOLS members. Thank you, Lena!

The thought advanced by one of the staff members about the Association being a Community continues to be reflected in the depth of the relationships that we have with each other. Those relationships are both positive and rewarding for the most part.

My report is very similar to my last year's report and I believe that this is because we have a stable, effective and efficient staff at the AOLS office. In fact as I said earlier, there have not been any staff changes in 2017. They are a staff that makes it enjoyable to come to work every day!!

Strategic Planning

This year Strategic Planning was highly effective with four main themes emerging from the session. We did revert back to our rigorous system with Peter Richardson, (my Queen's MBA Strategy Professor) taking the lead on the process.

The four themes are Legislative and Regulatory Changes, Marketing Strategy, Succession Planning and Developing New Members. Each them has been worked on diligently and this work will continue in 2018.

In 2018 we are holding another Strategic Planning Session but I suspect that it will only tweak the 2017 plan and not completely develop new initiatives.

Membership

AOLS committee work is a very valuable tool for membership communication. Members have participated in many committees this year and several members who have never been involved in Association matters have volunteered for Committee work. This indicates an increased engagement by the members in our profession.

The Geomatics Picnic took place at the Nottawasaga Inn with well over 100 members and guests in attendance. Once again it was a success

Membership numbers continue to be a concern with the aging of our membership. This appears to be a continued trend in our sister organizations and in society generally with the aging of the baby boomers.

We still have our membership in decline and an aging membership. It is my belief that this does create tremendous opportunity for new surveyors to become members of our Association. The aging population statistics combined with the salary studies that indicate that surveyors are generally well paid indicates that surveying is an

attractive opportunity for young people looking for a profession.

Our committees have been doing some great work in attracting new people and this is indicated by the number of articling students in the system. In 2017 we had 17 new surveyors which is the highest number since I have been tracking the demographics of the Association. We also have the highest number of Evaluated Students since my tracking begun. This is a good sign for our future.

It should also be noted that the percentage of women in our profession is very small at 7% but that does seem to be changing as the percentage of women in our articling process is at just over 20%.

Unfortunately, the number of surveyors that are over 60 years of age, over 70 years of age and even over 80 years of age also continues to go up. This is not a good sign as these people are coming to the end of their careers and we are going to lose a great deal of very senior experience over the next few years.

Across Canada there are some organizations with aging surveyors but others have turned the corner with many more young people joining their ranks. The overall numbers up to January 30, 2018 are as shown below.

Demographics January 30, 2018											
Age	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	M	F
Evaluated Student	28	39	35	44	53	57	59	71	15		
Articled Student	38	45	49	50	51	68	71	94	88	72	16
New Surveyors	12	15	7	12	12	9	15	14	17		
20 - 29	5	6	3	3	6	8	6	12	10	10	
30 - 39	40	32	26	31	31	36	38	40	46	40	6
40 - 49	189	162	143	130	112	99	84	78	71	70	1
50 - 59	237	244	247	242	238	229	211	205	186	170	16
60 - 69	117	128	137	139	136	139	130	123	143	134	9
70 - 79	46	46	48	41	38	39	30	34	35	35	
80 +	5	8	6	9	8	9	9	11	13	13	
Total	639	626	610	595	569	559	508	503	504	472	32
Percentage Under 50	37%	32%	28%	28%	26%	26%	25%	26%	25%		
Percentage Over 50	63%	68%	72%	72%	74%	74%	75%	74%	75%		7%
Percentage Over 60	26%	29%	31%	32%	32%	33%	33%	33%	38%		
Percentage Over 70	8%	9%	9%	8%	8%	9%	8%	9%	10%		

Government Relations

Several meetings occurred throughout the year with the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration in connection with the Fair Access to the Regulated Professions Act, 2006.

The Association met with Service Ontario concerning the submission of Digital Plans into the Registry system of Ontario. A Digital Plan Task force with AOLS members and Service Ontario Members has been created to move this forward.

As your Executive Director I have met with MPPs and with my local MP to gage the reaction to our profession and to the initiatives that we have underway. In all cases their reaction was very positive.

Public Relations

The Public Awareness Committee oversees most of the Association's activities in public relations. In addition to preparing brochures and articles, the Committee provides support to the membership and hosts promotional activities at trade fairs, conferences and career fairs.

In 2017 the Committee once again attended education career days, as well as conferences hosted by the Ontario Good Roads Association, URISA and TREB. Media advertising rounds out the Committee's activities to ensure continued exposure of the benefits and resources of the Association to the Ontario public. The Public Awareness Committee and Deputy Registrar, Maureen Mountjoy are to be commended for the effort they put into this very demanding task.

Issues of the Ontario Professional Surveyor publication are available on our website in "book form" with hot links imbedded for the various advertisers.

Executive Directors Meetings

We continue to be very active on the national front in seeking solutions to strengthening our profession as a whole. Last year most of the other Provincial Executive Directors met in British Columbia to advance closer cooperation between surveying associations. I attended by GoToMeeting.

I would like to thank President Russ and all of Council for their help over the past year. Along with that, I especially want to thank all the staff at 1043 and all committee members for their continued efforts and work toward the betterment of our Association and profession.

Blain Martin, OLS, CLS, PMP, MBA
Executive Director
Association of Ontario Land Surveyors

REGISTRAR'S REPORT

For the year 2017

William D. Buck, OLS, CLS, P.Eng.



The Registrar is appointed by Council under Section 3.(8) of the *Surveyors Act* and is responsible for overseeing the statutory responsibilities of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors.

The Registrar's activities are concentrated primarily in the areas of Academic and Experience Requirements, Public Inquiries, Licences, Certificates of Registration, Certificates of Authorization, Complaints and Discipline.

Academic and Experience and Requirements Committee (AERC)

The Registrar is not a voting member of the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee, but carries out its administrative activities, including preparation of the agendas, motions and minutes for each meeting. On behalf of the Committee, the Registrar also responds to requests for information regarding academic evaluations, requirements for membership, articling, monitoring, and examinations. Deputy Registrar Maureen Mountjoy also assists in coordinating the activities of the Committee, in consultation with the Registrar and the AERC Chair, ensuring that all relevant issues are brought to the Committee's attention. In 2017, the Registrar also presented four articling information sessions, assisted with the statutes, oral and written professional examinations, organized and participated in the annual Professional Lecture course, and participated in the swearing-in of 17 new Ontario Land Surveyors.

Thirty-nine (39) new students entered into articles during 2017, compared to thirty-one (31) in 2016, and three (3) students' articles expired or were cancelled. As of January 30th, 2018 there were eighty-nine (89) articling students, an increase of five (5) over this date last year, and the most we have had since 1993. Seventeen (17) of the current articling students are females. The implementation of the new articling system in 2014 removed the requirement for work reports and one-on-one monitoring and allows the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee members to track student progress using our web-based Learning Management System. The Statutes examination is now fully on-line and is available throughout the year and may be written in a remote location if more convenient for the student. The Academic and Experience Requirements Committee also approved seventy-one (71) academic evaluations during 2017, twelve (12) more than last year. The number of evaluations has increased by more than 100% over the past 5 years. Twenty-three (23) of the 2017 evaluations (32%) were internationally educated applicants, which is two (2) more than in 2016. Nine (9) of the 71 were female applicants. The following charts provide a graphical illustration of these statistics.



Educational Services

The Registrar responds to inquiries from both the membership and the public. Many requests for information are satisfied during the initial contact, but others require research and written responses after appropriate discussions with other surveyors, staff and occasionally Council. Three individual Educational Services files were opened in 2017, all involving companies charged with offering cadastral surveying services to the public without a Certificate of Authorization. Numerous other inquiries were dealt with without opening files. Typical issues included non-OLS activity in cadastral surveying, right-of-entry inquiries from the public, concerns from the public regarding lack of response from members for various reasons, and requests from the public to assist in encouraging members to honour their business and/or financial responsibilities. It is often possible to resolve issues at this level and avoid a formal written complaint, which by statute, must be directed to the Complaints Committee.

Compensation Fund


No applications to the Compensation Fund were received during 2017. The Compensation Fund is set out under Section 33 of the Surveyors Act. Council established a Compensation Fund Committee in 1998 and delegated its powers pursuant to Section 33 (10) of the Surveyors Act to this Committee, made up of the Executive Director, Registrar and Finance Councillor, for any application up to \$5,000.

Complaints Committee

Formal complaints regarding the actions or conduct of a member of the Association must be filed in writing with the Registrar. The Registrar acknowledges receipt of the complaint and notifies the member who is the subject of the complaint. The member is provided with a copy of the complaint letter and materials and is given at least two weeks to provide an explanation and supporting documentation in response. The member's response is provided to the complainant, who is also allowed two weeks to make any further response, and the member is also provided with the complainant's second response and allowed to make a final submission. The Registrar compiles all of the information submitted by both the complainant and the surveyor and presents the file, without comment, to the Complaints Committee in a timely fashion. The Registrar also acts as the recording secretary of the Complaints Committee and distributes all correspondence and decisions resulting from the Committee meetings. The Registrar is not a member of the Committee and attends meetings at the request of the Committee to provide information and administrative support. This committee makes extensive use of their secure area of the AOLS website for the exchange of information, and committee meetings are held using Go To Meeting, allowing members from all areas of the province to easily participate.

Nineteen (19) new complaint files were opened in 2017, compared to ten (10) in 2016. The Committee held ten (10) teleconference meetings during 2017 and one face to face meeting, which was attended by our Complaints Review Councillor.

Fourteen (14) of the nineteen complaints originated from members of the public, two (2) from Association members and three (3) from the Registrar. The Committee issued eleven (11) final and seven (7) interim decisions during 2017. Interim decisions usually request specific action on the part of the surveyor. If the surveyor complies, the interim decision becomes final and no further action is required. If the surveyor does not comply, the Committee must reconsider the matter and determine an appropriate course of action. Of the eighteen (18) decisions issued in 2017, one (1) referred a member to AOLS Council for further action. The following chart shows the total number of complaints per year from 2000 to 2017, the average number over that period being 14 per year.



Discipline Committee

Two discipline hearing were completed in 2017. Both were concluded when the panel accepted a joint submission agreed to by both parties.

A hearing that began in January 2016 continued in 2017 with seven more days of hearings. No decision was reached and 5 more hearing days have been scheduled.

Registrar's Investigations

Section 30 of the Surveyors Act allows the Registrar to undertake an investigation where the Registrar believes that there are reasonable and probable grounds that a member of the Association has committed an act of professional misconduct or incompetence, or that there is cause to refuse to issue, or to suspend or revoke a Certificate of Authorization. Two Registrar's Investigations were initiated during 2017. One investigation led to Council referring the member to the Discipline Committee, while the other investigation was dismissed.

Registration Committee

The Registration Committee is a statutory committee, created under Section 9 of the Surveyors Act, having a Statutory Power of Decision that allows it to hold a hearing under the Statutory Powers Procedure Act. When the Registrar proposes to revoke or refuse to issue a licence, Certificate of Registration or Certificate of Authorization, or proposes to issue one of these subject to conditions, the member or

applicant may appeal to the Registration Committee, who must then hold a formal hearing. One hearing was held during 2017 as the result of an appeal to the Registrar's decision to refuse to grant a Certificate of Authorization. The panel's decision supported the Registrar's decision.

Regulation 1026 of the Surveyors Act requires that this committee approve applications from members who wish to be in charge of more than one survey office. No such application was made during 2017.

Survey Review Department Referrals

During the past year, several firms were referred to the Registrar from the Survey Review Department pursuant to Regulation 1026, S.40(8), subsequent to a Comprehensive Review. Most referred files are closed after the firms provide satisfactory explanations and/or implement remedial procedures to address the concerns identified in the review report. Some may undergo a follow up review to assess progress in addressing the concerns. Three (3) members were referred to the Complaints Committee during 2017 as a result of Survey Review Department referrals to the Registrar.

Licences, Certificates of Registration and Certificates of Authorization

The Registrar is responsible for the issuance and renewals of Licences, Certificates of Registration and Certificates of Authorization (C of A). During 2017 nineteen (19) new licences and several new or revised Certificates of Authorization were issued. As detailed in the Statistics section below, there has been a slight decrease of 0.4% in the overall number of professional members, an increase of 0.6% in the number of licenced members and a decrease of 2.2% in the number of Certificates of Authorization since the end of 2016.

Elections and By-Laws

The Registrar oversees the distribution and counting of ballots for voting on By-laws, Regulations and elections to Council. There were no new By-laws or Regulations requiring votes during 2017, and all new Council positions for 2018 were filled by acclamation.

For the 2018 Council, Vice-President Dan Dzaldov was acclaimed as President and Councillor Alnashir Jaraj was acclaimed as Vice-President. Anna Aksan and Nancy Grozelle were acclaimed as Junior Councillors. Senior Councillor Eric Ansell did not pursue the position of Vice-President and has retired from Council.


Statistics

Below are some relevant statistics of the Association, current to January 31, 2018.

	As of Jan. 31, 2018	Last Year	Change	% Change
Total Membership	503	505	-2	-0.4%
Licences	473	470	+3	+0.6%
▪ Certificates of Registration	30	35	-5	-14.3%
▪ Certificates of Authorization	174	178	-4	-2.2%
Members who have passed away since the last AGM	13	14		
Retired Members	181	204	-23	-11.3%
Newly commissioned members since the last AGM	17	13	+4	+30.7%
Articling Students	89	84	+5	+6.0%
Associate Members	95	124	-29	-23.4%

The chart below illustrates the trends in our membership over the past 17 years, during which we have seen a decline of 24.2% in the number of licensed members. Total membership during this period has decreased by 173 a drop of 25.6%. The number of Certificates of Authorization has declined from 294 in 2000 to 174 as of January 31, 2018, a drop of 40.8%. The number of articling students has risen steadily from a low of 27 in 2004 to the current number of 89, an increase of 230%.

AOLS Statistics - 2000 to 2017



SURVEY REVIEW DEPARTMENT MANAGER'S REPORT

Tim Hartley, OLS

The Survey Review Department (SRD) operates under the Inspection Program of the Surveyors Act, Regulation 1026, Section (40). The department is totally funded by the sales of the \$16 Plan Submission Form Sticker. Sales from 2009 to 2015 were fairly consistent at about 34,000 stickers per year. This past year we sold 38,860 up 520 over 2016, which is still only 63% of the approximately 61,000 sold per year in the late 1990's. The drop in sales is due to the introduction of title insurance resulting in much fewer requests for Surveyor's Real Property Reports.

The Department's budget for 2017 was \$575,000, we had a revenue of approximately \$622,000. Out of this we pay the salaries of an administrative officer (Sheila Lavina), an assistant examiner (Herman Bernardo), an OLS manager (Tim Hartley), a part time OLS field examiner (Alan Worobec), two OLS Comprehensive Review consultants (Doug Reitsma and Drew Annable), all office expenses and an allocation for use of the facilities and general administration. Of the four OLS's involved three have been on Council and two are past presidents.

In 2017 we opened up 46 Comprehensive Reviews which is about average, in 2016 we opened 62. This year 2018 we will open 49 and do the over 100 field examinations between May and October with office visits to follow. We completed 245 Systematic Reviews in 2017.

The Survey Review Department is constantly trying to improve its operation. More of the correspondence with the membership is being done electronically. We have received several electronically deposited test plans, they come in a PDF format and we are in the process of setting up an electronic filing system in which to store them. We will continue to receive the paper copy of plans that were registered or deposited in the traditional way. Having to maintain two filing systems will add to the work load but I don't think it will be onerous.

There is a new SRD Committee consisting of Marvin McNabb as Chair and Andrew Mantha as Council rep. David Raithby, Gabriel Laframboise, Robb McKibbin and Julia Meldrum Smith make up the rest of the membership.

2018 will be a year of change for the department. I will be retiring at the end of April, thus we need to hire a new manager plus two Comprehensive Review trainees in order to replace future retirements. I have enjoyed my stint as manager and thank the membership for their support and input.

Tim Hartley, OLS

Manager - Survey Review Department

INAUGURAL PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

DAN DZALDOV, OLS, OLIP

It's been a great week and I'm very appreciative of the fact that so many people have chosen to come to this dinner.

My brother and partner, Ophir Dzaldov is here. He and I have built and today operate a highly successful professional land surveyor practice. I thank you Ophir for the support and encouragement you have provided over the last three years. Not only will the next ensuing year put you even more to the task of running the ship but also will likely result in your golf handicap escalating to heights you haven't seen in recent years.

My sister Naomi is here as is my wonderful Mother, Nili and (I better say) my wonderful in-laws, Harvey and Goldie. I'm a pretty lucky guy to have and to have had all of you in my life.

My wonderful, gorgeous daughter Brooke is also here. You will all know who she is by a glance in her direction. My amazing wife, Shawna is here. Not only is she also a beauty but is also the backbone of our marriage and has always been my number one supporter through my articling days when I worked in the field as well as helped manage the business side of things with Ophir. She managed the family and Brooke as I studied and put in long hours. Without her, I wouldn't be here today.

Shawna! When the prospect of joining Council came up, you told me that it would be a good thing for both me and Council itself for me to take an active role. Your support has been of utmost importance to me and if you're correct Council will benefit from your role in convincing me to participate at Council level. I would be remiss if I neglected to thank my friends from the office who are here as well as those who could not attend.

I am so very proud of the people I work with. In my opinion Schaeffer Dzaldov Bennett Ltd. is one of the best Land Surveying firms in Ontario and that is, thanks to having the very best staff in Ontario. From Tom and Sophia, who are here tonight to the entire group, who bring an unsurpassed level of dedication, professional ethics and hard work to our company. Without them, I wouldn't be able to take on this new role with Council.

I also wouldn't be here today but for the insistence, persistence and nagging of Blain. Many of you know only too well and have experienced his persuasive character in the past.

Thanks Blain for the wonderful introduction. I'm sure that as the newest subject of your kingdom, I will soon find my plate full of your demands. We all joke about

Blain and often ask ourselves, “How did we let him convince us to do what he wanted.” In fact, however, I really want to thank you for being the way you are. You have been, and continue to be, one of the best advisors I have ever had. You have encouraged me, corrected me when I was wrong scratch that I have been wrong only one time ever and that was when, once in my life, I thought I was wrong but soon realized that I was right all along.

Blain, to refer to you as Executive Director shortchanges your talents. You are a major resource for new ideas and have a feel for the membership, their needs and desires as well as being a friend to many of us. I have learned a substantial amount from having worked with you and consider myself lucky to have you as a close friend.

One of my tasks this year might very well be to try to convince you to stay for yet another term beyond the recent extension. As everybody on Council knows, I too, can be persuasive, insistent and nagging.

I would also like to thank current and past Council. I have been very fortunate to have made some great and valuable friendships with many new people over the last few years. I would like to acknowledge the warm and supportive friendship and advice from numerous past presidents of the Association.

I would like to acknowledge PPPMP, Murray Purcell who I did not know at all three years ago and who I now consider a close friend. Murray, you have truly led this Association with class I have learned a great deal about leadership from you.

I would particularly like to acknowledge another person as well. Russ Hogan, now PPRH. Your friendship and valuable advice as to how to prepare for this exciting new challenge and the warmth that both you and Vicki have shown Shawna and me has been most appreciated.

I would also like to thank the fabulous staff at the AOLS office. Not only do they do an incredible job all year but there is so much that goes on behind the scenes before and during the AGM. I am really not sure how you manage but I am so very impressed with how year after year these Annual meetings run so smoothly.

For those of you who don't know, I am also one of the many surveyors who have come from a family of surveyors. My brother and I grew up with the best mentor we could possibly have had. Baruch Dzaldov, our late father, was not only the best dad a child could have but he was a role model for us and there is no doubt he is the reason we are here today and are successful surveyors.

Dad was well respected, appreciated and loved by his clients and staff. His is the model Ophir and I have used in establishing our career. If I can accomplish half of what my dad did I will consider myself a success. It has been a very long time for us since he passed away, but I firmly believe and know he is watching and is truly proud of us.

