



Minutes

**The first meeting of the Repeal of the Industrial Exception Task Force
Wednesday, January 19, 2011 at 5:00 p.m.
Room 70, PEO Offices, 40 Sheppard Ave. W., Toronto**

Present: Mr. Peter Broad, P.Eng. (Chair)
Mr. David Adams, P.Eng.
Ms. Stela Stevandic, P.Eng. (by teleconference)
Mr. James Lowe, P.Eng. (by teleconference)
Mr. Julien Samson, P.Eng. (by teleconference)
Mr. Michael Wesa, P.Eng. (by teleconference)
Mr. Eduard Guerra, P.Eng. (by teleconference)
Mr. Austin Walker, P.Eng. (by teleconference)
Mr. Ken Warden, P.Eng. (by teleconference)
Mr. Wayne Kershaw, P.Eng. (by teleconference)

Absent: Mr. Chris Maltby, P.Eng. (Vice-Chair)
Mr. Edward Poon, P.Eng.
Mr. Clarence Klassen, P.Eng. (with regrets)
Ms. Marisa Sterling, P.Eng. (Staff advisor) (with regrets)

Staff: Mr. Steven Haddock (Staff advisor, Secretary)
Ms. Maria Ianonne (Staff support)

1. Welcome and Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda of the meeting was approved on consent with no amendments

3. Approval of minutes of December 15, 2011

The draft minutes of the meeting of December 15, 2011 were approved on consent with no amendments

4. Task Force Membership

a. Introductions

The members and staff introduced themselves.

Mr. Wesa is a former councilor. He currently works for Hydro One and previously worked in the pulp and paper industry.

Mr. Guerra is a professor at Laurentian University whose primarily works in the field of metallurgy.

Mr. Walker has worked in industry since 1981 and has been a PEO member since 1984.

Mr. Kershaw works for Bosch Rexforth Canada Corp. and is from the Hamilton/Burlington Chapter.

Mr. Sampson has been involved with the Chatham-Kent chapter since 2005. He has spent most of his career in automotive manufacturing, but now works in small manufacturing.

Mr. Warden has worked in the chemical industry since 1977.

Mr. Lowe has been practicing in industry since 1974 and has formerly served as a councilor. He currently runs a consulting company providing design and project management services to industry

5. Review of steps taken to date

Mr. Haddock reviewed the steps taken to date.

Ms. Ianonne is compiling the information about the targeted associations regarding the most appropriate contact. We have identified about 200 associations to date.

We have set up a new e-mail address RIETF@peo.on.ca. However, it is not being monitored at present. There is also a bounce back address for rejected e-mail.

We have compiled a lengthy list of employers, excluding C of A holders that employ at least ten professional engineers. It was suggested that we target all employers of P.Eng.'s as smaller employers may be just as likely to have persons taking advantage of the exception. Mr. Haddock noted that many smaller employers are not involved in the practice of professional engineering.

A presentation has been set up for the Quinte Chapter, and we are in the process of setting up a presentation for the Peterborough Chapter.

6. Identification of targeted associations

Our current list of associations was provided from internal sources.

It was agreed that task force members would provide to staff the names of non-engineers who may want to work with the task force.

7. Review of initial message

No draft has been prepared, although the initial draft has been discussed at length. The problem with the original letter from Mr. Allen is that it is too broad to cover the message we have to get out. Mr. Haddock has provided a list of key messages, but it is both too long and too brusque. Ms. Sterling will attempt to find the right balance between length and diplomacy.

Mr. Haddock also expressed concern about the use of the term “industrial exception”. Although it is well understood among professional engineers, it will most likely hold no meaning to our target audience.

Mr. Haddock agrees that the exception has been interpreted too broadly by industry and that it will be an important part of the message to explain exactly sort of activities it covers.

Mr. Lowe suggested that the message should emphasize how engineers can help industry and their operating costs. This is an approach that has worked in Quebec. Mr. Broad also suggested we stress the positive impact on Occupational Health and Safety.

Staff hopes to have the initial message out by the end of January. The task force members should provide to Mr. Haddock what elements should be included or excluded from the initial message

8. Request for web site resources

Mr. Haddock asked the task force to recommend that the task force be assigned web site resources to provide a central repository of information regarding the exception, partly to take the pressure off staff to respond to individual inquiries and partly to have somewhere else to direct recipients of our message. It was also suggested that we ask for a link on the front page of the web site.

It was moved by J. Sampson, P.Eng., seconded by D. Adams, P.Eng.

That the task force request web site resources together with a link to the task force’s site on the PEO web site front page.

CARRIED

Mr. Haddock asked the task force to consider providing content for the task force’s web site, as well as providing additional contact information.

9. Discussion of communication timeline and likely date of Bill 68 Proclamation

The initial timeline was to work towards proclamation in six months, although that will most likely have to be extended slightly to June or July 2011. The government has rejected a plan to phase in the changes over a longer time frame.

After associations, chapters and employers, there is a plan to send an e-mail blast to the members. The members are not being targeted earlier because members will not be affected by the repeal. The members will be approached for assistance in getting the message out to persons who will be affected by the change.

The ultimate target of our message will be individuals whose ability to do work will be affected by the change – unlicensed persons who are currently taking advantage of the exception. At present, we cannot identify these individuals or even the companies they work for. Our initial messages are to seek assistance in pointing us towards these individuals and employers who rely on them.

Mr. Adams suggested that many of the people taking advantage of the exception are people with formal engineering education even at the university level who moved into industry but saw no need to get licensed. Mr. Haddock suggested that students and recent graduates are groups we do have contact with that should also be told about the change because it will affect their career in future. It was also suggested we contact the deans of engineering (CODE).

It was suggested we contact APEGGA to talk about their high intake rate for engineering students.

