1.0 Attendance and Call to Order

1.1 Members Present: Tim Oliver, Chairman; Gerard Rood, Secretary; Tony Peralta, Vice Chair; Bill Dietrich; John Kuntze; Jeff Dickson

1.2 Liaison Members Present: Davin Heinbuck, Conservation Authorities (Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority); Art Groenveld, M.T.O. (Ministry of Transportation Ontario); Kristian Kennedy, O.S.P.E. (Ontario Society of Professional Engineers) (phoned in);

1.3 Absent Members: Sid Vander Veen, O.M.A.F. (Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food); Pat Shaver, Open Learning & Educational Support (University of Guelph); Tom Hoggarth, D.F.O. (Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada); Jeremy Downe, M.N.R. (Ministry of Natural Resources Ontario)

1.4 Chairman Tim Oliver called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m.

2.0 Approval of Agenda

2.1 The committee reviewed the agenda prepared by Tim Oliver. Motion by Gerard Rood, seconded by Tony Peralta, that the agenda as prepared by the chairman be accepted. Carried

3.0 Minutes of Last Meeting

3.1 John Kuntze moved to accept the October 17, 2013 LDC meeting minutes and seconded by Bill Dietrich. Carried

3.2 Final documents are to be sent to Pat Shaver by Gerard Rood for posting to the LDC web site.

4.0 Business Arising From the Minutes

4.1 Bill Dietrich asked about the status of Items 4.1 and 4.3 regarding the Norfolk submission. John Kuntze advised that he had not yet completed this work. Action by John & L.D.C.

4.2 Tony Peralta would like an update on Item 11.2 from O.M.A.F. regarding the appeal under the Farm Nuisance Act. Jeff Dickson advised that an owner has appealed to the Normal Farm Practices Board. Jeff has provided some guidance to the Clerk. It also involves a landowner from the Wingham who is a member of the Ontario Landowners Association who will
represent the appellant at the hearing. The appeal has not been moving forward and apparently deals with the passing of the by-law. They could challenge the by-law before the drain is constructed and delay the drain work.

4.3 John Kuntze referred to Item 6.5 regarding the history of the Committee and O.S.P.E. affiliation. He has not found a copy of the standing resolution information yet. Jeff Dickson will also review his files. Information will be forwarded to secretary Gerard Rood for insertion at the front of the meeting minutes binder for future reference. Action by John & Jeff.

4.4 John Kuntze asked about the L.D.C. website update. The report from Pat Shaver should address this item and is noted to be discussed under new business.

5.0 Correspondence

5.1 Tim Oliver opened discussion on the November 18, 2013 email sent out by Gerard Rood with new Fisheries Act information. Tom Hoggarth replied to the message and provided a link on the D.F.O. website to their assessment tool. Tony Peralta advised that he has done 2 submissions in consultation with Emily at D.F.O. New culverts require a D.F.O. review. His submission was made about 1 week ago and there has been no response yet. He called D.F.O. on Monday morning and received a return call in the afternoon so they appear to be interested in prompt reaction. Tim advised that Dave Balint will still come out and meet with you to review S.A.R.A.

5.2 Kristian Kennedy of O.S.P.E. commented on a posting in their October 22, 2013 Advocate newsletter regarding the Drainage Conference. The 45 year timeline was mentioned and O.S.P.E. attended the conference and was impressed with our work. Bill Dietrich believes that the link with O.S.P.E. has been firmed up but no funding is expected. Jeff Dickson stated that this is similar to the P.E.O. situation 10-15 years ago.

5.3 Kristian Kennedy called into the meeting at approximately 1:40. Tim Oliver advised him of the discussion on the Advocate article.

5.4 Tim noted that there is a posting on the public registry for underground locates and Ontario One Call changes. The government is proposing legislation to make it mandatory. There will be a speaker at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning to discuss the update. Tim sent out information to the committee members so that they could respond if interested. Tim had a situation where a fibre optic cable was cut by a contractor on an abandoned railroad. No one located the cable for the contractor even though the call was put in. The matter is apparently still with the utility.

5.5 The January 4, 2014 email on repeating the drainage course was brought up by Tim. He noted that this is open for discussion under New Business Item 3.3 of the agenda.
6.0 Liaison Report – OSPE - Kristian Kennedy

6.1 Kristian Kennedy commenced his report at 2:10. He provided remarks on the drainage conference noting that he enjoyed it and learned a lot.

6.2 O.S.P.E. was able to circulate their information at their booth. William Goodings who was a longtime chair of O.S.P.E. was also there.

6.3 Going forward he noted that O.S.P.E. offers professional development and tools are available to assist with further training. He suggested that interested parties should see the “Professional Development and Services” section of their website. He noted that they have a wide audience that we can go to.

6.4 Tim Oliver stated that they have other engineers in their company who are interested. This can be another way of promoting things.

6.5 Jeff Dickson suggested that Sid Vander Veen could contact O.S.P.E. about promoting the survey for interest in training courses for drainage engineering as discussed under new business. Kristian suggested that they could connect in the near future. They recently hired a new professional development manager. O.S.P.E. can help us out with communications through their magazine, and weekly, bi-weekly and monthly newsletters. Action by Sid & Kristian.

6.6 Tim Oliver believes that we may get a bigger response and may need to establish who should attend the training. In the future, others may want to attend just for the general knowledge. There are only small numbers of engineers practicing drainage work. Recent statistics show only 26 engineers are writing reports versus mid 30’s a decade ago.

6.7 Kristian doesn’t expect an overwhelming response. There may be some S.W.M. engineers who are interested. They could do a pilot circulation and see what sort of response there is. Tim noted that he met a mechanical engineer at the training course and was not sure why he was there. He believes that training results will be better if the course is limited to approximately 30 attendees.