My Agenda for this year includes:

- Increased communication with the membership
- Building relationships across Canada with other surveyors' Associations
- Strengthen relationships with post-secondary education institutions
- Ensure continued professional development education for current members.
- Increase articling student population and ensure that they are not only ready but responsible future members having strong professional ethics.
- Educate the public as to our significance and role in society
- Build and increase Membership engagement in our Association

I have learned a considerable amount over the last three years and now have a greater appreciation of the processes by which a self-governing organization operates. It will be difficult for me to refrain from being that person Council has grown to know and love so much. I have made a promise to them, and myself, to temper my enthusiasm, and to be mildly less aggressive in seeking changes to the methodology of the Association.

I'm not at all convinced I can do that because what normally seems obvious to me, is almost never the case for the rest of the world and my wife.

Most members of the public have little or limited knowledge of the service we render and they lack the training to interpret the product we produce. The Association is thus charged to protect the public and I believe that this is not only an obligation of Council but also an obligation of each and every member of this Association. We owe it to the public to continue to hold ourselves to the highest standards possible. While privileged to be the President of this self-governing association I commit that I will do my best to uphold the trust we have been given.

My goal is to make this Presidential term, a year of positive enhancement for both me personally and for the Association.

Thank you.

Dan Dzaldov
AOLS President 2018

ARCHIVAL AND HISTORICAL COMMITTEE

Annual Report 2017

Gord Good, O.L.S. (Ret.), Chair

The Committee is composed of Gordon Good, Chair, James Hill, Past Chair, Ross Burton, Past Chair and Manager of our Ottawa Branch, Doug Sutherland, Rental Director, Don Anderson, Photographer, Peter Moreton, Vicky and Doug Culbert, caretakers of the Monument Garden, Kent Campbell, John Vinklers, Bruce McMurphy, Blain Martin, Office Liaison, Al Jeraj, Commissioner, Jeff Fee, Assistant Commissioner.

In the year 2016 the Committee dedicated a lot of time relating to the AGM in 2017. The organization was contracted out to a private party as the Quebec Land Surveyors and the Canada Lands Surveyors agreed to have a joint celebration to commemorate our Quasiquicentennial celebration and the Sesquicentennial celebration of Canada.

The AGM in Ottawa was a blast. If you missed it due to unforeseen circumstances I apologize. I am certain your committee enjoyed themselves as none of the committee displayed the stress and tiredness visible in your executive. On your behalf I extend your thanks for their combined efforts.

As mentioned in our last report Kent Campbell's many hours of work is still ongoing with inroads into obtaining a special joint presentation by the AOLS and Archives of Ontario of Thompson's Map of Canada. Information is still being sourced from the Ryerson University on future directions of how the Committee handles artefacts. This development takes time so you may have to read the 2018 report for full details. What a credit it is for you to have Kent on your Committee.

In May, we were fortunate to have a visit from John Vinklers and he suffered the usual fate of most visitors by being voted in as a member. John is a fine addition as he ponders how he can contribute to our success without stressing others. His presence is most valuable as he will be assisting Kent.

Ross Burton, our Ottawa correspondent, actually refused to shake the beach sand off his feet show up at our AGM in 2017. Sorry Ross, there is only one way to retire. Don Anderson continues to collect memorabilia. Just contact our Committee through the office or personally and the information will be duly forwarded to Don.

Doug Sutherland manages all the loan agreements on behalf of the Association and just finished upgrading the certificates. I further believe he is the only person who knows where all our artefacts are actually stored. Doug has written a chronological history report on the CST and CET. For you younger surveyors that would be

Certified Survey Technician and Certified Engineering Technician. I believe the topic includes Certified Technologist.

Peter told us, if he did not know a subject he could find it on Google. What an asset that is to have during a meeting. He did mention that there is no “app” for translating cursive writing into any legitimate form. I guess we older folk still have some use. Peter is another asset that you should be proud to know.

The Monument Garden in Goderich “Hortum Monumenta” had an exceptional year. Many bus loads of people stopped by and several European visitors were fascinated by the monuments. If you have any spare monuments lying around the committee has several ways to take them off your hands.

This year the Committee visited the airplane museum in Hamilton. An American B-17 just happened to land and take off during our visit. Another interesting fact that all aircraft on display with the exception of two and of course those that were being worked on are flight ready. I found out why those old Harvards made so much noise when they were taking off. Want to know? The tips of the propeller are approaching the speed of sound.

Maintenance of the W.C. Yates Project is continuing. The data base is being updated and will be ready for use and I believe shall be available to Ontario Land Surveyors for research and for supplying biographical sketches. Should any surveyor, out there, get an urge to write up a biographical or historical sketch of deceased surveyors just give Joyce a call in our front office and she will be pleased to direct you to several past surveyors that have no historical aide memoir.

I want to thank the staff at 1043 which help us become an efficient Committee. Thank you, Lena, for thinking of our needs before we know them. Thank you, Maureen, for always having the correct historical references. Thank you, Julia, for helping us prepare articles for the Bi-weekly. Thank you, Sheila for reminding us of our meetings. Thank you, Joyce, your search for lost surveyors has helped finalize at least 12 “lost” surveyors in the W.C. Yates Project. Thank you, Penny, you are unofficially attached to our committee and your contributions are essential. Finally, I have to thank Blain. There is nothing else I can say.

I was at a nice concert recently which was well presented. On leaving a young man, who was one of the band, waited and held the door open for me. I thanked him heartily and his reply was “I am pleased to do it for a Surveyor!” I immediately inquired, “How did you know?” His reply, “I am also a Surveyor.” I do a fair amount of volunteering and it is wonderful to find more and more surveyors are using their skills and helping in a public manner. Congratulations to all volunteers.

These are just some of our fun topics of interest.

Gordon Good,
Chair

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the members of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors,

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors, which comprise the statement of financial position as at December 31, 2017 and the statements of operations, changes in fund balances and cash flows for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with Canadian accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for my audit opinion.

Opinion

In our opinion, these financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors as at December 31, 2017 and the results of its operations and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "RSSM LLP". The letters are stylized and cursive.

Toronto, Ontario
February 23, 2018

RSSM LLP
Licensed Public Accountants

ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION
AS AT DECEMBER 31, 2017

	General Operating Fund	Liability Insurance Fund	Claims Reserve Fund	York Project Fund	Compensation Fund	Total 2017	Total 2016
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
ASSETS							
CURRENT							
Cash	629,484	18,972	794,161	-	-	1,442,617	1,485,434
Investments (note 2)	465,526	1,180,096	1,048,522	-	150,000	2,844,144	2,733,047
Accounts receivable	15,026	-	-	-	-	15,026	12,326
HST recoverable	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,614
Inventory	120,793	-	-	-	-	120,793	12,171
Prepaid expenses	79,418	-	-	-	-	79,418	250,937
	1,310,247	1,199,068	1,842,683	-	150,000	4,501,998	4,497,529
CAPITAL ASSETS (note 3)	146,086	-	-	-	-	146,086	128,484
TOTAL ASSETS	1,456,333	1,199,068	1,842,683	-	150,000	4,648,084	4,626,013
LIABILITIES							
CURRENT							
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	146,225	-	-	-	-	146,225	142,369
HST payable	31,562	-	-	-	-	31,562	55,636
Deferred revenue (note 5)	827,250	-	-	-	-	827,250	1,126,430
Insurance premiums refund payable	-	424	-	-	-	424	-
	1,005,037	424	-	-	-	1,005,461	1,324,435
FUND BALANCES							
Invested in capital assets	146,086	-	-	-	-	146,086	128,484
Discipline reserve	2,480	-	-	-	-	2,480	2,678
Externally restricted	-	1,198,644	1,842,683	-	150,000	3,191,327	3,023,923
Unrestricted	302,286	-	-	-	-	302,286	145,449
Building reserve	444	-	-	-	-	444	1,044
	451,296	1,198,644	1,842,683	-	150,000	3,642,623	3,301,578
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES	1,456,333	1,199,068	1,842,683	-	150,000	4,648,084	4,626,013

COMMITMENTS (NOTE 4)

APPROVED ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL:

Executive Director and Treasurer

Finance Councillor

ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS
STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2017

	General Operating Fund			Restricted Funds				Total 2017	Total 2016
	Budget 2017 (Note 7)	Actual 2017	Actual 2016	Liability Insurance Fund	Claims Reserve Fund	York Project Fund	Compen- sation Fund		
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
REVENUE									
Fees and licences	1,362,150	1,316,132	1,302,269	-	-	-	-	-	-
Survey Review Department	575,000	542,571	529,832	-	-	-	-	-	-
Survey Review Index	39,000	26,900	32,113	-	-	-	-	-	-
Investment income	3,000	33,755	42,821	78,184	-	-	9,424	87,608	160,382
Cost-related activities	341,200	393,254	312,109	-	-	-	-	-	-
Continuing education	12,500	31,275	75,262	-	-	-	-	-	-
Internship program	-	10,983	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Book sponsorships and sales	150,000	215,952	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Insurance premiums	-	-	-	1,548,561	550,000	-	-	2,098,561	2,014,861
Other income	6,000	25,341	11,624	1,500	-	-	-	1,500	1,500
	<u>2,488,850</u>	<u>2,596,163</u>	<u>2,306,030</u>	<u>1,628,245</u>	<u>550,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>9,424</u>	<u>2,187,669</u>	<u>2,176,743</u>
EXPENSES									
Salaries, benefits and consultants	671,400	691,382	678,097	48,000	-	-	-	48,000	70,839
Office and general	173,400	102,605	120,878	307	-	3,614	-	3,921	5,206
Survey Review Department	540,000	548,590	529,832	-	-	-	-	-	-
Survey Records Index	39,000	36,000	42,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Building	53,800	40,620	45,611	-	-	-	-	-	-
Discipline expenses	150,000	217,198	235,097	-	-	-	-	-	-
Constitutional challenge	85,000	20,796	23,495	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cost-related activities	313,200	388,361	303,337	-	-	-	-	-	-
Governance commission	164,500	91,577	52,362	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional standards and practice commission	4,500	8,434	13,493	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outreach and professional education commission	45,550	42,574	44,599	-	-	-	-	-	-
Member services and other commission	39,000	29,236	21,929	-	-	-	-	-	-
Continuing education	12,000	31,056	75,194	-	-	-	-	-	-
Insurance premium	-	-	-	1,479,760	-	-	-	1,479,760	1,427,090
Claims against the fund	-	-	-	-	360,082	-	-	360,082	652,494
Credit card charges	-	19,400	46,044	-	-	-	-	-	-
Refund of insurance premiums	-	-	-	20,000	65,000	-	-	85,000	-
Cost of books distributed	150,000	164,116	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Refund of consulting income	-	-	-	-	-	34,078	-	34,078	-
	<u>2,441,350</u>	<u>2,431,945</u>	<u>2,231,968</u>	<u>1,548,067</u>	<u>425,082</u>	<u>37,692</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2,010,841</u>	<u>2,155,629</u>
EXCESS OF REVENUE OVER EXPENSES (EXPENSES OVER REVENUE)									
	<u>47,500</u>	<u>164,218</u>	<u>74,062</u>	<u>80,178</u>	<u>124,918</u>	<u>(37,692)</u>	<u>9,424</u>	<u>176,828</u>	<u>21,114</u>

ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2017

	General Operating Fund				Restricted Funds				Total 2017 \$	Total 2016 \$
	Unrestricted \$	Invested in Capital Assets \$	Discipline Reserve \$	Building Reserve \$	Liability Insurance Fund \$	Claims Reserve Fund \$	York Project Fund \$	Compen- sation Fund \$		
Fund balances at the beginning of year	145,448	128,484	2,678	1,044	1,118,466	1,717,765	37,692	150,000	3,301,577	3,206,402
Excess of revenue over expenses (expenses over revenue)	392,315	(10,899)	(217,198)	-	80,178	124,918	(37,692)	9,424	341,046	95,176
Investment in capital assets	(22,901)	28,501	-	(5,600)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrafund transfers (note 8)	(222,000)	-	217,000	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interfund transfers (note 8)	9,424	-	-	-	-	-	-	(9,424)	-	-
FUND BALANCES AT THE END OF YEAR	302,286	146,086	2,480	444	1,198,644	1,842,683	-	150,000	3,642,623	3,301,578

ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS
STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2017

	General Operating Fund		Restricted Funds				Total 2017 \$	Total 2016 \$
	2017 \$	2016 \$	Liability Insurance Fund \$	Claims Reserve Fund \$	York Project Fund \$	Compen- sation Fund \$		
OPERATING ACTIVITIES								
Cash collected from members, customers and other sources	2,260,528	2,720,758	1,550,061	550,000	-	-	2,100,061	2,016,361
Investment income	18,370	13,042	11,595	-	-	4,467	16,062	20,782
Cash paid to suppliers and employees	(2,378,367)	(2,299,330)	(1,547,643)	(425,082)	(34,078)	-	(2,006,803)	(2,159,243)
	(99,469)	434,470	14,013	124,918	(34,078)	4,467	109,320	(122,100)
INVESTING ACTIVITIES								
(Increase) decrease in investments	(23,256)	(24,361)	(5,868)	-	-	4,957	(911)	(643)
Purchase of capital assets	(28,501)	(9,362)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(51,757)	(33,723)	(5,868)	-	-	4,957	(911)	(643)
NET INCREASE (DECREASE) IN CASH	(151,226)	400,747	8,145	124,918	(34,078)	9,424	108,409	(122,743)
Cash position at the beginning of the year	771,286	356,469	10,827	669,243	34,078	-	714,148	850,961
Interfund transfers	9,424	14,070	-	-	-	(9,424)	(9,424)	(14,070)
CASH POSITION AT THE END OF THE YEAR	629,484	771,286	18,972	794,161	-	-	813,133	714,148

**ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2017**

PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION

The Association of Ontario Land Surveyors (the "Association") is an organization whose principal object is to regulate the practice of professional land surveying in Ontario and to govern its members and holders of certificates of authorization in order that the public may be served and protected. The Association is a corporation without share capital created under the laws of the Province of Ontario. It is not subject to either federal or provincial income taxes.

1. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

These financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Canadian accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations.

a) Fund Accounting

The Association follows the restricted fund method of accounting for contributions. Unrestricted contributions related to general operations are recognized as revenue in the General Operating Fund in the year in which the related expenses are incurred. Restricted contributions are recognized as revenue in the appropriate restricted fund in the year received.

Revenues and expenses related to program delivery and administrative activities are reported in the General Operating Fund.

The Liability Insurance Fund has been established to cover the costs of administering the professional liability master insurance policies. Member firms are covered by master policies with the Novex Insurance Company. The Association's deductibles under these policies are paid out of the Claims Reserve Fund.

The Surveyors Act requires the Association to maintain the Compensation Fund to relieve or mitigate loss sustained by any person as a consequence of the dishonesty or incompetence of any member of the Association in the practice of professional land surveying.

The Association entered into a contract with York University to assist the University with a project that will develop and implement a systematic approach to Competency-Based Assessment of the internationally educated land surveyors who enter York University's Geomatics Engineering program, based on the Competency Continuum developed by the Association. Revenues and expenses related to this project are reported in the York Project Fund.

b) Revenue Recognition

Revenue for the Survey Review Department, the Survey Records Index and Continuing Education are recorded as deferred contributions and are recognized as revenue of the General Operating Fund in the year in which the related expenses are incurred.

Fees and licences are recognized into income in the period to which they relate.

Revenue from cost-related activities is recognized as revenue in the General Operating Fund in the year in which the goods are sold or when the services are rendered.

Unrestricted investment income is recognized as revenue in the General Operating Fund when it is earned. Restricted investment income accrued on the restricted funds is recognized in the fund balances as it is earned.

c) Capital Assets

Capital assets are recorded at cost less accumulated amortization. Amortization is provided on a straight-line basis at the following annual rates:

Land and building	1/30
Furniture and fixtures	1/10
Computer equipment	1/3

If there is an indication that the capital assets may be impaired, an impairment test is performed that compares carrying amount to net recoverable amount, which is normally determined by estimating the sales less direct costs on an undiscounted basis over the remaining life of the asset. There were no impairment indicators in 2017.

d) Donated Services

The work of the Association is dependent on the voluntary services of many members. Since these services are not normally purchased by the Association and because of the difficulty of determining their fair value, donated services are not recognized in these financial statements.

e) Inventory

Inventory is recorded at the lower of cost and net realizable value, with cost being determined on an average basis. Net realizable value is estimated selling price less costs to sell in the ordinary course of operations.

f) Collections

The Association has a collection of historical artifacts and a library of books and publications. No value is placed on these collections in these financial statements.

g) Management Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with Canadian accounting standards for not-for-profit organizations requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the year. Significant areas requiring the use of management estimates include amortization of capital assets, long-lived asset impairment assessments, and allocation of administration expenses to various departments within the Association. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

h) Financial Instruments

The Association initially measures its financial assets and financial liabilities at fair value, except for non-arm's length transactions. The Association subsequently measures all its financial assets and financial liabilities at amortized cost, except for investments, which the Association elected to measure at fair value. Changes in fair value are recognized in the statement of operations.

Financial assets measured at amortized cost include cash and accounts receivable.

Financial liabilities measured at amortized cost include accounts payable and accrued liabilities.

Financial instruments that will be subsequently measured at amortized cost are adjusted by the transaction costs that are directly attributable to their origination, issuance or assumption. Transaction costs for financial instruments that will be subsequently measured at fair value are recognized in the statement of operations in the period they are incurred.

2. INVESTMENTS

	Fair Value	
	2017	2016
Guaranteed investment certificates (GICs)	\$ 972,310	\$ 828,182
Bonds	387,468	447,400
Equity	1,484,366	1,457,465
	2,844,144	2,733,047

The GICs and bonds mature from April 2018 to January 2026, and earn interest at rates between 2.55% and 5.0% (2015 - 2.55% and 5.0%).

3. CAPITAL ASSETS

	Cost	Accumulated Amortization	2017 Net Book Value	2016 Net Book Value
Building	\$582,677	\$(462,946)	\$119,731	\$114,984
Furniture and fixtures	235,146	(224,980)	10,166	9,571
Computer Equipment	105,228	(89,039)	16,189	3,929
	923,051	(776,965)	146,086	128,484

Amortization expense for the year was \$10,899 (2016 - \$8,537), of which \$5,569 (2016 - \$7,887) is included in office and general expense and \$5,330 (2016 - \$650) is included in the Survey Review Department expenses.

4. LEASE COMMITMENTS

The Association is committed under the terms of its non-cancellable equipment leases to make the following payments over the next 5 years:

2018	\$8,600
2019	8,600
2020	8,600
2021	8,600
2022	2,150

5. DEFERRED REVENUE

Deferred revenue relates to amounts collected in advance and is recognized into income in the period in which the related expenses are incurred or when the service is rendered.

	2016	Funds Received	Revenue Recognized	2017
Fees and licences	\$356,380	\$1,199,312	\$1,316,132	\$239,560
Survey Review Department	322,720	634,024	542,571	414,173
Survey Review Index	-	26,900	26,900	-
Cost-related activities	151,553	318,212	393,254	76,511
Continuing Education	71,561	28,282	31,275	68,737
Internship program	36,546	-	8,277	28,269
	1,126,430	2,235,181	2,534,361	827,250

6. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

The significant financial risks to which the Association is exposed are credit risk, liquidity risk and market risk.

Credit risk

Credit risk is the risk that one party to a financial instrument will cause a financial loss for the other party by failing to discharge an obligation. The Association is subject to credit risk in respect of its accounts receivable, but has historically suffered very few bad debts.

Liquidity risk

Liquidity risk is the risk that the Association will encounter difficulty in meeting obligations associated with financial liabilities. The Association is exposed to liquidity risk arising primarily from the accounts payable. The Association expects to meet these obligations as they come due by generating sufficient cash flow from operations.

Market risk

Market risk is the risk that the fair value of future cash flows of a financial instrument will fluctuate because of changes in market prices. Market risk is comprised of currency risk, interest rate risk and other price risk.

Currency risk

Currency risk is the risk that the fair value or cash flows of a financial instrument will fluctuate because of changes in foreign exchange rates. The company does not use derivative instruments to reduce its exposure to foreign currency risk.

As at December 31, 2017, the balance sheet includes \$671,137 (2016 - \$501,251) of cash and investments investments, denominated in foreign currency and converted into Canadian dollars.