It was suggested we contact EITs as well as members with our e-mail blast.

Mr. Adams suggested we talk to the WSIB. Mr. Haddock has already suggested we contact the Ministry of Labor. He admitted there is information sharing issues with the MOL. Mr. Sampson also suggested we contact the IAPA.

It was also suggested we contact the federal immigration ministry and provincial agencies dealing with new immigrants. They can probably be approached quickly.

It was agreed that if the effect of repeal will have an impact on our ability to enforce the act against individuals who remain non-compliant that we have a mandate to inform PEO of that fact. However, any operational or policy issues regarding enforcement are outside the mandate of the committee. Mr. Haddock encouraged the task force members to brainstorm and advise him by e-mail of any adverse impact of repeal that should be dealt with as soon as possible.

Mr. Haddock also noted that the task force and PEO as a whole are largely unprepared to anticipate what questions will come from the general public. The task force, members and staff are very familiar with this issue, but only from one side.

Mr. Broad expressed the problem that much of the communication coming from PEO to its members is largely ignored. However, he pointed out that members generally do read their own chapter newsletter and it may be a good way of getting the message to the members. He also noted that the newsletter often winds up with people who aren't members of PEO as well. However, one of the problems is that the next regular issue may not come out until the fall. He suggested that a special issue could come out just after the PEO elections.

One of the members pointed out that any communication has to be made within the six month time frame. He suggested most Chapters are holding their AGM within the next couple of months. Mr. Haddock advised that some Chapters have already approached us for a presentation. It was agreed that we proactively contact all the Chapters to offer a presentation. This can be split between Ms. Sterling and the task force members. Mr. Haddock encouraged task force members to freely ask for resources to make a presentation. It was agreed that we should have a common PowerPoint presentation about 15-20 minutes long for use by everyone giving presentations. However, Mr. Haddock reminded everyone that the web site should be the main hub for information rather than the PowerPoint presentation. A presentation should probably be ready by early February as Ms. Sterling is planning to give a presentation in that time frame.

Mr. Broad also suggested that we prepare a presentation for the PEO AGM.

It was also suggested we have some written material ready for distribution. However, given our limited time frame, we cannot prepare anything too professional.

Mr. Adams wondered if we should have a backup plan to determine how well our message is getting out and how we should follow up. We have already thought of having respondents doing a survey in response to the message. The number of replies we receive will also be a good indication. Mr. Adams expressed the concern that the message will simply be ignored. Mr. Haddock noted that the responsibility of the task force ends at getting the message out and that dealing with non-compliance will be an enforcement issue, not a task force issue. Mr. Haddock noted that any attempt to follow up will be far more expensive and time consuming than the initial contact. However, we will have a better idea by our next meeting how many people have responded to our initial message. In addition, the important feedback we expect to receive is not about how many people responded to the message, it is whether the recipients realized the importance of the message and understood what it meant.

It was agreed that we should be ready to deal with accusations that the repeal is merely a ploy to increase membership and revenues. Mr. Haddock also agreed that we should have a contingency to deal with the possibility that the initial message is widely ignored. However, the consensus was that any contingency plan could wait until our February meeting. Mr. Broad stressed that in any event, our follow up to our initial message should, as far as is possible, target non-members.

The possibility of using public relations to spread the message was raised again. Mr. Haddock agreed to speak to Communications to determine what the appropriate budget would be to properly do a press release and related publicity. At present, the only expenses we are looking at are for a company to run the initial e-mail blast and monitor how many people actually read the message.

Mr. Haddock agreed that the task force should probably have preliminary discussions on enforcing the law once the change is promulgated, although this work would probably have to be taken up by the Enforcement Committee.

The task force agreed that providing a definite date for the promulgation in our communications was of vital importance. It was decided that at our next meeting we suggest a date for promulgation. It was understood that the promulgation would most likely have to take place before the next provincial election in the fall, and that the final decision will have to be left up to the government as there are several other acts that are also affected by the promulgation.

It was suggested as part of our effort, we encourage *Dimensions* to speak to employers who have shifted to a largely professional engineer workforce, such as 3M.

10. Discussion of PEO resources and budget requirements for task force

Mr. Haddock will look at the costs of someone to prepare press releases, and Ms. Sterling will be looking at the cost of e-mail service providers. We may also need help to do web design if it cannot be handled in-house.

There was a discussion as to whether the Power Point presentation would have to be approved by Communication. It was obvious that we would have to reimburse travel expenses for task force members to travel to presentations, but Mr. Haddock did not see those as an issue. Mr. Adams noted that we may have to budget for visits to large employers.

11. Review next steps

Mr. Haddock reviewed the steps to be completed by the next meeting:

- To look at smaller employers rather than just those with 10 or more P.Eng.'s.
- To contact Chapter Chairs and the Regional Congresses to arrange presentations at AGMs or other meetings and to include them in the initial message.
- To determine what it would cost to get Dun & Bradstreet to prepare a list of companies that should be targeted with our message.
- To identify persons outside of PEO who can help the Task Force spread its message and identify potential problems.
- To ask for our own web site and to prepare it in advance of the first e-mail to the associations.
- Prepare a standard Power Point presentation.
- To develop budget requirements.
- To identify issues or problems that may arise as our message goes out.

12. Quinte and Peterborough Chapter presentations

Mr. Klassen is prepared to do the presentation to the Peterborough Chapter AGM. Ms. Sterling will most likely accompany him, but has not been able to confirm to date. Ms. Sterling has committed to do the presentation in Quinte, and Mr. Warden has agreed to accompany her.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:57 p.m. The next meeting is Feb. 16 at 5 p.m.

Mr. Peter Broad, P.Eng., Chair

Mr. Steven Haddock, Secretary