Interest rate risk

Interest rate risk is the risk that the fair value or future cash flows of a financial instrument will fluctuate because of changes in market interest rates. The Association has investments in bonds and GICs yielding fixed interest rates. Changes in the market yield rate can cause fluctuations in the fair value of the investments. The Association does not use derivative financial instruments to alter the effects of this risk.

Other price risk

Other price risk is the risk that the fair value or future cash flows of a financial instrument will fluctuate because of changes in market prices other than those arising from interest rate risk or currency risk, whether those changes are caused by factors specific to the individual financial instrument or its issuer, or factors affecting all similar financial instruments traded in the market. The Association is exposed to other price risk through its investments in marketable securities invested in equity securities traded in an active market.

7. BUDGET

The budget figures are presented for comparison purposes only. They are unaudited and have been reclassified to conform with these financial statements.

8. TRANSFERS

During the year, the Association's Council internally restricted \$217,000 (2016 - \$235,000) and \$5,000 (2016 - \$3,000) to be used for discipline related matters and major building repairs, respectively. Transfers of this amount were made from the unrestricted fund balance to the discipline reserve and building reserve funds within the General Operating Fund. The internally restricted amount is not available for unrestricted purposes without approval of the Council.

In 2007, the Council passed a motion to allow the Compensation Fund to accumulate to a maximum of \$150,000. Accordingly, in the year ended December 31, 2017, \$9,424 was transferred from the Compensation Fund to the General Operating Fund (2016 - \$14,070 transferred from General Operating Fund).

9. ALLOCATION OF EXPENSES

	2017	2016
	\$	\$
Salaries, benefits and consultants:		
Survey Review Department	27,600	27,600
Survey Records Index	3,000	3,000
Office and general:		
Survey Review Department	16,200	16,200
Building:		
Survey Review Department	14,700	14,700
Amortization:		
Survey Review Department	5,330	650

Association of Ontario Land Surveyors – Budget 2017

Page -1-

SUMMARY OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES

ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO LAND SURVEYORS



SUMMARY OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES				
		2017	2017	2018
		BUDGET	ACTUAL	BUDGET
REVENUE:				
FEES AND LICENSES (from pg.2)		\$1,362,150	\$1,316,132	\$1,355,950
SRD REVENUE (from pg.5)	5000/5010	\$575,000	\$542,571	\$600,000
SURVEY RECORDS INDEX (from pg.6)		\$39,000	\$26,900	\$39,000
CONVENIENCE FEE ON CREDIT CARD CHARGES		\$40,000	\$18,383	\$18,000
COST-RELATED ACTIVITIES (from pg.2)		\$341,200	\$136,863	\$328,000
CONTINUING EDUCATION (from pg.5)		\$12,500	\$31,275	\$10,000
LEGAL/LEGAL CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE COST RECOVERY		\$0	\$1,770	\$1,500
DISCIPLINE RESERVE FUND (from pg.6)		\$50,000	\$35,145	\$50,000
BOOK " GREAT LENGTHS" SALES REVENUE		\$150,000	\$215,952	\$18,000
INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (from pg.6)		\$0	\$10,983	\$0
York University Project	1046	\$0	\$3,614	\$0
OTHER INCOME (from pg.2)		\$9,000	\$38,944	\$66,000
PUBLIC AWARENESS COST RECOVERY	1061		\$0	
TOTAL REVENUE		\$2,578,850	\$2,378,532	\$2,486,450
TOTAL REVENUE Excluding SRD		\$2,003,850	\$1,835,961	\$1,886,450
EXPENSES:				
SALARIES, BENEFITS AND CONSULTANTS (from pg.4)		\$671,400	\$691,382	\$680,588
OFFICE ADMINISTRATION (from pg.4)		\$250,400	\$121,446	\$260,300
SURVEY REVIEW DEPARTMENT (from pg.5)		\$540,000	\$548,590	\$579,500
SURVEY RECORDS INDEX (from pg.6)		\$39,000	\$36,000	\$39,000
BUILDING (from pg.4)		\$53,800	\$40,620	\$53,500
DISCIPLINE RESERVE FUND (from pg.6)		\$200,000	\$252,342	\$200,000
BOOK " GREAT LENGTHS" COST OF SALES		\$150,000	\$164,116	\$1,500
COMMITTIES & RELATED EXPENSES (from pg.3)		\$253,550	\$171,872	\$267,200
COST RELATED (from pg.2)		\$313,200	\$131,969	\$311,300
LEGISLATIVE CHANGES, STANDARDS/TECH GUIDELINES	2180		\$90	\$100
CONTINUING EDUCATION (from pg.5)		\$12,000	\$30,916	\$14,000
CREDIT CARD CHARGES	1532	\$40,000	\$19,400	\$18,000
INTERNSHIP PROGRAM (from pg.6)		\$0	\$0	\$0
AMORTIZATION (from pg.4)		\$8,000	\$5,569	\$4,560
TOTAL EXPENSES		\$2,531,350	\$2,214,313	\$2,429,548
TOTAL EXPENSES Excluding SRD		\$1,991,350	\$1,665,723	\$1,850,048
NET REVENUE OR (EXPENSES)		\$47,500	\$164,218	\$56,902
NET REVENUE OR (EXPENSES) Excluding SRD		\$12,500	\$170,237	\$36,402

GENERAL REVENUE AND COST RELATED INCOME (EXPENSE)

			2017	2017	2018
			BUDGET	ACTUAL	BUDGET
FEES AND LICENSES:					
OLS (Licensed) FEES (Note "B" below)			\$978,500	\$956,012	\$985,800
OLS (Registered) FEES (Note "B" below)			\$27,125	\$25,316	\$24,000
CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION (Note "B" below)			\$280,675	\$279,423	\$270,300
ASSOCIATE MEMBERS FEES (Articled Students, Retired & Associates)			\$75,850	\$55,381	\$75,850
TOTAL FEE AND LICENSES (Carried to Summary pg.1)			\$1,362,150	\$1,316,132	\$1,355,950
OTHER INCOME:					
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE				\$279	
INTEREST ON INVESTMENTS			\$3,000	\$43,179	\$60,000
ALLOCATION OF INVESTMENT TO COMPENSATION FUND				(\$9,423)	
OTHER (Follow-up reviews, interest, charged back)			\$6,000	\$4,909	\$6,000
TOTAL OTHER INCOME (Carried to Summary pg.1)			\$9,000	\$38,944	\$66,000
COST RELATED INCOME (EXPENSE):					
REVENUE:					
EXAMS, LECTURES, EVALUATIONS			\$70,000	\$80,039	\$75,000
SURVEY LAW COURSES			50		
PUBLICATIONS & MATERIALS			\$1,200	\$2,770	\$3,000
ONTARIO PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR MAGAZINE			\$50,000	\$45,299	\$50,000
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING			\$220,000	\$8,755	\$200,000
TOTAL REVENUE (Carried to Summary pg.1)			\$341,200	\$136,863	\$328,000
EXPENSES:					
EXAMS, LECTURES, EVALUATIONS			\$55,000	\$44,471	\$50,000
PUBLICATIONS & MATERIALS			\$1,200	\$2,353	\$3,000
ONTARIO PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR MAGAZINE			\$55,000	\$57,354	\$55,000
MEMBERSHIPS & SUBSCRIPTIONS			\$2,000	\$3,340	\$3,300
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING			\$200,000	\$24,451	\$200,000
TOTAL EXPENSES (Carried to Summary pg.1)			\$313,200	\$131,969	\$311,300
TOTAL COST RELATED REVENUE(EXPENSES)			\$28,000	\$4,894	\$16,700
NOTE "A"					
As per Council motion there will be no administration fee allocation until the Compensation Fund exceeds \$150,000.00					
NOTE "B"	FEE		2016	2017	2018
LICENSED MEMBERS	\$2,060.00		471	475	465
REGISTERED MEMBERS	\$775.00		38	35	30
CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION @ \$1,030 PER FIRM	\$1,030.00		193	190	170
CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION + \$515 PER ADD'L CADASTRAL MEMBER	\$515.00		160	165	170
ARTICLED STUDENT	\$310.00		48	85	95
ASSOCIATE MEMBER	\$210.00		210	150	125
RETIRED ASSOCIATES	\$90.00		195	200	210

COMMITTEE AND RELATED EXPENSES

	2017 BUDGET	2017 ACTUAL	2018 BUDGET
STATUTORY & RELATED COMMITTEE EXPENSES:			
COUNCIL MEETINGS	\$60,000	\$63,292	\$60,000
COUNCIL/REGIONAL GROUPS	\$4,000	\$3,207	\$3,000
COUNCIL APPROVED PROJECT FUNDING	\$83,500		\$86,000
COUNCIL SPECIAL PROVISION-INTRODUCTION TO SURVEYING	\$0	\$0	\$0
SURVEYORS NEEDED ? - DAVE HORWOOD	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
COUNCIL APPROVED BOOK PROMOTION	\$9,000	\$7,385	\$9,000
PRACTICE MANUAL UPDATE		\$0	
PROVINCE WIDE SRI	\$2,500	\$582	\$0
COUNCIL APPROVED AERC STRATEGIC INITIATIVES PROJECT	\$0	\$0	
MEMBERS SURVEY COST		\$0	
AERC COMMITTEE	\$10,000	\$11,515	\$10,000
MARKETING TASK FORCE		\$30	\$100
UNIVERSITY & COLLEGES STUDENT LIAISON COMMITTEE	\$2,000	\$200	\$2,500
COMPLAINTS	\$200	\$1,888	\$2,000
DISCIPLINE	\$1,000	\$1,414	\$500
REGISTRATION COMMITTEE	\$100	\$10,625	\$500
REGISTRATION HEARING	\$0	\$5,945	\$0
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	\$200	\$140	\$300
LEGISLATION REVIEW COMMITTEE	\$0	\$1,086	\$2,000
FEES SCHEDULE			
FEES MEDIATION	\$100	\$7	\$100
NOMINATIONS	\$100	\$0	\$100
PRESIDENTIAL EXPENSES	\$30,000	\$20,233	\$30,000
PUBLICATIONS(Annual Report, etc.)	\$5,000	\$5,108	\$4,000
CBEPs REGISTRATION			
PSC DUES & COMMITTEES (Note "C" below)			
ARCHIVES & HISTORICAL	\$2,000	\$2,899	\$2,000
AGM PLANNING COMMITTEE	\$500	\$84	\$500
AGM OPERATING TASK FORCE	\$200	\$0	\$500
GOVERNMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE			\$0
ADVOCACY BUSINESS CASE TASK FORCE COMMITTEE			
AWARDS & CITATIONS	\$500	\$658	\$2,000
FINANCE COMMITTEE	\$100	\$0	\$100
FUTURE COMMITTEE			
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE			
PEER REVIEW TASK FORCE		\$0	
LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE			
MONUMENTATION TASK FORCE	\$100	\$0	\$500
MUNICIPAL LIAISON COMMITTEE			
PROF. DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE			
CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE	\$250	\$359	\$500
PROFESSIONAL INTEGRATION COMM			
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE	\$2,500	\$2,573	\$2,500
DIGITAL PLAN SUBMISSION TASK FORCE	\$100	\$0	\$500
INSURANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE	\$500	\$255	\$500
SRD COMMITTEE	\$100	\$1,752	\$2,000
STRATEGIC PLAN COMMITTEE (Includes Committee Chair and Council Meeting)	\$0	\$0	\$0
CADASTRE LIAISON TASK FORCE			
TECHNICAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE			
UNDERGROUND UTILITIES COMMITTEE	\$500	\$0	\$500
BEACH TASK FORCE	\$0	\$135	\$0
GEOMATIC REQUIRMENT LIAISON COMMITTEE	\$8,000	\$4,062	\$12,500
SURVEY RECORD MANAGEMENT SYSTEM TASK FORCE - SRMS	\$0		\$0
WEBSITE MAINTENANCE COMMITTEE	\$500	\$0	\$500
PUBLIC AWARENESS	\$25,000	\$26,438	\$27,000
TOTAL (Carried to Summary pg.1)	\$253,550	\$171,672	\$267,200

OFFICE ADMINISTRATION AND BUILDING EXPENSES

	2017	2017	2018
	BUDGET	ACTUAL	BUDGET
OFFICE ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES:			
AUDIT & ACCOUNTING	\$13,000	\$12,500	\$13,000
BANK CHARGES	\$2,500	\$3,524	\$3,500
COMPUTERS (Maintenance, Software, Supplies)	\$40,000	\$15,409	\$15,000
SOFTWARE SUBSCRIPTIONS	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$10,000
CITRIX WEB EXPENSES		\$0	\$0
INSURANCE - (Media, Dir/Off)	\$18,000	\$11,428	\$15,000
COPIER LEASING & MAINTENANCE	\$18,000	\$9,660	\$17,000
GENERAL LEGAL CHARGES	\$15,000	\$23,725	\$15,000
LEGAL- CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE	\$85,000	\$20,796	\$85,000
INTERNET ACCESS	\$1,500	\$1,450	\$2,500
WEBSITE MAINTENANCE & DEVELOPMENT	\$20,000	\$0	\$50,000
WEBSITE HOSTING	\$4,000	\$1,619	\$1,500
OFFICE SUPPLIES & EXPENSES	\$7,500	\$7,494	\$5,000
POSTAGE & COURIER	\$6,000	\$5,911	\$5,500
STAFF SEARCH	\$0	\$0	\$15,000
STATIONARY & PRINTING	\$3,000	\$1,778	\$2,000
TELEPHONE	\$7,000	\$6,592	\$6,000
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S EXPENSES	\$7,500	\$4,022	\$7,500
REGISTRAR'S EXPENSES	\$1,600	\$382	\$2,000
DEPUTY REGISTRAR'S EXPENSES	\$7,000	\$6,356	\$6,000
Less Allocation to SRD	(\$16,200)	(\$16,200)	(\$16,200)
TOTAL (Carried to Summary pg.1)	\$250,400	\$121,446	\$260,300

SALARIES, BENEFITS AND CONSULTANTS:

	2017	2017	2018
	BUDGET	ACTUAL	BUDGET
SALARIES, BENEFITS AND CONSULTANTS:			
SALARIES	\$600,000	\$615,265	\$630,000
BENEFITS & PENSIONS	\$98,000	\$94,320	\$77,688
STAFF TRAINING	\$1,000	\$1,120	\$500
CONSULTANTS, OFFICE OVERLOAD	\$0	\$8,277	\$0
LESS ALLOCATION TO SRD	(\$27,600)	(\$27,600)	(\$27,600)
TOTAL (Carried to Summary pg.1)	\$671,400	\$691,382	\$680,588
BUILDING EXPENSES:			
UTILITIES	\$20,000	\$15,622	\$20,000
INDOOR MAINTENANCE	\$10,000	\$12,159	\$12,000
V.B.V. OUTDOOR MAINTENANCE	\$9,000	\$7,000	\$8,000
PROPERTY TAX	\$7,500	\$7,114	\$7,200
RENOVATION & REPAIR	\$10,000	\$3,096	\$10,000
INSURANCE-(Commercial General)	\$12,000	\$10,329	\$11,000
Less Allocation to SRD	(\$14,700)	(\$14,700)	(\$14,700)
TOTAL (Carried to Summary pg.1)	\$53,800	\$40,620	\$53,500
AMORTIZATION:			
AMORTIZATION	\$12,000	\$10,899	\$8,760
Less Allocation to SRD	(\$4,000)	(\$5,330)	(\$4,200)
TOTAL (Carried to Summary pg.1)	\$8,000	\$5,569	\$4,560
Surplus for Building Fund as of Dec 31, 2017 \$444.00			

SURVEY REVIEW DEPARTMENT

	2017	2017	2018
	BUDGET	ACTUAL	BUDGET
INCOME:			
PLAN SUBMISSION REVENUE	\$575,000	\$527,906	\$600,000
SRD -REVENUE - OTHER		\$14,665	
TOTAL REVENUE	\$575,000	\$542,571	\$600,000
EXPENSES:			
OFFICE SUPPLIES	\$4,500	\$3,644	\$4,000
POSTAGE & COURIER	\$16,000	\$12,579	\$12,000
STATIONARY & PRINTING	\$3,500	\$7,303	\$3,000
TELEPHONE	\$7,500	\$7,119	\$7,500
COMPUTERS (Maintenance, Software, Supplies)	\$6,000	\$6,360	\$6,500
COPIER	\$1,000	\$741	\$1,000
SALARIES	\$248,000	\$246,684	\$255,000
BENEFITS & PENSIONS	\$40,000	\$34,177	\$37,000
CONSULTANTS	\$125,000	\$145,022	\$165,000
MANAGER'S EXPENSES & TRAVEL	\$12,000	\$9,040	\$12,000
EXAMINERS' EXPENSE & TRAVEL	\$30,000	\$28,292	\$30,000
AMORTIZATION	\$4,200	\$5,330	\$4,200
ALLOCATION OF FACILITIES	\$14,700	\$14,700	\$14,700
ALLOCATION OF GRL ADMIN (Lena)	\$27,600	\$27,600	\$27,600
TOTAL EXPENSES (Carried to Summary pg. 1)	\$540,000	\$548,590	\$579,500
NET INCOME OR (EXPENSE)	\$0	\$0	\$20,500
SRD had an accumulated surplus of \$414,173.21 as of December 31, 2017			

CONTINUING EDUCATION

	2017	2017	2018
	BUDGET	ACTUAL	BUDGET
REVENUE			
CONTINUING EDUCATION - REVENUE/REVENUE ADJUSTMENT		\$2,824	
SEMINARS (non-ols participants, meals & incidentals)		\$18,650	
INTEGRATED SURVEYS			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT		\$0	
GEODETC PICNIC	\$12,500	\$9,801	\$10,000
TOTAL REVENUE (Carried to Summary Pg. 1)	\$12,500	\$31,275	\$10,000
EXPENSES			
PARTY CHIEF SEMINARS		\$0	
GEODETC PICNIC	\$6,000	\$7,706	\$8,000
SPECIAL PROJECTS/TRACKING SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			
CONTINUING EDUCATION SUBSCRIPTIONS	\$3,500	\$3,635	\$3,500
SURVEY EQUIPMENT THEORY		\$19,575	
LEADERSHIP EXCELLENCE SEMINAR		\$0	
CONTINUING EDUCATION WEBINARS	\$2,500	\$0	\$2,500
INTERNET DATABASE			
LESS CARRY FORWARD FROM RESERVES			
TOTAL EXPENSES (Carried to Summary Pg. 1)	\$12,000	\$30,916	\$14,000
NET INCOME OR (EXPENSE)	\$0	\$359	\$2,000
The Continuing Education Fund had an accumulated surplus of \$68,736.64 as of December 31, 2017			

DISCIPLINE RESERVE FUND

	2017 BUDGET	2017 ACTUAL	2018 BUDGET
REVENUE			
CARRY FORWARD FROM PREVIOUS YEAR			
DISCIPLINE COST RECOVERY	\$50,000	\$35,145	\$50,000
TOTAL REVENUE	\$50,000	\$35,145	\$50,000
EXPENSES			
REGISTRAR'S INVESTIGATION	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
HEARING 1	\$0	\$0	\$0
HEARING 2	\$190,000	\$225,883	\$190,000
HEARING 3		\$12,913	
HEARING 4		\$13,482	
HEARING 6		\$0	
HEARING 7			
HEARING 8		\$64	
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$200,000	\$252,342	\$200,000
NET INCOME OR (EXPENSE)	-\$150,000	-\$217,197	-\$150,000

INTERNSHIP PROGRAM


	2017 BUDGET	2017 ACTUAL	2018 BUDGET
REVENUE			
REVENUE	\$0	\$10,983	
OTHER	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL REVENUE (Carried to Summary Pg. 1)	\$0	\$10,983	\$0
EXPENSES			
SALARIES AND BENEFITS	\$0	\$0	
ADMINISTRATION	\$0	\$0	
BOOKKEEPING	\$0	\$0	
BANK CHARGES	\$0	\$0	
PHOTOCOPIES	\$0	\$0	
POSTAGE AND COURIER	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL EXPENSES (Carried to Summary Pg. 1)	\$0	\$0	\$0
NET INCOME OR (EXPENSES)	\$0	\$0	\$0

SURVEY RECORDS INDEX

	2017 BUDGET	2017 ACTUAL	2018 BUDGET
REVENUE:			
SURVEY RECORDS INDEX FEES	\$39,000	\$26,900	\$39,000
TRANSFER FROM SURPLUS			
TOTAL REVENUE	\$39,000	\$26,900	\$39,000
EXPENSES:			
ADMINISTRATION	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
CONSULTANTS/CUSTODIAL FEES/DB MGR	\$36,000	\$33,000	\$36,000
POSTAGE & COURIER/PRINTING & DUPLICATION		\$0	
COMMUNICATIONS			
MISC. COMMITTEE EXPENSES		\$0	
2008 CONTRACT			
TOTAL EXPENSES (Carried to Summary Pg. 1)	\$39,000	\$36,000	\$39,000
NET REVENUE OR (EXPENSE) (Note below)	\$0	-\$9,100	\$0

BIOGRAPHIES

Godfrey Lancelot Spragge OLS# 885 January 4, 1929 – May 4, 2003



Godfrey Lancelot Spragge OLS, MCIP was born in Toronto. He was educated at Trinity College, University of Toronto and Cornell University, where he received the Masters in Planning Degree.

Godfrey articulated with Harold Howden and obtained his commission in 1955. From 1955 to 1960 worked as a land surveyor with the Department of Highways. During the 1960s, Spragge became increasingly active as an urban planner in southwestern Ontario, eventually rising to become Deputy Director of Planning at the City of London.

In 1970, he was appointed a founding professor of the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen's University. Professor Spragge taught at Queen's for nearly a quarter century, conducted research on heritage preservation and was editor of the national planning journal *Plan Canada* in the 1970s. In retirement, his passion for social justice led him to become an election observer and witness for peace during the civil wars in Guatemala.

Godfrey was married to the urban historian Shirley (Cox) Spragge for 41 years, until her death in 1995. They left two sons, John and Michael Spragge.

Submitted by David Gordon, Director of the Queen's School of Urban and Regional Planning and one of Professor Spragge's former students.

Godfrey Lancelot Spragge died suddenly, at Kingston General Hospital on Sunday, May 4, 2003, in the presence of his sons John and Michael. He leaves behind a loving family, a circle of friends who shared his passionate concern for peace and social justice, and who will miss him very much. He was married to Shirley (nee Cox) for forty-one years. They were a couple and best friends for fifty years before her death in 1995.

Born in Toronto on January 4, 1929, he studied at Trinity College, Toronto, and worked as a land surveyor and Urban Planner before obtaining his Masters of Planning from Cornell University. He then went on to help found the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen's University, Kingston, where he taught for twenty-five years.

Following his retirement from Queen's, he trained with Project Accompaniment to serve as an election observer and witness for peace in Guatemala. His passion for social justice led him to the Early Years Coalition and Better Beginnings, Kingston Electors On Line, and the Kingston Faith and Justice Coalition.

He derived great strength from his involvement with mens' support groups and great pleasure from piano lessons and singing with the Kingston Choral Society and Open Voices Choir. His spiritual journey began with the Anglican Church and led to the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers).

Since the death of his wife, he found great joy with his many friends. He is survived by his sisters Elizabeth (J.D. Watson and their three children) of Belfast and Monica of Toronto; sons John (Allison MacDuffee) and Michael (Lynne Foran) of Toronto. He particularly delighted in his grandchildren Kathleen and Liam.

The Kingston Whig Standard from May 4 to 6, 2003

**Anthony Owen Stickings, OLS# 1071
December 3, 1923 – February 20, 2005**



Figure 1: Friends Ambulance Unit "China Convoy". The photo was taken at Chungking South Bank Garage. Anthony Stickings is in the front row, far left.

Anthony Owen Stickings, or “Tony” was my father. He was and continues to be one of the greatest influences on my life.

Tony was born in 1923 in England in Mitcham, Surrey, now Southwest London, and moved when he was a young boy to Brentwood in Essex County, just Northeast of London. He was the youngest of the boys in a family that also included a younger sister. A family that valued education, his father was a chemical engineer, mother was a qualified teacher and accomplished musician, and eldest brother Brian had plans to be an architect, but died at age 22, a Commando in the Royal Marines in World War II. Brother Ewart was a biochemist, and Margaret, the youngest, was a multilingual journalist who in later years attended Medical School in France.

The Stickings family also stressed moral and ethical values. Married in the United Methodist church in Mitcham, Dad’s parents, Ralph and Dora, later joined the Congregational church in Brentwood where Ralph was a deacon and lay preacher. The dinner table in the family home was a place to gather for conversation on topics of importance, both sacred and secular. It was where they would discuss their differences in response to the call to join the British war effort in the Second World War. The family of six were split three and three as they tried to apply the church’s teachings to the news from Europe.

Ralph and Brian both enlisted – Ralph seconded to the medical corps where he had served twenty-five years earlier, and Brian into the Royal Marines. Ewart was in university, Margaret was too young, Dora too old, but Tony was just the right age to be eligible for conscription. He registered as a conscientious objector and went to court to defend his convictions. He joined the FAU – Friends’ Ambulance Unit – China Division, which decision and experience determined much of the future direction of his life.

Dad’s work in the FAU involved procuring, storing and distributing medical supplies, in an area where the invading forces had cut off normal supply routes and continued to be a threat to safe travel. In addition, Tony was trained as an emergency ‘midwife’ and was called upon to deliver a baby (successfully!) in one of the villages.

When he could, he travelled through the hills of China to see as much of the country as possible. On one trip he contracted malaria, but in spite of this he fell in love with the land and its people, as did many of his fellow workers. As the war ended and he looked at the possibilities for the future, he seriously considered ordained ministry, but, maybe because of the different landscapes he had seen in his time abroad, he finally opted for studying geography back in England at Cambridge University, where he received his MA.

Dad rekindled his friendship with my mother through their connection in “Young Peoples” at the church in Cambridge. In March of 1949 they were married and settled briefly in a very old cottage with wavy stone floors, until Dad found a new adventure.

This one took them to British North Borneo with the Colonial Service, and it would be his first foray into surveying. In Borneo, Mum, who had some nursing training, was given a first aid kit to tend to the villagers, while Dad headed a team of surveyors made up of local Dayak people.

They travelled inland by river and mapped out areas of the jungle as they hacked and hewed paths to travel by foot. This meant being away for months at a time. Dad loved the work and the people, but Mum, who faced the birth and raising of her first child with no one around who spoke her language, was less impressed.

The tropical rainforest with variation of only one degree when the rains fell every day at four in the afternoon, the army ants that marched relentlessly through anything in their path, the lizards that fell off the ceiling onto the table...as I say, not impressed. But Dad would have stayed on if he could have persuaded Mum to stay with him, along with their daughter – me – who complicated things.

We went back to England when the three-year tour was over, and Tony and Jean had a house built according to Jean's own design. Dad worked as a cartographer and we lived in Ashted in Surrey. Mum planted an English cottage garden and with the addition of an adopted son, James, followed quickly by the birth of another son, Tim, life began to be settled...until Dad found another new adventure.

This one brought us finally to Canada – to North Bay in 1957.

Dad had gone ahead on a reconnaissance mission to find work and a home before he wrote to Mum to join him. It was the AOLS that beckoned to him and he found employment with the Ontario Department of Highways, working between Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie. He was not away for months, but for two weeks at a time, coming home on a Friday evening and returning on the Sunday. The neighbours did speak English, but not quite the same vocabulary or accent that we were used to. It was a learning curve for them and us.

North Bay at that time was still quite wild around the edges, and we lived on the edge of town. I, at the age of almost seven, thought it was wonderful. Mum, now with three children, away from home and family, felt isolated. Dad, despite having almost lost a toe (or more) to an axe that bounced off an Ironwood tree, loved the outdoor life in a Canadian winter just as much as he had loved the jungles of Borneo, and the hill country of China.

But the die was cast, and in 1959, Tony took an office position in Kingston, still with Highways. This time, when he felt adventurous, he looked for something new that would keep him closer to home. He went into teaching and because of his university education, secured a position as a high school geography teacher. We lived in Kingston for six years, the longest I was ever in one place while I was growing up.

But Dad did stay with teaching, moving next to Amherstburg to be Head of Department of Geography there. It was while there that Dad and Mum adopted my sisters, Marlene, eight years old and Valerie, six, from Rainy River Reservation. An adventure of a different kind, and one which Mum also embraced.

The advantage to teaching, though the pay when Tony first started was a pittance, was that you had two months off in the summer. Dad, who planned field trips for his students during the school year, also planned incredible trips for the family in the summer. On a shoestring budget which meant nothing could go wrong, we went from one side of Canada to the other. Of course, things did go wrong – especially when you didn't have the best car to begin with. One thing Tony did not excel in was auto mechanics.

The last move as a teacher was to Port Elgin in 1970, and this time I stayed behind, and not long after, started a family of my own. There were several more moves for Tony and Jean – who, after Dad took an early retirement from teaching, decided to become church organists and choir directors. They moved to Paisley and then to Kincardine, and finally went to BC to Victoria, and on to Sidney, BC when it was time to go to an assisted living facility. Dad died not long after that move, on February 20th, 2005.

I began by saying that my father was a great influence on my life. I inherited, whether by nature or by nurture, the same ability to see a grand adventure in new places and people. My Dad taught me a love of landscapes. I remember him studying the sample collection of fifty rocks and minerals that would be part of his exam for AOLS. I still look for the beautiful granite rock-cuts along highways as we go north in Ontario, and the unusual one near Gananoque where the limestone changes to granite abruptly, as though someone had drawn a line through the rock. Dad taught me never to go to and from a place on the same route if I could travel a different one to see something new.

He taught his children respect for all people and an absolute regard for life in all its forms. Dad taught us to question, and to learn by questioning. From him, I learned the importance of standing up for my convictions, especially when it would not be easy. He was a strong ethical influence, contributing to me eventually becoming a congregational minister.

Thank you for this opportunity to spend time with my memories, and to share my father's life with you.

Submitted by Rev. Catharine House

Edward LaFontaine, OLS# 940
1929 – February 17, 2006



Edward died peacefully after a struggle with heart disease on February 17, 2006 in his 77th year. Husband of Patricia (nee McSweeney). Father of Chris and Sherry of Georgia, Stephen of Windsor, Patrick and Mary of Tobermory, James of Milton and the late Anthony (1955), and Lori (1990). Grandfather of eight wonderful and loving children Alexa, Josie, Candace all of Georgia, Nicole and Michelle of Tobermory, Daniel, Tyler, and Elliot of Milton.

Ed was the son of the late Evelyn and Omer LaFontaine. Brother of Peter of California, Joe and Sharon of LaSalle, the late Philip husband of Connie (Windsor), Dolores and Peter Goubert of Florida, Rod and Bonnie of Goderich, Rosalie of Windsor, Don and Joyce of Cambridge, also survived by many nieces and nephews. Brother in-law of Terry and Joan, Maureen, Curtis, Sheila, and John McSweeney.

Ed was one of the founding fathers of St. Gabriel Church. He was a volunteer instructor with Windsor Power and Sail Squadron. Mr. LaFontaine graduated in 1950 with a B.A.Sc. degree in Civil Engineering from the U of T and obtained a M.A.Sc. degree from the University of Windsor in 1965. He was a retired Professional Engineer as well as a retired Ontario Land Surveyor. He was president and CEO of LaFontaine, Cowie, Buratto and Associates Ltd., Consulting Engineers which operated successfully for thirty years in southwestern Ontario. Ed worked on foreign aid projects for the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

Published in The Windsor Star from Feb. 18 to Feb. 20, 2006

Lachlan Eoin MacRae Ross, OLS# 1227
Deceased March 9, 2008

Lachlan Eoin MacRae "Lac" Ross, former Ontario Land Surveyor, "crossed the great divide" suddenly, but very peacefully, in hospital, with his family by his side, on Sunday, March 9, 2008. Much loved brother of Fairley Baker (Cecil) of Philadelphia, and Malcolm (Judy) of Aylmer, Quebec.

Predeceased by older brother Bob. Proud uncle of Colin Ross of Toronto, Alison Leeds and Malcolm Baker of New York, Rebekah Burke of Long Island, and Katie Ross and Jennifer Ross-Carriere of Ottawa. Lac was fortunate to have a caring extended family including sister-in-law Judy Ross-Presley, and best friend and cousin Rod Matheson, who is a brother to us all.

Lac was a book of knowledge, a man's man, who loved to golf and talk...about anything! He boasted of the many accomplishments of the younger members of our family, as long as they were out of hearing range. He will be missed by his good friends, Darlene Gouda and Ron Desjardins, who were always so kind to him, especially in the last few years. He will never know how really loved he was, by so many.

Visitation will be at Pinecrest Remembrance Services, Baseline Rd., Ottawa, from 11:00 a.m. Wednesday March 12, to service in the chapel at 1:00 p.m. A reception will follow. The family requests donations to the Canadian Cancer Society or the Parkinson Society Ottawa. Thank you to all who knew and cared for him. He will be forever in our thoughts. And the sun shone brightly as he left us.

Published in The Ottawa Citizen from Mar. 11 to Mar. 12, 2008

David Aaron Raphael Rabin, OLS# 704
July 18, 1925- November 9, 2012

David Aaron Raphael Rabin passed away peacefully, on Friday, November 9, 2012. Beloved husband of the late Eleanor Namerow, and Louise Montreuil for fifty-three years. Son of the late Cantor Joseph and the late Sonia Rabin. Loving father and father-in-law of Marilyn Rabin and John Curtis, Lawrence and Laurie Rabin, and Jill Rabin.

Born in Vilkaviskis, Lithuania, David immigrated to Canada in 1929. He attended York Public School in Ottawa and graduated in 1938. Thereafter, he attended Lisgar Collegiate in Ottawa and he graduated in 1943. He attended McGill University in Montreal and graduated with a B. Eng in metalurgy in 1947. He articulated with Norman Barry MacRostie, OLS# 477. In 1950, he obtained his B. Eng. in civil engineering at McGill University. In 1955, he was sworn in as a Quebec Land Surveyor.

David partnered with the firm of Gaudreault, Rabin, Legault, Lacroix & Pigeon, Quebec Land Surveyors and created Electromasure and Aerophoto, 135 employees and 5 aircraft. The business boomed. In 1976, a changing political climate had a negative impact on his company. The partnership dissolved. The aircraft was sold and David Rabin went into private practice. His son Lawrence now 63, and still practicing, joined the firm Rabin & Rabin in 1984. They have collectively surveyed over 37,000 properties in the greater Montréal region.

He enjoyed tennis and golf. He was a well known and respected surveying instructor at Vanier College for 20 years.

Cherished Grandpa of Ava and Josh Friedmann; Benjamin Schlisser; and Jesse Rabin. Dear brother and brother-in-law of Dr. Lionel and Carol Rabin, Dr. Eli and Elaine Rabin, the late Esther and the late Lawrence Bilsky.

Brother-in-law of Dr. Irwin and Peggy Fineberg, the late Charlotte Fineberg, the late Norman Namerow. David will be sadly missed by his Aunt Miriam Reich and Aunt Liselotte Ivry, his many nieces, nephews, cousins, friends, and extended family in Israel, Ottawa, Phoenix, Saint John, and Maryland.

Submitted by Mr. Lawrence Rabin



David and Lawrence Rabin, photographed on February 16, 1984




Dieter Klaus Zeuner, CR 106
October 13, 1939 – March 17, 2013

Dieter Klaus Zeuner was born in 1939 in Saschen, Germany. He obtained his engineering degree at the Technical University of Dresden on February 1963.

From March 1963 to August 1970, he worked for Carl Zeiss Jena in East Germany. From September 1970 to March 1972, he worked in a managerial capacity at Jena Instruments Ltd. in Toronto, ON. Thereafter, he joined Leica Canada Inc. in April of 1972 as the first manager of the Geodesy and

Photogrammetry department. Later in his career he was named Vice President of Leica's Surveying Division. On December 10, 1991, Dieter became a member of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors. On July 13, 1995 Dieter became a member of the AOLS Council. In 1999, he worked for Applanix Corporation. He retired in 2001 and passed away peacefully at the age of 74 on Sunday, March 17, 2013 after a short illness.

Beloved husband, for 51 years, of his wife, Christine. Loving father of his daughter Elke, son-in-law, Ian, and daughter, Katrin. Proud Opa to Jenny, Connor, Kyle, James and Alex. Survived by his sister, Gudrun, brother-in-law, Joachim, sister, Karin, his brother-in-law, Klaus, and sister-in-law, Inge. He will be sadly missed by his nieces and nephews; Karina and Joachim, Gero and Erik, Uta and Tini, Lars and Ute and many dear friends. Published in <http://www.lifenews.ca/announcement/2510528-zeuner-dieter>



George Merton Lowe, OLS# 980
unknown – July 15, 2014

Our family announces the passing of George Merton Lowe, loving husband, brother, father, grandfather and great-grandfather. George died peacefully in his sleep July 15, 2014, with Agnes by his side. He will be missed greatly by family and many friends in North America and abroad. Cremation has taken place. A memorial service was held for George on Tuesday, July 22nd at the Highland Funeral Home, 3280 Sheppard Ave. E., Toronto. Friends and family were invited to share memories of George between 9:30 and 11:00 a.m. In lieu of flowers, please

donate to the charity of your choice. Published in www.Legacy.com on July 20, 2014.

Kenneth Stephen Bunton, OLS# 1640
July 07, 1947 – December 11, 2015



Ken was born in Toronto, and grew up in Scarborough. His love of mapping began as a teenager in Scouts keeping on course for a week hiking with another boy (including an episode of food poisoning) on the Bruce Peninsula.

He studied archaeology as an undergraduate at Trent and was hired for two summers to work along the Skeenaw River in British Columbia, mapping and taking casts of fallen totem poles for the Museum of Man (which became the Museum of Civilization) in Ottawa. As a graduate student at Memorial in

Newfoundland, he worked on the first excavations of the early settlement at Cupid's Bay.

After university, he began as a surveyor's assistant with McAlpine Construction on the Spadina subway extension in Toronto. This gave him a vision of surveying as a continuation of his archaeological interests; he was hired by McBain and Carmichael Surveyors, who encouraged him to qualify as a surveyor.

After 4 more years of full-time university, with summer and holiday work first as instrument man and then as party chief, he apprenticed with Bill Carmichael and got his OLS in 1988. He continued as a surveyor with McBain and Carmichael, and retired after several years with Ertl Surveyors.


Ken thrived on the combination of physical strength in field work and intellectual challenges of research and reading plans and transferring the details of the plans on to the land or a building site. He enjoyed the companionship of a small company, and the collegiality of the profession. He continued researching, examining archival records for the Weston Historical Society in retirement.

Before his death from pancreatic cancer, he was able to revisit the Cupid's Bay site and see the fruits of his early survey work. His surveying experiences were always vivid, so any trip around Toronto or into the countryside beyond would be punctuated by surveying stories and memories.

Ken found work that he loved, he worked with people he admired, and he was dedicated to doing the best job possible. He was proud of being an Ontario Land Surveyor.

Submitted by Maureen Lennon

Donald Frank Walton, OLS# 748
October 23, 1924 – March 19, 2017



D. F. Walton was born in Midland, Ontario. He obtained his primary and secondary education at Mooretown Public School in Lambton County and at Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School. He enlisted in the Canadian Army in 1943 and after his discharge in 1946, completed his education under the D. V. A. programme in London, ON.

In 1947 he was employed by the Department of Highways and was articled to H. S. Howden in the same year. He was admitted to the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors

on March 19, 1951. He was employed by the Department of Highways as Regional Services Manager for the North western region. During his employment with the Department of Highways, he surveyed in Woodstock, Kingston, North Bay, Cochrane, Thunder Bay and Rainy River areas.

He was a member of the Masonic Order, the Board of Stewards, Current River United Church in Port Arthur and past executive member of the Fort William branch of the Canadian Legion. Mr. Walton was a resident of Port Arthur and was married to Joyce Rita Hyatt of Emo, Ontario in 1949 and is a father to one daughter and two sons.

Submitted by Mr. D. F. Walton on January 2, 1960

Don was sent to Fort William to establish a land survey office for the DHO. To my knowledge, none of the people he recruited has anything but good to say about Don. Don was responsible for mentoring and encouraging many young people like myself into becoming OLS's. In my case I was told where and when to show up when, in response to his question, I indicated I had not thought about the future. He encouraged me to return to school part time to overcome a failure in French, to qualify for university entrance, and arranged for me to work in the drafting office, the other part time. That's the kind of person he was.

Additionally, Don started the Northwestern Group of the AOLS. Through this medium he encouraged beneficial communication between rival and sometimes competitive surveyors. He insisted that no more than one group meeting would be held in Thunder Bay and encouraged "press releases" in the various locations (Thunder Bay, Sioux Lookout, Dryden, Kenora, and Fort Frances), where the other two meetings a year were held, in order to familiarize the public with the importance of Land Surveying.

He made sure that the self-employed surveyors took part in the group and its activities. He was a strong advocate of private practicing surveyors as responsible owners of businesses. Unselfish in his interests, and outspoken, when pursuing his interest in the welfare of Land Surveying and land surveyors, in Northwestern Ontario.

Submitted by Howard Graham, OLS# 1132

David Matthew Bews, OLS# 977
May 20, 1932 - March 28, 2017



It is with great sadness that we announce the death of David Bews at age 84. Dave was loved and respected by his family, colleagues, and friends for his commitment to community, work and family. Dave was born in Belleville, ON to Douglas and Aline Bews.

He attended Queen Alexandra and BCIVS. When Dave was 11, his mother passed away, and he and his father spent their summers building and selling houses around Belleville. Dave would carry on his love of designing and building throughout his lifetime. His skills as a handyman were legendary.

In 1951, he and his father moved to Kingston where he earned his BSc in Civil Engineering at Queen's University, Class of '56. He cherished his days there, where he secured many lifelong friendships, studying hard and stirring up trouble with his classmates. After graduating, Dave signed on with the Ontario Department of Highways and became an Ontario Land Surveyor based in Toronto. A quiet but social guy, Dave loved golf, tennis, curling, and skiing. It was on the slopes that he would meet Ethel Green, his future wife. When he was offered a transfer to Bancroft, ON, Dave knew that he couldn't go without her. They were married on June 8, 1963.

Dave and Ethel spent many happy years in Bancroft, where they built their first house together. In 1967, they moved to Ottawa, where Dave accepted a position with the federal government. In 1968, they were thrilled to welcome their son, Peter, into their lives and shortly after, their daughter, Christina in 1969. The family settled in Manotick, ON, where Dave and Ethel built two more houses and made a lifetime of happy memories. Dave's love of map reading made family vacations memorable. He was always first to win the geography pie when playing Trivial Pursuit at the family cottage on Robertson Lake near Lanark, ON. The cottage was a refuge where Dave would swim, fish, sail and build new additions. Dave retired from his position as Director of Professional and Technical Services with Indian and Northern Affairs Canada in 1992, after 23 years. He was the Project Manager on the construction of

both the Dempster and Liard highways. His career took him all over the world, often accompanied by Ethel.

In retirement, Dave helped Ethel with the gift shop that she owned in Manotick until they decided it was time for a new adventure. They moved back to Dave's hometown, restoring a house right across the street from where Dave was born. They became deeply immersed in the Belleville community, volunteering with Kiwanis and on the board of the Quinte Cultural Centre project. The two were often spotted walking with their golden retriever, Lucy, along the Bayshore or at Massasauga Conservation Area, for which they served on the Board. They carried on their love of travel with trips to Europe, the Maritimes, and BC.

Dave is survived by his wife, Ethel, and his sister, Barbara. He was a much loved Grandpa to Alex, Heather, Nick and Abbie Bews, and "Pop Pop" to Will and Maggie Shorthouse. He passed away peacefully, surrounded by his wife and children. He will be deeply missed by all.

Source: N.p., n.d. Web. <<https://www.arbormemorial.ca/burke/obituaries/david-matthew-bews/3528>>.

Nicolaas (Nick) H. Verhoef, OLS# 1134
September 20, 1931 – July 11, 2017



Nick was born in Potosí, Bolivia, the youngest of three brothers. His father was a mining engineer there, but the family moved back to the Netherlands just a few months after Nick's birth. They settled in a town called Zeist, where Nick met his future wife, Thea, in high school. In 1953, Thea was sponsored by an uncle in Toronto to come to Canada. She, in turn, was able to sponsor Nick, after he finished his mandatory military service in Holland. He arrived in March of 1954, and they were married in Toronto in April of that year.

One of Nick's first jobs in Canada was at a Woolworth's store, but he knew he didn't want to work there forever. As he once wrote,

"In 1955, while working in the basement of an F. W. Woolworth store on Dundas Street in Toronto, I decided to do something else, which would get me into the outside world. As it turned out, the choice was to get into surveying/ engineering and to follow that through, I subscribed to a correspondence course." When the job at Woolworth's came to an end, Nick was able to find employment with Marshall

Macklin Monaghan, where, in his words, he “started off as chainman and doubled as rodman on the engineering crew.”

In 1956, Nick and Thea moved to Peterborough, where he got a job with John G. Pierce (known for completing the survey of the Ontario-Manitoba border). Nick articulated with Mr. Pierce, and got his OLS licence on May 7, 1963. He worked for Smith and Smith in Lindsay for about a year, and then worked at Grange Elliott in Peterborough. Around 1967 he returned to Pierce and Pierce, and stayed there until he decided to strike out on his own. On March 23, 1970, he opened his own office in Campbellford, and once he felt financially secure, he moved his family there (wife Thea and two daughters, Monique and Henriette) in 1974. Nick eventually opened satellite offices in Marmora and Tweed. After many years as the only O.L.S. in the company, Nick realized he needed some help. He articulated Jack Keat, and when Jack obtained his OLS, he and Nick formed a new company called Keat and Verhoef on April 8, 1991. They continued until Nick’s retirement on December 31, 1997.

Nick was a member of the Kawartha Haliburton Regional Group for many years. He belonged to Cephas Christian Reformed Church in Peterborough, and after retirement, he volunteered at Campbellford Memorial Hospital until shortly before his death.

Nick took to surveying because he loved the outdoors. This love showed in his personal interests too. He wanted to learn to fly - initially taking gliding lessons and later getting his ultralight instructor’s licence. He flew his ultralight at Norwood. Nick was an amateur rockhound, collecting many interesting specimens over the years. He loved music, and a great thrill for him was participating in the Liberation Choir, which travelled back to Holland in 1995, in celebration of the 50th anniversary of Dutch liberation.

On his retirement, Nick and Thea were able to travel more, including making an annual road trip to Fort Frances to visit their daughter Henriette, who was also a surveyor (OLS #1817 - she passed away in October of 2017). Nick and Henriette even travelled to Bolivia together to learn more about the place where he had been born.

In his later years, Nick spoke often of his gratitude for the “many blessings” he felt he had received during his life. His story is like that of so many immigrants to Canada – one of hard work and dedication to a profession he loved, and of realizing the dream of making a better life for himself and his family.

Submitted by Monique Ibey

Ronald G. Theyers, OLS# 924
January 20, 1931 – July 15, 2017



Ron was born on January 30, 1931 in Scarborough, Ontario. He was the second child of four born to Leonard and Linda Theyers. Brother Raymond was the oldest and sister Rosalind and brother Ralph were younger. Like many Canadian families, they struggled through the Depression. Ron even spent time living with his Uncle Jim and Aunt Kay in Sudbury.

He attended Oakridge Public School in Scarborough and Scarborough Collegiate. Before graduating high school, Ron joined the Army Reserve. He did his training at Camp Meaford where he spotted for the Artillery. He served weekends while still in high school and graduated in 1949. After graduation, Ron tried out for the RCMP but wasn't accepted. Insufficient height was probably the main reason. He then succeeded in obtaining a position as a draftsman for the Department of Highways of Ontario in Toronto. He also took a math class in the evening to further his career.

Being a person who loved the outdoors, Ron applied to be articulated as a surveyor and was accepted. One of the first big surveying projects he worked on was the new Highway 401. There was much anger and opposition to this project due to the amount of prime farmland being expropriated. One old lady constantly sat on her porch with her shotgun. No one dared go on her property. They ended up surveying around it.

Ron was sent all over the province on many highway projects. One cold winter day up north, the crew was keeping warm by the campfire during lunch and was not responding to a call to get back to work. One old grizzled character in the group decided to help things along by throwing a handful of .22 bullets into the fire. Needless to say, the rest of the crew scrambled back at record speed.

On another occasion, while cutting a survey line, the crew came upon one of the largest trees for miles around. Of course, it was right in the middle of the line. They set about the task of cutting the tree down. After a couple of minutes, during a momentary pause, a loud buzzing sound was noticed. Looking up, they saw a very large wasp nest and a huge swarm of wasps trying to figure out what was going on. Not wanting to bring the nest down to ground level, it was prudently decided to survey around the tree.

In October 1952, Ron married Irene Weeks and in less than two years they had their first child, Brenda. As regional offices started to be established, Ron and family were transferred to London. There he and Irene had their second daughter, Elaine.

It was in London that Ron also joined the Masons. He continued working on advancing his career and received his OLS designation on August 15, 1956.

After several years, Ron was transferred to North Bay where he was made an Inspector of Surveys (field supervisor). Meanwhile, sons Bruce and Dennis were added to the family. The eleven years in North Bay were busy ones for Ron. Work, Cub Scout and Boy Scout events, church committees, family camping trips, the Masons, and a vegetable garden in the backyard kept him hopping. He even made time to try his hand at prospecting. Ron and three partners staked out some land of geological interest, probably discovered on a Scout canoe trip. This venture never panned out.



In the fall of 1968, Ron accepted the position of College Instructor at Northern College of Applied Arts and Technology in Timmins. During Christmas break, Ron, Irene, the four kids, the dog, the pet bird and the vacuum cleaner were somehow all packed into a car with an already-full trunk and headed north.

Ron soon settled into his teaching career. He was big on “the practical” and often took his students out of the classroom and into the field to deal with real-life land surveying. Students were also taken on surveying-related field trips to government offices in Toronto and Ottawa.

Ron enthusiastically involved himself with college activities and sports. He even cut ice out of Porcupine Lake to make ice sculptures for the Timmins Winter Carnival. With his help, Northern College won the ice sculpture/snow sculpture contest several years in a row. Apparently measuring skills are useful for turning a drawing into a 3-D ice sculpture. Ron also worked with local surveyors on side jobs and involved himself with local issues involving land surveys.

Ron retired from teaching in 1987 but then took on the job of College Arbitrator for contract disputes for one year. He also did some part-time teaching. Retirement didn't slow Ron down. He now had the time to get more involved in community activities. Ron started the clown unit of the local Shrine club. He played the role of Rondo the clown for many years, doing hospital and school visits as well as parades, and raising money for the Shriners Hospital for Children in Montreal. He was involved with Scouts, Meals on Wheels, and church activities. Ron also enjoyed puttering around the cottage, working in his garden, and spending time with his grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Ron passed away suddenly while gardening on July 15, 2017.

Submitted by his family

Lawrence Preston Tomkins, OLS# 867
August 6, 1926 – August 20, 2017



We are deeply saddened to announce the passing of Lawrence Preston Tomkins on August 20, 2017 at *Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre* after a brief illness. He was completely at peace and, in his own words, 'ready for heaven'. Devoted husband of Vera for almost 66 years, proud father of Lynn and her husband Dan Kmiecik, 'Uncle Laurie' to Carol, Mary, Susanne, Anthony and Christine and 'Grandpa' to Mindy, Kyle and Troy and their families. Known fondly by many as 'Mr. T'.

Laurie was born in Toronto and raised in the Beach area, attending Williamson Road Public School.

Upon graduation from Malvern Collegiate at age 17 he enlisted in the RCNVR and saw active duty on corvettes out of Halifax and in the North Atlantic. Following the war he graduated top of his class from Forestry at the University of Toronto in 1953 and became an Ontario Land Surveyor. He practised land surveying for forty years, a profession he loved and at which he excelled.



Laurie always led an active life and loved to be outdoors; golfing, playing tennis, hiking and growing the best-maintained lawn in the neighbourhood. Laurie and Vera enjoyed square and round dancing and travelled extensively in North America, Great Britain, Europe and North Africa, often with friends and family. He was a volunteer with Tennis Canada for twenty years and supported many charities. Laurie was a kind and generous man with a creative mind and a penchant for crosswords, card games and conundrums. He loved woodworking and was the author of many

original poems and cards for special occasions. A private family service has been held and Laurie rests in the Veterans Section of the York Cemetery near an old oak tree.

If desired, donations may be directed to the 'Tomkins Family Award in Dentistry' at the Faculty of Dentistry, University of Toronto. This endowment was founded by Laurie and Vera in honour of their daughter Lynn, and supports deserving dental students in financial need. Dr. Tomkins has very set up two awards for 5 years each in Faculty of Engineering and Architectural Science in honor of her father, Lawrence Tomkins. Both awards have been setup to celebrate the life and work of Lawrence Tomkins and to provide support to students in civil engineering.

One award is called, The Lawrence Tomkins OLS 867 Scholarship. This award will be given to a student each year, starting from Fall 2018. The student recipient will

have completed the 2nd year basic surveying course CVL 323 and will have achieved high academic standing. The second award is called, The Lawrence Tomkins OLS 867 Award. This award will also be given to a student each year, starting from Fall 2018. The student recipient will have completed the 3rd year geomatics surveying course CVL 354 and will have achieved high academic standing. The student must also submit a letter of not more than 200 words demonstrating his/her interest to pursue a career in becoming an Ontario Land Surveyor.

Submitted by Dr. Lynn Tomkins

Donald D. McGeorge, OLS# 985
June 17, 1934 – August 30, 2017



At Riverview Gardens Nursing Home on Wednesday, August 30th, 2017, Donald Dolsen McGeorge of Chatham passed away in his 84th year. Donald was born in Chatham on June 17th, 1934 and was the cherished son of the late William Graham McGeorge and Adele Irene Dolsen. He attended Queen Mary Public School, Chatham Collegiate Institute and McMaster University. He studied civil engineering from the University of Toronto and graduated in 1957. He was sworn in as an Ontario Land Surveyor in 1958. Don practised in his father's firm as a partner in the firm of W.G. McGeorge and Sons. He was the principal of McGeorge and Barry. His practice was mainly in the fields of land development, drainage engineering and legal land surveying, having served the former townships of Dover and Chatham for some years. Don was the beloved husband of 58 years of Virginia (nee Dean), and loving father of Heather, and Dean, both of Toronto. He is survived by his sister Jane Dewar of Ottawa, and his brother David and his wife Betty McGeorge of Chatham. He is predeceased by his sisters Mary Cochrane, Margaret Jacks, and Helen Coulter, and his brothers Bill and Malcolm McGeorge. He will be fondly remembered by his many cousins, nieces and nephews, and great nieces and nephews. Don was a past president of both the Chatham Kiwanis Club and the Chatham Granite Club. He was elected twice to the Kent County Board of Education in 1970 and 1972. Don was a 70 year plus member of First Presbyterian Church. During this time, he served on numerous committees as well as being an elder. *"Well done thou good and faithful servant"*.

The family wishes to thank the staff of the Chatham-Kent Health Alliance, Copper Terrace, and Riverview Gardens for their support and care during the past year.

Source: <http://www.alexanderfuneralhome.ca/2017/08/mr-donald-d-mcgeorge/>

Henriette (Henri) J. Verhoef, OLS# 1817
July 7, 1966 – October 10, 2017



Henriette – Henri to all who knew her – was born in Peterborough, Ontario. The family moved to Campbellford in 1974 after her father, Nick Verhoef (OLS #1134), opened his own survey business there.

Henri graduated from the University of Waterloo in 1989 with a B.A. Joint Honours degree in English and Psychology, and a Canadian Studies Honours option. Her interest in surveying began that summer, when she was hired by the county of Northumberland to work as instrument person on a survey crew. When this job ended, she worked at Keat and Verhoef Surveyors, Inc., from 1989-91. This is where she realized just how much she loved surveying and decided to pursue it as a career.

To that end, Henri studied Geological Science at Queen's University in Kingston from 1991-92, in order to upgrade her skills and complete the courses she needed as prerequisites for entering the survey program at the University of Toronto (Erindale). From 1992-94 Henri was registered as a special student in the Surveying Science Program at University of Toronto. Upon graduation, Henri articulated with Ronald H. Smith in Kingston from 1994 to March of 1997. Henri was commissioned as an OLS on August 13, 1997. She was hired later that year by Jim Bowman, of W.J. Bowman Ltd., to manage his Fort Frances office. Henri obtained her CLS on July 11, 2001. After Jim Bowman retired, the company underwent several transitions. In 2008, Henri took over the management of both the Fort Frances and Dryden offices, and at the time of her illness, the company was called exp Services Inc.

Henri was an active member of the Northwestern Regional Group. Over the course of her career she eventually served on all the executive positions in the group. She built good working relationships with many of her colleagues, whose friendships she enjoyed and whose professional knowledge she greatly respected.

As a surveyor, Henri was committed to ensuring that her clients received the best quality work and that they fully understood the survey process. She was also very dedicated to her employees, doing her utmost to create a positive work environment and to provide continued employment in uncertain economic times.

Henri's dedication to her work left little time for other pursuits, but much like her father Nick (who passed away earlier in 2017), she had a great love of the outdoors and nature. This was evidenced in her interests and activities. She was a member of

the Emo Christian Reformed Church. She enjoyed birdwatching, hiking, canoeing and rockhounding. She was active in groups such as the Rainy River Valley Field Naturalists and the Rainy Lake Conservancy. She mentored on the Rainy River Natural Resources Advisory Committee. Henri was a co-recipient (with Ahlan Johanson) of a provincial volunteer award for their work in establishing an interpretive nature trail in Crozier Township through the peat bog, which opened in July 2006.

During her final weeks in the hospital, Henri reflected on her career by answering a series of interview questions from Anne Cole, BSc, OLS, CLS. The resulting article, called "Recruiting the Best and the Brightest" appeared in the Fall 2017 issue of "Ontario Professional Surveyor" (Vol. 60, No. 4). Henri tells in her own words, what her life and career were like as a surveyor, a surveyor's daughter, and a female in a largely male profession.

Henri came to love living in Northwest Ontario, where she truly felt at home. She met her cancer diagnosis with a positive attitude, and her concern for friends, employees, colleagues and clients, remained paramount even in the face of her illness. She will be missed by many.

In March of 2018, Henri was posthumously given the AOLS Centenary Award. The AOLS Educational Foundation Henriette Verhoef Award was established after her death to be given annually to a female student enrolled in Geomatics at York University."



Henri and Nick Verhoef, May, 2017

Submitted by Monique Ibey

Henry J. Gerrits, OLS# 1450
1935 – October 22, 2017



Henry J. (Harry) Gerrits peacefully passed away in his sleep on Sunday, October 22 at home, 2 weeks after his 82nd birthday. He will be lovingly remembered and sadly missed by all his drinking buddies at the Black Dog Pub.

Survived by 5 of his siblings in Holland.
Predeceased by his brother Jan and sister Wilma.

Survived by the light and love of his life, his daughter Monique, and her mother and his partner of almost 30 years, Nanette Snel.

Harry came to Canada at the age of 19 and made his home here. He was the proud owner of Henry J. Gerrits Surveying Ltd. for almost 40 years.

Friends are welcome at a visitation on Monday, October 30th at *Simple Alternative*, 275 Lesmill Rd. Toronto, 6-8pm. and/or a Celebration of Life at the *Black Dog Pub*, 87 Island Road, Scarborough, 4-6pm. In lieu of flowers, buy yourself a lottery ticket and a beer or two. *"Don't worry, be happy!"*

A private cremation will take place and his ashes will be buried in the Netherlands this summer.

Published in the Toronto Star on Oct. 26, 2017

**Ralph Willis Barry OLS# 1239, P.Eng.
1938 – October 31, 2017**



With deep sorrow we announce the passing of Mr. Ralph Willis Barry on Tuesday, October 31st, 2017, at the Chatham-Kent Health Alliance Chatham Campus.

Surrounded by his loving family, Ralph passed away in his 79th year. Ralph was the son of the late Armstead and Neva Barry. Loving husband of 52 years to Betty (Bennett) Barry. Devoted father to Carolynn Barko (Scott) and Richard Barry (Koren) and adoring grandfather to three grandchildren Jade, Drew, and Allie.

Brother of the late James and Robert Barry. Ralph is survived by his sisters Carolynn Lund-Mead and Lorraine MacDonald. Missed by his many nieces, nephews, and extended family.

Ralph attended Chatham Collegiate Institute and was a graduate of Civil Engineering at Queens University in 1964, qualifying as an Ontario Land Surveyor in 1969.

He was partner in the former business of McGeorge and Barry before operating his own business of Barry Consulting and Barry Land Surveying. Ralph operated as former president of the Kent Club and Progressive Conservative Party.

He also served as Chatham Hydro Commissioner and was a Rotarian. In keeping with his final wishes cremation has taken place and private ceremony will be held at a later date.

Many thanks and appreciation to the doctors, nursing and care staff at the Chatham-Kent Health Alliance Chatham Campus, as well as Meadow Park Nursing Home and Windsor Regional Hospital.

Arrangements entrusted to the Alexander & Houle Funeral Home, 245 Wellington St. W. Chatham 519 -352- 2710. Friends planning an expression of remembrance are asked to consider the CKHA Diagnostic Imaging Equipment Renewal Campaign. Online condolences may be left at: www.alexanderfuneralhome.ca

Published in: <http://yourlifemoments.ca/sitepages/obituary.asp?oid=1048454>

**William Douglas Ratz, OLS# 726, P. Eng.
December 27, 1923 – November 5, 2017**



Bill was born at a farm in Fullarton Township, County of Perth on December 27, 1923. His early education was at Munro Public School and honour matriculation at Mitchell High School in Mitchell, ON. From 1943 to 1945 he attended the University of Toronto in Civil Engineering during which time he was in the Canadian Officers Training Program (C.O.T.C.).

In 1946, he married Dorothy Feltz who he met during his high school years. That same year he started working for the Department of Highways in the Legal Surveys office. Bill was articled to Harold S. Howden and was commissioned as an Ontario Land Surveyor in May of 1950. Following his commission he completed the remaining Civil Engineering examinations and was registered as a Professional Engineer in April 1957.

Bill's survey training and experience as a party chief and field supervisor was widespread throughout the province, including several sessions in northern Ontario. In 1957, he succeeded H. S. Howden as Superintendent of Surveys, a position he held until 1975. At that time re-organization of the Ministry brought together the engineering and legal survey activities. Bill became the manager of the Surveys and Plans office. He retired from the Ministry in 1980 after 35 years of service.


Outside of work, Bill was active within the surveying profession. He was a member of the Canadian Institute of Surveying (CIS) and the American Congress of Surveying and Mapping (ACSM).

He was also active in several association committees, including two terms with the education committees; the first being instrumental in establishing the first survey technology course at Ryerson and the second being responsible for promoting and developing the first university degree course in surveying at Erindale College.

Bill was a devout family man. He and Dorothy raised two children, a son, Douglas and a daughter, Deborah. His community and social activities consisted of the following: Registrar and President of a boys and girls sports club for many years, member of a Lutheran church where he served as a Councilor and Secretary. He was also a director of a condominium board. He enjoyed square dancing for 25 years. He loved woodworking and cottage life. Bill died at the age of 94 and is sadly missed by his family, four grandchildren and one great-granddaughter.

Submitted by Dorothy Ratz

William Arthur Brewer, OLS# 1172
May 1, 1936 – November 14, 2017



Bill passed away on November 14, 2017 in his 81st year. He was born on May 1, 1936 to Dorothy Jean Smith and Harold Cuthbert Brewer in Windsor, Ontario.

Bill articled to Maurice Armstrong, was commissioned on May 7, 1965 and worked with the Armstrong and Smeeton firms in Windsor and the Settingerton firm in Leamington. He was a sole practitioner in Wheatley before becoming a partner at the firm of Verhaegen Stubberfield Hartley Brewer and Bezaire, managing their Leamington office. He served on AOLS Council and was active on many committees.

Bill was a man of many interests. He was a past president of the Essex County Sports Car Club, raced an MGA, an open wheeled Formula B and an Alexis Formula Ford. He and a partner were the North American dealer for these racing cars. He was a member of the Ontario Flying Farmers. From his farm's airstrip he flew his Piper Cub to many of his scuba diving and Windjammer sailing adventures, flying coast to coast from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Bering Sea to the Caribbean.

Predeceased by his many cats and dogs that he called family, Bill is survived by his long-time partner Joyce Sutherland and will be missed by all who knew him.

Submitted by Tim Hartley, OLS# 1528

Andrew Miles MacKenzie, OLS# 1112
September 7, 1934 – November 23, 2017



He had the last laugh with a midnight departure on Thursday, November 23, 2017. Andrew Miles MacKenzie, Ontario Land Surveyor, a joke and story teller extraordinaire, life-long fisherman and Craigowan golfer passed away at age 83 after a two year bout with cancer.

Left with a lifetime of good memories are his wife of 60 years Annabelle, daughter Alison (Trenton), son Alexander (Lorraine), and five cherished granddaughters: Cleo, Abigail, Kenzie, Kellan, and Katerina. Of the Woodstock MacKenzies, brother Pete now carries on the family traditions from Calgary.

During his spirited stint at Woodstock Collegiate, he met the love of his life, Annabelle. Andy was a proud graduate of the Ontario Agricultural College (OAC) and the University of Toronto. He had a remarkable and influential career, reinventing himself many times over. After engineering work on the DEW line in Labrador, Andy ran a successful land surveying firm in Woodstock and served multiple terms as City and County Councillor. He was proud of the many subdivisions, houses, and businesses he helped to build across the County. But more than anything else he was proud of his two kids, Alison and Alexander and his 5 granddaughters, who can do no wrong. He was able to combine his fascination with computers and his surveying expertise at TERANET where he spearheaded the automation of the provincial land registry system.

A lifelong fisherman, he could regale us all with tales of the big one (*that he mostly always caught*). Andy will be remembered for his unstinting encouragement and the optimism he always sought to instill in his family and friends.

Cremation has taken place and a proper bash is being planned for Saturday, January 6, 2018 at Craigowan Golf Club from 1 to 4 pm (stories and speeches at 2 pm).

In lieu of flowers, donations are much appreciated in care of the Oncology Day Unit at the London Health Sciences Centre and the Woodstock Hospital and may be made directly or through Wareing Cremation Services, 346 Simcoe Street, Tillsonburg, Ontario N4G 2J8.

Obituary: Woodstock Sentinel Review, 30 Nov 2017, A, p. 8, column 5

John (Jack) Young, OLS# 1446
January 30, 1939 – December 2, 2017



Jack was born in Wingham, Ontario and grew up in a family of three brothers and four sisters in Belgrave. Following primary and secondary schooling, he entered the engineering program at Acadia University and the Nova Scotia Technical College (now part of Dalhousie University) graduating with a Bachelor of Engineering in 1961 and a Master of Engineering in Drainage Engineering in 1962.

While attending university, he met Sandy Lee and they married following graduation in 1961.

He began his professional career at Fenco Consultants (1962 - 1967) and quickly achieved both professional engineer and consulting engineer designations. During that period, he

and Sandy relocated to Toronto and subsequently, in 1965, to Vancouver where he was Project Engineer on the construction of the railway bridge between Vancouver and North Vancouver. In 1967, they put down roots in Sudbury, Ontario.

In Sudbury, Jack began his second and third careers. He joined the engineering faculty at Laurentian University and he established himself in private practice opening his own firm, Noront Engineering in 1974.

Professional surveying began to attract him - career 4 - and in 1976 he entered into articles with Don Endleman, OLS in Sudbury. While articling, Jack attended a number of survey law courses at the then newly established Survey Science Program at Erindale College, University of Toronto.

Jack was sworn in as an Ontario Land Surveyor in 1978. With both professional engineering and professional surveying licenses to practice in hand, he changed the name of his firm to J. K. Young Limited and began a multi-discipline professional services firm. For many years he sat on a Tribunal for the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs dealing with drainage issues. Jack was the consummate professional. Dedicated, thorough, fair and honest. His skills as a teacher were to bring out the best in his students and he became a mentor to all.

As the Erindale program grew, new opportunities arose. Jack and family were still living in Sudbury but his exposure to the Erindale environment and his compatibility with the staff at Erindale resulted in an offer to join the Faculty in 1980. Jack accepted the offer and he and family, now including 2 preschoolers and a 6-week old baby boy, relocated one more time to Brampton. Somehow in that same year, he found time to achieve certification as a Canada Lands Surveyor.

In 1984, he was elected by his peers to the Council of Management of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors. This began a six-year voluntary involvement with the management of the survey profession in Ontario. He was a member of Council when the new Surveyors Act was approved and was closely involved with all the changes that ensued. In 1988 he became the Association President.

During his time on Council, Jack was involved on a number of Association Committees including the Board of Examiners, the Academic and Experience Requirements Committee, the University Liaison Committee, the Discipline Committee, the Nominating Committee and the APEO/AOLS Joint Committee on Land Drainage.

He and Sandy attended most, if not all, Association Annual Meetings where he served for many years as Parliamentarian and Master of Ceremonies at the Veterans' Dinner. To say he was well known and respected within the Association would be a clear understatement.

Jack loved his work and took great pride in the accomplishments of his students. He left his professional mark not only on the engineering and surveying professions but also on academia. His careers spanned over 40 years. But his involvement with his professional associations would continue in retirement.

While living in Brampton, Jack and Sandy had purchased a cottage property on Lake Muskoka and over a number of years replaced that structure with a new home which was to become known as 'The Shack'. Following the closure of the Erindale Program, they relocated to Gravenhurst and divided their time between that home and one in Florida.

In 2006, Jack was instrumental in the creation and management of an informal, but effective, process to maintain the involvement of past presidents once they left Council. That group was to become a quasi-advisory group to the Association and Council and is now known as The Senate.

It is not surprising that Jack was equally committed to his communities. He was a member of the Brampton Board of Trade, Brampton Rotary and Gravenhurst Rotary. He also volunteered at the Muskoka Discovery Center.

In his leisure time, Jack maintained 2 antique cars, one of which apparently brought him home after birth, and an antique Muskoka boat. In 2017, just a few weeks before he entered the hospital, he and Sandy relocated to Ballantrae to be closer to family.

Jack is survived by his wife of 56 years, Sandy, his children, Heather Tipping, Nancy Young (Stephen Cudmore), Bruce Young (Betty Ann) and Christie Young (Ian Braby) and nine grandchildren.

Jack was honoured and remembered at a Celebration of Life held at the Muskoka Discovery Center on May 12, 2018 attended by family, friends, colleagues and former students. He was a mentor and good friend to many and will be long remembered.



The Senate Picnic, photographed at ‘The Shack’

Submitted by Sandy Young and Jim Statham, OLS# 1469

JACK YOUNG EULOGY
BY: DREW ANNABLE, OLS# 1434
May 12, 2018 - Muskoka Discovery Centre, Gravenhurst

I want to thank Sandy and the family for including the land surveying community in Jack's memorial this afternoon. Our community was an important part of Jack's life. It is a true honour for our profession, but also for me in particular, to tell you about the many ways our good friend Jack was involved in the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors (AOLS). As a relatively small professional association (numbering about 500), Jack enjoyed, (and played a big role in), the spirit of fraternity that exists amongst our colleagues.

I first met Jack in the washroom at Erindale College, during a break in one of David Lambden's long evening law classes. Jack was coming in from Sudbury and I was coming in from London to take the required survey courses at Erindale. It was early in the school year and I was coming from London for the evening classes while working during the day at Archibald, Gray & McKay (AGM) in London. I didn't know anyone, except for Norm Sutherland who was my friend and driving partner. As it happened, Jack and I were standing side by side at the urinals during the break and Jack leaned over and asked me how John Bagnall was doing. I didn't know he knew who I was let alone John Bagnall, who was a long-time party chief at AGM. As only Jack could, he intended the question to have a shocking effect and it certainly did. Jack and I hit it off that night and have been good friends ever since.

This past February 22nd was the fortieth anniversary of Jack being sworn in as an Ontario Land Surveyor. If you do the math, he was in his late 30's when this happened. A little older than most. I never got to discuss this with him, but I've always marvelled that, while having a young family, with a pregnant wife and a one-year old back home in Sudbury, Jack gave up a successful career as a professor in engineering at Laurentian University in Sudbury, plus a successful drainage engineering business on the side, and went back to school at the Erindale College campus of the University of Toronto in Mississauga. This, so that he could take the necessary courses to become an Ontario Land Surveyor. And then, after that, he articulated and worked in the field for his surveyor friend Don Endleman in Sudbury in order to get his ticket. I think you have to go back to his early life to understand why he did this.

Starting when he was just 14 years old, growing up in the rural community of Lucan, Ontario, just north of London, Jack worked for the summers with his older brother-in-law, Charles Corbett. Charlie, as everyone calls him, who, by the way, is with us here today, had an engineering and land surveying practice in Lucan, doing municipal drains and some legal surveys, those being mostly road projects for the County of Middlesex. Some of these projects were too big for Charlie's small firm so he subcontracted the work to Jack Gray of AGM, where John Bagnall was a party chief. It was on these projects that Jack worked with John Bagnall.

As Jack was a pretty sharp and industrious kid, Charlie took him under his wing and taught him quite a bit about engineering and survey work. Jack was a quick learner and absorbed all he could. Charlie became a mentor to Jack and was influential in Jack enrolling in the engineering program at Acadia University in Nova Scotia. From there, in 1962, Jack went on to get his Master of Engineering designation in Drainage Engineering from the Nova Scotia Technical College, which is now part of Dalhousie University. Of course, he met Sandy while in University in Nova Scotia and after they were married, Jack's career had numerous stops until they ended up in Sudbury.

But, getting back to why Jack had this mid-life crisis of sorts to get his Ontario Land Surveyor ticket. It is my theory that, back when he was working with Charlie, Jack caught the 'surveying bug'. It happens to a lot of us in this profession. As a young person in either high school, college or university you take a bunch of math courses and are pretty good at them. Then, somehow, you find yourself in a summer job on a survey crew, using survey equipment and tools and discover a real practical application for the courses you enjoy. While, at the same time, having the added bonus of working in the great outdoors. As a result, you fall in love with the surveying profession as a career. For Jack, it is my belief that his early work with Charlie tugged at his heart until he couldn't ignore it anymore and decided he had to do something about it. And, for us in the surveying profession, we're sure glad he did!

After getting licenced, Jack was asked to take a position on the staff of the surveying program at Erindale, so he and Sandy moved their family to Brampton. As well as teaching at Erindale, Jack continued to run a practice on the side, only this time, as well as doing drainage engineering, he hired other land surveyors to get into the land surveying business. Jack loved to burn the candle at both ends and was able to successfully balance both a career as a professor at Erindale College with his surveying/engineering business.

Jack had a natural tendency to lead. I'm sure it was the same with other organizations that he was involved with as it was with the AOLS. For all forty years that he was involved, Jack was one of our leaders in just about all aspects of our profession. It wasn't that he pushed his way to the top, but it was his inherent ability to see the practical and wise solution to problems that made people turn to him. After he came on the staff at Erindale, he involved himself with the Association's Academic and Experience Requirements Committee (AERC), who were responsible for the training and licensing of young surveyors. Of course, Jack taught many of these students at Erindale, where his friendly, yet sage demeanor would help guide them. Many of our membership today were taught and influenced by Jack as they grew into their successful careers as surveyors. On the AOLS's memorial page found on their web site, you will notice many comments from some of these students.

In 1984, Jack was elected to the Association's Council of Management. This led to him being President of the Association in 1988. As the surveying community is relatively small, not only in Ontario, but across the country as well, the Presidents from each provincial Association travel with their spouses to each provincial Annual Meeting to share, not only in the fellowship of the profession, but with ideas for advancement as well. Jack and Sandy certainly enjoyed this year of travel and made good, long lasting friendships with surveyors from other provinces. After his time on Council and serving as our President, Jack spent many years on the Association's Discipline Committee, where he tried to have some influence in guiding surveyors who had lost their way. These activities were mostly confidential, but I'm sure Jack was able to provide some positive effect, as it was his nature to build people up, rather than tear them down.

For many years, Jack was also the Parliamentarian for our Association's Annual Meeting. Of course, the business of these meetings must follow a strict rule of order, which, from time to time, would get testy over some contentious issue. Frequently, as our Parliamentarian, Jack's sage advice and manner had to be called upon to get the meeting back on track. He was particularly good at that.

Our current Executive Director, Blain Martin, who is also present here today, has been in his role for about 10 years now. In the beginning, Blain admits that he was stumbling until Jack came along to help him out. All the various tasks involved with the job, and the very weighty decisions that kept popping up daily, caused Blain to turn to Jack. Again, Jack's wise, cool manner, and his ability to cut through the chaff helped Blain get some guidance while he got his feet wet with the new job. Blain says that he will be forever indebted to Jack for his help in getting him started and for working with him year after year. Blain says that Jack never did stop helping him and he misses him dearly. This was especially true with our Annual General Meetings. Jack's absence at our meeting this past February left a huge hole, particularly at the Veteran's Dinner, where Jack has been the Master of Ceremonies for years.

Jack was a very sociable guy. As such, he was instrumental in getting an organization within the Association called, 'The Senate' going. This is a group of Past Presidents who get together with their spouses each year for purely social reasons. Friendly conversation, food and of course only the best of scotch, tend to be at the centre of these events. Again, Jack was the organizer and leader of these get-togethers, which are moved around the province in the homes of various participants. Most of us from the Senate last saw Jack at our last event on September 23rd in Peterborough. That was at a time when he was in the middle of his steroid therapy and was feeling better than he had for some time, so we're happy that he really enjoyed the day as it was only a couple of weeks after that that he went into the hospital.

In his retirement, and until quite recently, Jack sat on the Drainage Tribunal of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. There, as a member of a panel of adjudicators, Jack used his skills to bring disputes to a logical end. As Drainage Engineering involves both the Professional Engineers of Ontario and the AOLS, Jack represented our Association at joint events.

In recognition of his many contributions to our profession, in 2004 the AOLS presented Jack with the rarely bestowed, Professional Recognition Award. An award he fittingly received at the Annual General Meeting that year.

As I've mentioned, Jack was a natural leader in so many ways. He garnered the respect from anyone who came in contact with him. This tendency means that for many of the organizations he was involved with, but especially for the AOLS, there is a huge hole that needs filling. At the AOLS, we have rallied to do just that, but it certainly won't be the same without him.

Rest peacefully old friend, you've left things in good shape so hopefully we can figure it out from here.

Now, I have a 'breaking news' announcement that just occurred this past Thursday night. To explain, for the AOLS, the Province is broken down into 8 Regional Groups or local chapters. One of the main purpose of these Regional Groups is educational. Working most of his life as a Professional Surveyor in the Toronto area, Jack was a member of what we call the South Central Regional Group, which takes in the GTA and some regions beyond it. This group had a meeting on Thursday night and made the following motion: "... *moved that the South Central Regional Group of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors:*

- 1) *Set up a scholarship fund in memory of Jack Young to be titled The Jack Young Memorial Education Fund*
- 2) *The monetary amount of the fund to be set at \$1500 per annum*
- 3) *The South Central Regional Group of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors hereby authorizes the Executive of the SCRG of the AOLS to withdraw the said \$1500 from its bank account and to liaise with the Education Committee to find the appropriate institution (for the funds) "*

This motion was unanimously passed and indeed is a very timely tribute for Jack and one that he would be very proud of, for education and his students were a very important part of Jack's career. Thanks to the surveyors from the SCRG for this grand gesture.

And, thank you Sandy for allowing me this honour this afternoon.

Drew Annable, OLS# 1434

Fernando De Luca, OLS# 1838
August 10, 1970 – December 21, 2017



Fernando was the middle of three children born to Ida and Guiseppe De Luca and was raised in Weston, Ontario. At a young age, Fernando was a multitalented athlete. His love of sports was very evident. He received many awards in high school including “Athlete of the Year” for his involvement in track and field and a number of other sports. Throughout his teenage years, he was an avid cyclist, participating in many Toronto based races. He, his brother and his close-knit group of friends spent many summers cycling through the rural areas north of Toronto. His love of soccer was also very evident. He played organized soccer for many years. He took his love of the game to an even higher level when he played soccer professionally for the Junior team of the Toronto Blizzard of the NASL. Fernando also played hockey through his teen years and participated in the sport through adulthood.

When he graduated from high school Fernando decided, due to his love of the outdoors and the combination of science, law, and problem-solving involved, that the surveying profession could afford him the opportunities and challenges he needed, and he enrolled in Ryerson University’s Survey Engineering program in 1990.

Upon Fernando’s graduation from Ryerson he joined Marshall Macklin Monaghan Ontario Limited in 1994 based out of their Thornhill office, and once he completed the Survey Law requirements at the University of Toronto in 1996 commenced his articles at the MMM Halton-Peel office. Fernando was sworn in as OLS No. 1838 on January 26, 2000.

Never one to turn down a challenge Fernando played a significant role in major MMM projects in Ontario, Western Canada, and Nunavut, including territorial boundaries, wind farms and energy corridors. Fernando’s skill, dedication and ability to lead allowed him many opportunities at MMM. Moving back to the Thornhill office in 2006 he became Assistant Manager there in 2007 before taking on the role of Department Manager of the Halton-Peel office in 2010.

In 2014 he was appointed Vice-President, Geomatics for MMM Group as well as Partner in the firm and upon the acquisition of MMM by WSP Canada became Vice-President, Eastern Canada, Geomatics. Fernando joined Tulloch Engineering as General Manager, Geomatics, in July of 2017.

In 2005, Fernando married his soulmate Rosie, together they have two sons: Joey (born in 2007) and Michael (born in 2009) and the three were the lights of his life. Fernando had a great love for, and dedication to, his immediate and extended family, and had fierce loyalty to his friends and those he loved.

Fernando was an active participant in his community and combining his love of hockey and children, was a long time volunteer with the Schomberg Red Wings and King Rebellion hockey organizations. In recognition of his dedication and effort the King Township Minor Hockey Association have created an annual Coach of the Year Award presented to the organization's top coach in Fernando's name.

Living life to the fullest Fernando was active within his firm, profession and community until taking ill in the fall of 2017. After a valiant battle he succumbed to idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis on December 21, 2017 at the age of 47. Fernando touched every life that crossed his. During his short time with us he left a significant legacy and while we cherish what he left behind we lament what could have been... gone far too soon.

Submitted by Rosie De Luca and Michael Macek, OLS# 1605

Robert Douglas Tomlinson, OLS# 1110
August 18, 1935 – January 27, 2018



Robert Douglas Tomlinson, OLS#1110, aged 82, passed away peacefully on January 7, 2018, while watching his favorite sport, hockey at his residence in North Bay. Bob was born in Markham Township August 18, 1935. He married Shirley Anne Jones on June 15, 1957 and they had many happy years together. Bob articulated to William Douglas Ratz #726 (Ministry of Transportation), and John Celeste Moore #882 (J.C. Moore Inc.). As a young Ontario Land Surveyor, he worked for Toronto Transit Commission on the Bloor Street subway, for the City of Toronto, and for Yates

and Yates Limited before opening his own practice, R.D. Tomlinson Ltd. in 1968.

In the mid-seventies, Bob partnered with Lloyd & Purcell Ltd. for a brief period under the firm name Lloyd Purcell Tomlinson Ltd. There was also an attempt to create a heavy weight consortium with Edward Carter #1157, David Horwood #1128, Bob Garden #917, Charles Lloyd #679, and James Purcell #969. Eventually, the group dissolved, and Bob continued his private practice in King.

Over the years he articulated many notable future O.L.S.'s including Alfonso Roccaforte #1587, Tom Kristjanson #1722, Bahram Amirnezhad #1976, John Tallieu #1602, Elizabeth Campbell #1652 and Fuzail Siddiqi #1524, whom he also had a brief partnership, before Fuzail's unexpected passing.

Jim Purcell has often said "there is not a more conscientious minded and genuine surveyor than Bob Tomlinson". Bob had an enormous passion for his craft. He was a "surveyor's surveyor". He thrived on crashing through forests, surveying in remote Canada, bush camps, mining claims, latest technology (Bob had AutoCad in 1987) and historical research. For him, this was real surveying and he felt every student should experience this as a vital ingredient to becoming an Ontario Land Surveyor. Bob never stagnated, all of his articulated students / O.L.S.'s over the years kept him current with legislation and the AOLS profession in general.

Bob was a character with no shortage of crazy antics. Not surprising for any surveyor. Everyone who knew Bob has a story. Hiding in closets, shuffling papers, lunchtime wind surfing, driving in hockey skates, and numerous fashion statements, including his patented mesh shirts. He used to check plans on an old metal door laid flat on 2 oil barrels behind the office so he could work on his tan. He hated being inside the office.

Bob is survived by his wife Shirley, his two brothers Peter and Paul, his sisters Stella Harrison, and Janet Watson, his three children Rosemary, Bruce (Karen), and Helen and his many grandchildren, great grandchildren, nieces and nephews. One of the decent ones, he will be sadly missed.

Submitted by T. Murray Purcell, OLS# 1683

2018 ANNUAL REPORT**– Active Membership –****(as of March 1, 2018)**Branches: Cadastral, Geodetic, Geographic Information,
Hydrographic, Photogrammetry

1926	Abdelshahid, Aziz Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Jan-18	1434	Annable, Drew J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1977-Jun-24
1802	Adams, Kim C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Feb-19	1543	Ansell, Eric L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Dec-06
1961	Afzalzada, Haron Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Jul-22	1869	Aregers, Craig G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2002-Jul-19
1995	Ahluwalia, Sabir Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Jan-27	1509	Ashworth, Duncan Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1980-Dec-05
2019	Akhlaghi, Armin Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2018-Jan-26	2009	Assaie-Ardakany, Farrokh Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Feb-22
1831	Aksan, Anna M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1999-Jul-21	1650	Astri, Dino R.S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Dec-19
1591	Aldworth, Geoffrey G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1986-Jun-18	1860	Aubrey, Peter N. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2001-Sep-12
1753	Alton, J. Mark Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Jan-11	1501	Auer, Gerhard Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1980-Jul-09
1976	Amirnezhad, Bahram Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jan-14	1525	Avis, Roger Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS, M.I.A.S., F.R.I.C.S. 1982-Jan-25

1592	Balaban, Steven J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1986-Jun-18	1754	Bhatti, Wikar A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Jan-11
1763	Barrette, André P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Aug-02	2020	Bheri, Aisar Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2018-Jan-26
1941	Batchvarova, Tania Nenova Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Feb-24	1885	Bianchi, David Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2004-Sep-08
1913	Baya, Martin Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Sep-03	1606	Biason, Lawrence J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1986-Jun-18
1888	Bedard, Mark Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 2005-Jan-21	1593	Bishop, Gregory C.P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1986-Jun-18
1771	Beerkens, John M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Jan-21	1702	Black, David A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Aug-14
1800	Benedict, Paul J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Dec-11	1104	Blackburn, P. Ardon Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1962-May-14
1614	Bennett, R. Grant Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Jun-17	1738	Bode, Ralph T. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1993-Jan-16
1836	Beresniewicz, Chris Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jan-26	1580	Boehme, Kerry Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Dec-18
1737	Berg, Ronald E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1993-Jan-21	1967	Bogdanov, Yuriy Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Jan-22

1651	Bogue, Colin B. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1988-Dec-19	1971	Broxham, Andrew James Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Feb-27
1689	Bortolussi, Adrian Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Jan-29	994	Brubacher, Wayne D. Branch: C/I/ OLS, OLIP 1959-Jan-14
1861	Bounsall, Andrew T. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2001-Sep-12	CR141	Brubacher, David M. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2002-Feb-21
1565	Bowers, Francis N. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1984-Dec-20	1295	Buck, William D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng., CLS 1971-Dec-17
CR67	Bowlby, Ewart D. Branch: G// OLS, OLIP 1991-Jan-29	CR157	Buckle, Alan D. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2002-Jun-27
1530	Bowyer, Edward W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Jun-04	1768	Buisman, Jeffrey E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Jan-11
1402	Boyd, John G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1975-May-16	1947	Bunker, Chris Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Oct-06
1760	Bracken, George N. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Jan-14	1701	Burchat, Martha L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Aug-14
1917	Bridges, Ron Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2009-Jan-15	CR142	Cadeau, Francis M. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2002-Feb-21
1620	Brown, Donald H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Dec-14	1982	Calonia, Gualberto C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jul-10

1314	Cameron, Andrew Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1972-Nov-06	912	Clarke, Alvin J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1956-Aug-15
1810	Campbell, Kenton H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Aug-13	1201	Clarke, Ross A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, PLE, P.Mgr. 1966-Oct-04
1747	Campbell, Brian R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1993-Aug-11	1567	Clarke, Barry J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1984-Dec-20
1654	Chambers, Donald G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1989-Jun-19	1254	Clipsham, Robert E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1970-May-12
CR159	Chapman, Michael A. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng., Ph.D. 2002-Jun-27	1781	Coad, Brian A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Jul-20
1811	Chapple, Brooke D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Aug-13	1542	Cole, J. Anne Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1982-Dec-06
1962	Cherian, Boney Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Jul-22	1641	Collett, Brent W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07
1886	Chitty, Phil W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2004-Sep-08	1803	Comery, David A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Feb-19
1338	Clancy, Ronald W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1973-Aug-17	1511	Consoli, Guido V. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1980-Dec-05
1690	Clark, W. Bruce Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, ALS 1991-Jan-29	1788	Coons, Scott E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Jan-23

1837	Coutts, Hugh S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jan-26	1739	de Haan, Peter Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1993-Jan-16
1805	Cranch, Crystal R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-May-13	1983	de Jager, Matthew Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jul-10
1977	Crocker, J. Paul Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jan-15	1458	de Rijcke, Izaak Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, LL.B. 1978-Jul-19
1527	Culbert, Douglas A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Jan-25	1789	De Rosa, Pier L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Feb-22
1928	Cummings, Dwayne Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Jan-18	1655	Del Bosco, Terry W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1989-Jun-19
1892	Currie, Lise Roxanne Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2006-Aug-14	1876	Della Mora, Rick Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2003-Aug-13
CR132	Czajka, Stephen D. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2001-Sep-12	1630	Delorme, Line G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07
1714	D'Amico, John M.J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Jan-29	1878	DenBroeder, Ross B. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2003-Sep-10
CR196	Davis, Kelly P. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2003-Feb-20	1692	Denis, Ronald A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1991-Jan-29
1748	Day, Nigel A.P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1993-Aug-26	1863	Di Cosmo, Matthew Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2002-Feb-21

1568	Dietz, Terry P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1984-Dec-20	1538	Edward, Paul C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Dec-06
1521	Dolliver, Dan Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1981-Dec-02	1990	El-Chanti, Oussama Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Jan-18
1921	Domagalski, Adam Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2009-Jul-22	CR113	Emode, Richard E.O. Branch: G// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng., FEC 1993-Feb-11
1661	Dore, Ronald Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1989-Nov-06	1554	England, Brent J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1983-Dec-21
2006	Dorland, James D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jan-31	1764	Eplett, Dale F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1994-Aug-17
1400	Dorland, David S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1975-May-09	1782	Ertl, Lawrence O. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Jul-31
1854	Dosen, Vladimir Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2001-Jan-31	1812	Even, James Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Aug-13
1491	Dutrisac, Denis Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1979-Aug-15	1975	Fathi, Seyed Abdolmajid Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Jul-24
1716	Dzaldov, Ophir N. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Jan-29	1937	Fee, Jeff John Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Jan-12
1852	Dzaldov, Dan Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2001-Jan-16	1932	Feren, Peter Raymond Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Sep-08

1615	Ferguson, Kerry D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Jun-17	1882	Fournier, Marc G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2004-Jan-09
CR64	Ferguson, James E. Branch: G// OLS, OLIP 1990-Nov-06	1988	Fox, Christopher Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Aug-19
1616	Ferizovic, Ken Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Jun-17	CR21	Francis, Paul M. Branch: P//I OLS, OLIP 1990-Jan-23
1957	Fiddes, Zachary Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Jan-14	1676	Fulton, Robert J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jul-10
1575	Finnie, Roderick Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Jun-10	1138	Gacser, Ernest Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1963-May-28
1934	Fisher, Michael John Branch: C// OLS, P.Eng. 2010-Sep-08	1644	Galati, Pasquale Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07
1828	Fleguel, Robin L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1999-Feb-03	1636	Galejs, John Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07
1992	Fletcher, Guy Alexander Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Jan-20	1727	Garden, Edward R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Aug-04
1555	Fligg, Robert A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1983-Dec-21	CR95	Gariepy, David H. Branch: P// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1991-Nov-19
1974	Ford, Greg Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Jul-24	2003	Gauthier, John Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jan-30

1762	Gauthier, Richard R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Jun-15	CR96	Goadsby, J. Morgan Branch: G// OLS, OLIP 1991-Nov-19
1808	Gelbloom, Jaime Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1997-Jun-17	1813	Goebelle, Hugh B. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1997-Aug-13
1718	Geyer, Rodney H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Jan-29	1814	Goldman, Barry D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Aug-13
1984	Ghofrani, Mansour Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jul-20	1998	Golinski, Waldemar Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Dec-02
1952	Gholami, Ali Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2012-Jul-19	1185	Goltz, John F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1965-Dec-13
1819	Gibson, Laura E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1998-Jan-27	1942	Gondo, Thomas Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Feb-24
1625	Gifford, Steven J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Dec-14	1663	Goodridge, Paul G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jan-23
1791	Gilmore, Mark V. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Feb-22	1839	Gorman, Michael J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jan-26
2018	Girin, Ignat Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2018-Jan-24	1430	Gossling, Steven J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1977-Feb-02
2011	Girin, Mark Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-May-31	1288	Graham, Derek G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1971-Nov-22

1759	Grander, Ralph F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Jan-13	2002	Hanna, Maryna Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jan-30
1945	Green, David Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Apr-07	1713	Haramis, Patrick J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Aug-22
CR120	Greenfield, Kirsten M. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP, CLS 2000-Jul-19	1693	Harper, William A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1991-Jan-29
1868	Griffiths, Michael A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2002-Jul-18	1532	Harris, Robert K. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1982-Jun-04
1999	Grose, Roger Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jan-25	1786	Harris-Herr, Nancy L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Oct-14
1824	Grozelle, Nancy J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1998-Aug-12	1528	Hartley, Timothy D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Jan-25
1465	Gutri, John H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1978-Oct-30	1847	Hartwick, Travis G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jul-19
2001	Haines, Michael Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jan-26	1705	Hartwick, Gregory J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1991-Aug-14
1556	Halliday, Robert D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1984-Jul-04	1406	Hawkins, Robert C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1975-Jun-17
CR134	Ham, Jeffrey J. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP, CET 2001-Sep-12	1761	Hawley, David J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Apr-13

1880	Hazen, Jason P.E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2004-Jan-08	1631	Himma, Mart H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07
CR135	Henrickson, David R. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2001-Sep-12	1919	Hodgson, Shawn Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2009-Jan-15
1930	Herman, Zoltan Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Jan-18	1533	Hofmann, Phillip Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Jun-04
1576	Herweyer, Edward H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Jun-10	1617	Hogan, Russell J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Jun-17
1899	Hewlett, James A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2007-Jan-15	1750	Homer, Peter J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1993-Sep-24
1621	Heywood, Allan J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Dec-14	1815	Hook, Stephen D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Aug-13
1720	Hickson, Gerald G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Jan-29	1773	Hoppe, Thomas Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Jan-25
1596	Higginson, Leslie M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1986-Jun-18	CR144	Horwood, David M. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2002-Feb-21
1494	Hiley, John W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1979-Dec-07	741	Houghton, Donald I. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1950-Aug-29
1634	Hillis, Kerry F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07	741	Houghton, Ward I. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1950-Aug-29

1958	Hu, Yahui Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Jan-14	1629	Jacobs, Bryan Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07
1534	Hunt, Douglas E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Jun-04	1425	Jason, Ronald M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP CLS, P.Eng. 1976-Jul-15
1582	Husted, Kimberly S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Dec-18	1927	Jeffray, Angela Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Feb-18
1827	Hyde, Harold D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1999-Feb-03	1550	Jemmett, Douglas W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1983-Jul-12
1832	Iavicoli, Bruno Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1999-Jul-21	1648	Jemmett, Shawn A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Dec-19
1797	Ims, Theodor H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Aug-13	1574	Jenkins, Kevin G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Feb-19
1573	Irwin, Gary A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Feb-19	1864	Jeraj, Alnashir Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2002-Feb-21
1728	Irwin, Bruce C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Aug-04	1889	Johnson, James W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2005-Jan-26
1897	Isip, Reynaldo Lagman Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2007-Jan-11	1688	Johnston, Kerry S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Jan-15
1086	Jackson, John E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1961-Sep-20	1950	Jones, Tom Dixon Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2012-Mar-26

1626	Jordan, Robert J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Dec-14	1883	Keatley, Gordon R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2004-Jan-13
1619	Jordens, Douglas F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP S.L.S. 1987-Jul-11	1442	Kennedy, John H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP C.L.S. 1977-Sep-27
1955	Kaczmarek, Rafal P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Jan-10	1352	Kerr, Brian W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1973-Nov-22
1922	Kalantzakos, Harry Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2009-Jul-22	1577	Ketchum, Kenneth J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Jun-10
2017	Kanaganayagam, Athiththan Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Sep-08	1609	Kidd, Paul Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1986-Dec-15
1449	Karpiel, Ronald S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, ALS 1978-Jun-05	1972	King, Adam Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, BCLS 2014-Feb-27
1557	Kasprzak, Adam Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1984-Jul-04	1429	Kirkland, James E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP P.Eng. 1977-Feb-02
1985	Kasprzak, Simon A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jul-20	1639	Kirkup, Roy S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07
2014	Kayuk, Andrew Wade Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jul-24	1607	Kliaman, Cindy S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP C.L.S. 1986-Jun-18
1678	Keat, John C.G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jul-10	1649	Knisley, Martin W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Dec-19

1851	Kovacs, David A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jul-22	1986	Kumar, Vaitheki Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jul-20
1775	Krcmar, Saša Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Jan-25	1956	Ladines, Jayson F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Jan-10
1774	Krcmar, Maja Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Jan-25	1898	Laframboise, Gabriel Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2007-Jan-11
1900	Krcmar, Tomislav Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2007-Jan-23	1951	Lale, Goran Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2012-Jun-06
1370	Krcmar, Vladimir Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1974-Jan-22	1729	Lamb, Peter B. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Aug-04
1622	Kreze, Daniel Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Dec-14	1829	Lamont, David A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1999-Feb-03
1722	Kristjanson, Tom Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Jan-29	1918	LaPointe, Stéphane Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2009-Jan-15
1865	Kubicki, Borys D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2002-Feb-21	1798	Larocque, Brent R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Aug-13
1564	Kuelling, Laurence J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1984-Sep-04	1953	Lau, Jansky Tak Choi Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2012-Jul-19
1848	Kujala, Kevin P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jul-19	1914	Lau, Francis Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Aug-28

1906	Lawrence, Gavin Eldred Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Jan-23	1830	Lin, Joseph Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1999-Feb-03
1792	Laws, James M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Feb-22	1825	Linhares, Eduardo J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1998-Aug-12
1809	Legat, Jaro A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Jun-17	1963	Lise, Arthur J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Jul-22
1367	LeGris, Murray J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1974-Jan-04	1664	Lo, George C.M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jan-23
1755	LeGrow, Neil A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Jan-11	1991	Loai, Amar Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Jan-18
1997	Leiper, Rob Colin Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Jul-26	1679	Lord, Rodney D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jul-10
1896	Lemmetty, Anita I. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2006-Nov-10	1642	Lynch, Brian J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07
1694	Leslie, Craig Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1991-Jan-29	1849	MacDonald, Christopher A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jul-19
1940	Leslie, Jamie William Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Jan-26	2007	MacDonald, Gregory Michael Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Feb-07
1989	Levac, Patrick Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Jan-18	1822	MacDonald, Thomas G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1998-Jul-22

1656	MacGregor, Susan F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1989-Jun-19	1744	Mantha, Andrew S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1993-Jan-19
1246	MacMillan, Don J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1969-Nov-17	1924	Mares, Viorel Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2009-Aug-11
1816	Magee, Bret G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Aug-13	1540	Marlatt, Michael E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP C.L.S. 1982-Dec-06
CR99	Mailhot-Aron, Ann-Marie Branch: G// OLS, OLIP 1991-Nov-19	1337	Marr, Douglas G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1973-Aug-14
1785	Mak, Ronald M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Aug-15	1745	Martin, Robert C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1993-Jan-13
1546	Mak, Rudy Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Dec-06	CR149	Martin, Blain W. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP C.L.S., PMP 1978-Jul-05
2015	Malek, Maaz Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Aug-01	1907	Marton, Alexandru Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Jan-23
1549	Maloney, Brian J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1983-Jul-12	1339	Mascoe, William A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1973-Sep-20
1535	Mansfield, Peter J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1982-Jun-04	1740	Matthews, Michael F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP C.L.S. 1993-Jan-12
2000	Mantha, Alec Sloan Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jan-30	1881	Matthews, Jeremy C.E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2004-Jan-09

1884	Maughan, David U. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2004-Jan-20	1708	McKibbon, Robert W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Aug-14
2012	Maulion, Keene Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-May-31	1709	McLaren, Daniel S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP P.Eng. 1991-Aug-14
1548	Mauro, Frank Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1983-Jul-12	1741	McLeod, Daniel J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1993-Jan-21
1756	Mayo, Roy C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Jan-11	1874	McMorran, Douglas Scott Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2003-Feb-20
1966	Mc Rae, Reuben Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Jan-22	1558	McNabb, Marvin D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1984-Jul-04
1724	McConnell, Robert Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Jan-29	1840	McNeil, Trevor D.A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jan-26
1730	McDermott, Robert M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Aug-04	1780	Meldrum Smith, Julia M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1995-Jul-19
1751	McGuire, Gordon D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1993-Sep-23	1903	Merriles, John Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2007-Sep-07
1583	McKay, Scott A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP C.L.S. 1985-Dec-18	1559	Merry, William I. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1984-Jul-04
1949	McKechnie, Michael Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2012-Feb-23	1585	Miller, Richard D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Dec-18

1512	Miller, Paul A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1980-Dec-05	1467	Mountjoy, Maureen V. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1978-Dec-14
1855	Milne, Neil C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2001-Jan-31	1746	Mountjoy, Robert G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1993-Jan-12
1806	Miret, Dario A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-May-13	1779	Muir, John W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1995-Jul-24
1923	Mirzakhanlou, Manouchehr Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2009-Jul-22	CR136	Murdoch, Robert M. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2001-Sep-12
1946	Mitrev, Simeon E Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Jul-29	1341	Murray, Richard W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1973-Nov-08
1980	Mo, Jason Chun-Ho Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jan-29	1912	Musclow, Chris Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Jul-25
1681	Molloy, Perry A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jul-10	1658	Mwinyi, Omari B.S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1989-Jun-19
1053	Monteith, John D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1960-May-13	2021	Najjarbashi, Navid Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2018-Jan-26
1623	Moore, William J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1987-Dec-14	1870	Nanfara, Joseph Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2002-Oct-03
1317	Moreton, Peter G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1972-Dec-19	1871	Ng, Foo Yip Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2003-Jan-08

1959	Nicol, James Andrew Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Jan-14	1936	Oyler, Christopher John Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Sep-08
1833	Niculae, Roxana Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1999-Jul-21	1572	Packowski, Thomas J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1984-Dec-20
CR199	Nielsen, Peter M. Branch: G// OLS, OLIP 2004-Jan-08	1834	Page, Dasha Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1999-Jul-21
1682	Nisbet, T. Martin Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1990-Jul-10	1909	Papa, Valerio G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Jan-23
1908	Nisioiu, Tudor Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Jan-23	1721	Parker, Bruce A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Jan-29
2016	Noman, Juzer Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Aug-15	1410	Patten, Lynn H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1975-Jul-11
1873	Nouwens, Marcus J.T. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 2003-Jan-14	1778	Payette, Marc P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Apr-21
1867	O'Connor, Shawn M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2002-Jul-16	2022	Pearlman, Robert Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2018-Jan-26
1893	Osinski, Marek Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2006-Aug-14	1670	Pearson, Robert G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jan-23
CR200	Osuchowska, Zofia Branch: P// OLS, OLIP 2004-Sep-08	1680	Pearson, Michéle M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jul-10

1994	Perera, Wickramage Sunil Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Jan-27	CR173	Power, K. Michael Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2002-Jun-27
1776	Pesce, David Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Jan-25	1993	Pu, Tony Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Jan-20
1536	Petrich, Fred Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Jun-04	1683	Purcell, T. Murray Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jul-10
1970	Petrovic, Djordje Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Jan-22	1965	Querubin, Ron Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Jan-22
1586	Phillips, Gary W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Dec-18	1637	Quesnel, Paul M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07
1217	Piller, Helmut Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1968-May-22	1579	Quinlan, Danny P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Jun-10
CR171	Piraino, John P. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP P.Eng. 2002-Jun-27	2023	Rahman, Shafic Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2018-Jan-26
CR130	Poot, Robin W.L. Branch: G// OLS, OLIP 2001-Aug-10	1841	Raikes, Peter T. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 2000-Jan-26
1973	Popa, Dacian Nicolae Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Jun-12	1684	Raithby, David J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jul-10
1891	Popa, Dorin Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2006-Jan-13	2004	Rajakulendran, Shajieeshane Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jan-31

1968	Ramachandran, Piratheepan Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Jan-22	1472	Robinson, Ian D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1979-Feb-07
1561	Ramsamooj, Sase N. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1984-Jul-04	1725	Robinson, Gregory G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Jan-29
1943	Rathnayake, Vineetha S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Feb-24	1931	Robinson, Daniel Bernard Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Aug-18
1731	Ray, Gordon A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Aug-04	1804	Rody, Eric Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-Feb-19
1872	Reed, Thomas R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2003-Jan-09	1856	Rouse, Tracy R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2001-Jan-31
1766	Reid, Rodger J. Branch: C/G/ OLS, OLIP CLS, P.Eng. 1994-Dec-01	1910	Roy, André Roger Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Jan-23
1495	Reitsma, Douglas P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1979-Dec-07	1733	Rudnicki, Les S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Aug-04
1386	Reynolds, Rodney G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1974-Jul-25	1541	Rueb, Erich Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1982-Dec-06
1915	Rizk, Ashraf Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Sep-03	1875	Salb, Thomas J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2003-Jul-15
1176	Roberts, Donald E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1965-May-17	2010	Salehi, Farzad Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-May-29

1523	Salna, Robert Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1981-Dec-02	1611	Senkus, Tom A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1986-Dec-15
1894	Salzer, Eric G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2006-Aug-14	1857	Shanmugarajah, Tharmarajah Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2001-Jan-31
1544	Sam-Guindon, Kathryn Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1982-Dec-06	1686	Shantz, Murray R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jul-10
CR12	Sani, Anthony P. Branch: P// OLS, OLIP, M.R.I.C.S. 1989-Nov-06	1633	Sheehy, Paul J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1988-Jun-07
1842	Sankey, Alister D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jan-26	1719	Shelp, Andrew V. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Jan-29
1895	Scott, John S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2006-Aug-14	1697	Shipman, Jeffrey P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Jan-29
2008	Seaman, Gavin P.T. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Feb-08	1904	Sibthorp, Raymond James Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2007-Sep-14
2024	Sedaghat, Saeid Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2018-Jan-26	CR124	Silburn, James L. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jul-19
1978	Segaran, Nath Prashannath Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jan-16	1698	Simone, Roy A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, MIS 1991-Jan-29
1920	Seguin, Ryan William Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2009-Feb-19	1518	Simpson, Walter J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1981-May-08

1794	Simpson, Michael J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Feb-22	1570	Stanton, Chester J. Branch: C// MBA, CLS, OLS, OLIP 1984-Dec-20
1687	Singh, Tirbhowan Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1990-Jul-10	1850	Starcevic, Dario Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jul-19
1673	Sinnis, Spiro Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1990-Jan-23	1672	Stauskas, Tony Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jan-23
1699	Skuro, Peter M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Jan-29	1457	Stewart, Ronald J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1978-Jul-05
1600	Smith, Anthony G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1986-Jun-18	1588	Stidwill, Kirk L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1985-Dec-18
1960	Smith, Kevin R.D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Feb-28	1769	Stidwill, Grant T. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1995-Jan-20
1448	Smith, Andrew J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1978-Jun-05	1843	Stojanovic, Svetomir Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jan-26
CR125	Smith, Ian D. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jul-19	1783	Stringer, David B. Branch: C/G/I OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1990-Jul-10
1799	Sperling, Ernest G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Aug-13	1589	Suda, Philip Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1985-Dec-18
CR176	Springate, Mark C. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2002-Jun-27	1969	Sundar, Ganesh Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2014-Jan-22

1659	Suppa, Pasquale Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1989-Jun-19	CR148	Tierney, Kevin M. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2002-Feb-21
1858	Sutherland, Bloss J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2001-Jan-31	1911	Tomaszewski, Henry Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Jan-23
1435	Sutherland, Norman Elliot Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS, P.Eng. 1977-Jun-24	1340	Torrance, Paul H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1973-Nov-01
1879	Swift, Phillip S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, BCLS 2003-Oct-01	1938	Truchon, Mel Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Jan-17
1862	Talbot, Jeffrey P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2001-Sep-12	1905	Tulloch, Mark Kenneth Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Jan-15
1734	Taurins, Normans V. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Aug-04	1954	Tulloch, David Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2012-Aug-13
1563	Thaler, Robert C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1984-Jul-04	1348	Turpel, Wayne D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1973-Nov-20
1795	Thom, Kevin S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1996-Feb-22	1476	Urso, David S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1979-Feb-20
1844	Thomsen, Paul R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jan-26	1935	van der Veen, Blake Campbell Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Sep-08
1635	Tieman, Andrea E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07	1515	Van Lankveld, Ted Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1980-Dec-05

1777	Vanderveen, Gary B. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1995-Jan-25	1056	Wallace, Ivan B. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1960-May-20
1757	Verdun, Michael D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Jan-11	1944	Wannack, Robert John Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2011-Feb-24
1396	Visser, Raymond J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1975-Jan-10	1660	Warren, Brad K. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1989-Jun-19
1417	Vollebekk, Dan R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1975-Oct-27	1735	Watson, Keith Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1992-Aug-04
1765	Vollick, Stephen M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, ALS 1994-Aug-17	CR152	Watt, David R. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP 2002-Jun-14
1929	Wahba, Christopher Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Jan-18	1770	Webster, Brian J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, CLS 1995-Jan-20
2005	Wahba, Kevin Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jan-31	1319	Webster, William J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, FSPLS 1972-Dec-22
1845	Wahba, Youssef Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jan-26	1887	Werrell, Adam J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2004-Sep-08
1902	Walczak, Jacek Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2007-Aug-23	1696	Wiegenbröcker, Robert Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1991-Jan-29
1846	Walker, Darren R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2000-Jan-26	1877	Wilband, Jason P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 2003-Sep-10

1996	Wilcox, Luke G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2016-Jul-26	1916	Yalda, Bahram Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2008-Sep-03
1758	Wilkinson, Kenneth D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1994-Jan-11	1807	Yeo, Michael W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1997-May-13
1675	Williams, Edward J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1990-Jan-23	1821	Young, Joseph R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1998-Jan-27
1427	Wilson, Paul Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, P.Eng. 1976-Nov-11	1493	Young, John F.G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1979-Oct-16
1612	Wilton, David Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1986-Dec-15	1964	Yuen, John Ho-Ting Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2013-Jul-22
2025	Wood, Robert Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2018-Jan-26	1933	Zaharieva, Yordanka Nikolova Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2010-Sep-08
1645	Woolley, Patrick J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1988-Jun-07	1979	Zapata, Juan Diego Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2015-Jan-19
1613	Worobec, Alan J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1986-Dec-15	1925	Zeng, Zhiqiang Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2009-Aug-11
1820	Wylie, David J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1998-Jan-27	1835	Zervos, George J.F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 1999-Jul-21
1866	Yadollahi, Seyed M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2002-Jul-16	2013	Ziemlewska, Justyna Marzena Branch: C// OLS, OLIP 2017-Jul-24

2017 ANNUAL REPORT

– Retired Membership –

(as of March 1, 2017)

Branches: Cadastral, Geodetic, Geographic Information,
Hydrographic, Photogrammetry

1772	Agnihotri, Anil Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1995-Jan-25	934	Bishop, Curry H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS, P.Eng. 1957-Apr-30
CR203	Amin, Khairul Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2011-Feb-24	1594	Blais, Denis D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1986-Jun-18
1498	Aron, Douglas R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1979-Dec-07	1274	Brooke, Michael E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1971-Jun-07
CR206	Baila, Mircea Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2013-Feb-28	1553	Brouwers, Bruce Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1983-Dec-21
CR17	Bair, Ali J.M. Branch: G// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1990-Jan-23	1230	Bruce, Douglas R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1969-Feb-10
CR83	Beck, Norman Branch: G// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1991-Nov-19	1323	Bunker, Thomas A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS, P.Eng., CA 1973-Jan-29
873	Beninger, William A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1954-Oct-15	1034	Burton, Ross I. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1959-Nov-25
1292	Bennett, William E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1971-Dec-17	1017	Callon, Terrance O. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1959-Jul-06
1502	Bezair, Bernard J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1980-Jul-09	1566	Card, Steven J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) CLS, ALS, BCLS 1984-Dec-20

1531	Chau, Marvin M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), MHKIS, Accredited Mediator 1982-Jun-04	791	Crewe, Richard H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1952-May-05
1466	Church, Paul L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1978-Dec-11	1704	Cronier, Eric M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), LLS 1991-Aug-14
1466	Church, Paul L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1978-Dec-11	1253	Cullen, Donald J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1970-May-12
1443	Clarke, Carlton H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1978-Jan-18	1537	Czerwinski, Tom Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1982-Dec-06
902	Coe, William R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1955-Nov-28	1304	Daniels, William J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1972-Jun-20
1801	Cormier, Dan J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1997-Jan-18	1125	Donaldson, Bruce A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1962-Nov-17
CR19	Costello, Barry W. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1990-Jan-23	1222	Dotterill, Christopher E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1968-Jul-11
1413	Cotterill, J. Stanley Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1975-Oct-08	1309	Douglas, Robert G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1972-Jul-11
1608	Coulas, Timothy A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1986-Dec-15	1726	Dunlop, R. Dean Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1992-Aug-04
CR161	Crann, Wayne F.R. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2002-Jun-27	1115	Emo, Ronald J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1962-Jul-04

1408	Endleman, Thomas H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1975-Jul-11	1595	Gregoire, Paul J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1986-Jun-18
CR35	Erickson, Caroline A. Branch: G// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS, P.Eng. 1990-Feb-19	1516	Gunn, Robert C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1981-Feb-06
1424	Fencott, Robert J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1976-Jul-15	1118	Gurnett, Edward G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1962-Sep-17
1436	Force, Robert T. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1977-Jun-24	1447	Hackett, Richard Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1978-Feb-22
1311	Forth, Paul F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1972-Jul-24	941	Hadfield, Colin D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1957-Jun-19
1359	Fulford, Bruce F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1973-Dec-27	1503	Halsall, John R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1980-Jul-09
1332	Glassford, Thomas L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1973-Jul-24	1058	Hermanson, Glenn D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1960-Jun-21
1643	Godwin, Peter J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1988-Jun-07	818	Hiley, John R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP, (RET), P.Eng. 1953-May-01
1111	Good, Gordon S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1962-Jun-19	1078	Hill, James L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1961-May-10
1132	Graham, Howard M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1963-May-07	1128	Horwood, David O. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1963-Feb-25

1360	Hume, Darrell L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1973-Dec-31	1257	Larocque, Richard Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1970-Aug-25
CR187	Jaros, Ronald Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2002-Aug-29	1610	Lawlor, Michael J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), AMCT 1986-Dec-15
1646	Jiwani, Zul Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1988-Aug-10	1198	Legros, Leo A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1966-Aug-03
1262	Johnson, Ross M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1970-Nov-24	CR167	Li, Songnian Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET), Ph.D., P.Eng. 2002-Jun-27
1282	Jones, Russell W.R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1971-Sep-13	1597	Lymer, Daniel J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1986-Jun-18
CR128	Jones, Darrell W. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2000-Nov-17	1459	MacIntosh, James A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1978-Jul-19
1299	Kirstine, B. Gary Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1972-Feb-14	1489	MacLeod, Alistair M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1979-Aug-15
1488	Kowalenko, Walter Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1979-Aug-15	1668	Mann, Robert J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1990-Jan-23
1401	Krupicz, Joseph A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1975-May-09	CR70	Marlow, Robert M. Branch: P// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1991-Jan-29
1368	Kupferschmidt, Martin Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1974-Jan-10	920	Maughan, Michael J.M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1956-Aug-15

CR181	McCausland, Alvin D. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2002-Jul-17	1420	O'Donnell, J. Hugh Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), QLS 1975-Dec-10
1508	McKechnie, Stewart D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1980-Oct-09	1010	Ogilvie, Donald W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1959-May-06
1137	McKibbon, Ronald G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1963-May-07	CR143	Okoronkwo, I. Victor Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2002-Mar-06
1109	McMurchy, Bruce I. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1962-Jun-19	CR208	Oren, Nedim Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2016-Jan-20
1584	McPherson, Bruce G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1985-Dec-18	1169	O'Sullivan, Michael J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1964-Dec-14
1710	Minnie, Steven J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS, BCLS 1991-Aug-14	1182	Parr, Robert B. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1965-Nov-12
889	Moffatt, W. Harland Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1955-Jul-05	1290	Patterson, Douglas W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1971-Nov-29
CR45	Mrstik, Paul F. Branch: G// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1990-Feb-19	1695	Perkins, Kevin D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1991-Jan-29
CR170	Nadjiwon, Cathryn A. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2002-Jun-27	1638	Persaud, George M. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1988-Jun-07
1420	O'Donnell, J. Hugh Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), QLS 1975-Dec-10	1787	Pettit, Bruce D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1995-Oct-19

1539	Preiss, Richard A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1982-Dec-06	1001	Roberts, Anthony F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1959-Apr-22
1752	Preston, Gary L. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1993-Aug-18	1587	Roccaforte, Alfonso Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1985-Dec-18
1351	Preston, Ronald K. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1973-Nov-22	1096	Rody, Talson E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1961-Nov-22
1421	Pun, Yip K. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1975-Dec-30	1140	Roeser, Heinrich L.S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1963-Dec-04
1318	Rady-Pentek, Joseph Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1972-Dec-19	1260	Sauvé, Peter I.R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1970-Nov-17
1342	Redmond, Donald A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1973-Nov-16	CR122	Sauvé, Sheryn I. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2000-Jul-19
CR123	Reiach, Lindsay Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET), CET 2000-Jul-19	1890	Seleem, Nahed N. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2006-Jan-13
1474	Renaud, Marcel E. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1979-Feb-20	1188	Sexton, Christopher A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1965-Dec-13
CR131	Reshke, Regan G. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2001-Sep-06	898	Smith, Ralph A. Branch: I/C/P OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 2003-Sep-11
1236	Riddell, Paul A. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1969-Jun-16	1601	Snell, William D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1986-Jun-18

CR52	Srom, Jaromir Branch: G// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1990-Jul-10	1426	Tamblyn, Bryan W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1976-Jul-15
1365	Stassen, Bastian J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1974-Jan-03	CR185	Tarantino, Giovanni Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2002-Aug-19
1469	Statham, James S. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1979-Feb-07	1603	Thorpe, Peter Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1986-Jun-18
1164	Stewart, Robert Craig Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1964-Nov-17	1823	Ting, Eric Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1998-Aug-12
1513	Stirling, Robert D. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) CLS 1980-Dec-05	1279	Trivers, Colin G. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1971-Jul-30
1444	Stringer, Peter J. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS, BCLS 1978-Jan-18	1604	Tulloch, Michael F. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS, P.Eng. 1986-Jun-18
1428	Strongman, Charles T. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1976-Nov-11	1155	Van Harten, Menno P. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1964-May-08
1431	Stubberfield, William C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) P.Eng. 1977-Jun-08	1369	Wall, Francis Edward Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), CLS 1974-Jan-18
CR127	Sun, Patrick X. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2000-Nov-06	CR139	Wallace, Michael J. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 2001-Sep-12
1326	Taggart, Ross W. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1973-Feb-04	1504	Watson, Mark T. Branch: I// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1980-Jul-09

1035	Welsman, Roger R. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1959-Nov-25
856	Wood, Gordon H. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET), P.Eng. 1954-May-20
1344	Wyman, Paul C. Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1973-Nov-16
1736	Zizek, William Branch: C// OLS, OLIP (RET) 1992-Aug-04