6.8 John Kuntze asked if O.S.P.E. would be attending the drainage conference again. Kristian said he would check with his supervisor but expects that O.S.P.E. will attend future conferences.

6.9 Kristian asked about the type of survey to be done. Tim responded that it would be a gauging interest type of survey. He noted that we already do an evaluation survey as per the report from Pat Shaver.

6.10 In response to Kristian’s question, Tim confirmed that the next conference is October 24, 2014 and the Holiday Inn is already booked.
6.11 Kristian left the conference call at 2:25.

7.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Natural Resources - Jeremy Downe

7.1 Jeremy was not present and no report was provided by M.N.R.

7.2 Tim Oliver said that Jeremy had contacted Darlene Dove of M.N.R. He is not sure if there will be a liaison person appointed who will actually attend our meetings. We may just need to invite M.N.R. to continue making presentations.

8.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Transportation Ontario - Art Groenveld

8.1 Art reported that the gravity pipe update was done. Their guidelines are being re-written with a target delivery of March 31st. It will be available in the M.T.O. library.

8.2 They have completed their Hi-DIS (Highway Drainage Infrastructure Software) program and are trying to get it out for use. Target delivery is June 30, 2014.

8.3 Their IDF curve software has been updated and came out 1 week after the drainage conference. It is up and running and uses a Google maps display. The program uses up to 2007 rainfall data from the Federal government Atmospheric Environmental Service (A.E.S.). They have been approved to proceed with Phase 3 of the IDF program. 2012 A.E.S. information should come shortly.

8.4 Art discussed climate change and historical analysis. The M.O.E. says seasonal changes up to 30% by 2018 could be experienced. Some storms are predicted to increase by 150%. If M.O.E. numbers are approved it could result in much higher design standards and much more costly infrastructure being required. Jeff Dickson commented that he had also seen information to this effect. Art said that they will continue to have discussions with M.O.E. A white paper on climate change is expected shortly.

8.5 There will be a new study in April on gravity pipe rehabilitation. M.T.O. is looking at trenchless methods. There are about 21 technologies available versus open cut. They are looking for better and cheaper ways to replace failing infrastructure. This is expected to include a selection guide and development of B.M.P. (Best Management Practice) guides for designers to use. There is also a potential for standards drawings to be developed. Art said that the L.D.C. can participate as an advisory member. There would be 4 meetings per year with a 3-4 week response time. There are 70 documents.

8.6 John Kuntze observed that Sid Vander Veen has sent out an email about an M.N.R. tool for watersheds. Art stated that they are planning discussions with M.N.R. on linking the software and doing a correlation or comparison of results. He noted that the M.N.R. uses a regression analysis method.
9.0 Liaison Report – Conservation Authorities Report - Davin Heinbuck

9.1 Davin advised that as of last November 25th, the C.A. (Conservation Authority) agreements with D.F.O. are null and void. There will be no letters of advice issued by the C.A.’s.

9.2 The proponent has to self-assess the project and submit for review as required. The C.A.’s also have to re-learn the process.

9.3 In the cases where a self assessment is not feasible there may now be a requirement for input from “qualified environmental professionals”. Qualified environmental professionals will need to be defined through regulation.

9.4 There are still ongoing discussions and a task group of D.F.O. and C.A. members. They are trying to establish an M.O.U. (Memorandum of Understanding). The goal is to have better coordination and faster responses and better service. At this stage nothing is clear and there are no solid answers. The M.O.U. target is April but this is not fixed. It could be a year before there is feedback and not all C.A.’s may be interested.

9.5 Jeff Dickson asked if the L.D.C. could do anything to promote action. Perhaps a letter should be sent and copied to MP’s (Member of Parliament) and MPP’s (Member of Provincial Parliament). It would be helpful to promote D.F.O. liaison with the C.A.’s. Bill Dietrich endorses the idea. He finds that contact at the local C.A. is most helpful.

9.6 Davin noted that a 9 page application to D.F.O. is now needed for review. There will be opportunities to gain efficiencies but these will have to be explored.

9.7 Tim Oliver said that some C.A.’s have fisheries biologists available. Davin commented that the D.F.O. structure is shown online but there are no designated biologists for a given area.

9.8 Jeff suggested that we should respond to the situation sooner than later. Perhaps a generic letter could be prepared and addressed to each person individually. He believes that things have been regressing and it is taking far too long to get a response.

9.9 Art Groenveld asked if there was any factual basis to the concern - what is the turnaround time - how long is a response taking.

9.10 It was discussed that we should consider sending a letter to the Minister of the D.F.O. and c.c. all the C.A.’s. The letter should voice our displeasure with the current status of things. Perhaps a letter should be submitted to the Minister of Agriculture and discuss grant implications. The letter could also go to the Minister of M.N.R. and the Minister of M.T.O. Jeff suggested that the letter could go to Conservation Ontario to the attention of Samantha Dupres and the others. Davin noted that Conservation Ontario can distribute the letter to all the C.A.’s.
9.11 Jeff stated that we need to do something as soon as possible. Perhaps Tim and Gerard could draft something in a couple of weeks and send it to Conservation Ontario. A separate letter could be sent to the Chair of Conservation Ontario asking that the letter be distributed to all 36 C.A.’s. He believes that the letter needs to be sent directly to the Minister level and we should do follow-ups as needed. In summary, Jeff suggested a letter to the Minister of D.F.O., Minister of M.N.R., General Manager of Conservation Ontario, and the Minister of O.M.A.F. A separate letter to Conservation Ontario could ask for distribution of the letter to all 36 C.A.’s. Jeff is willing to provide input or assistance on the letter. **Action by Tim, Gerard & Jeff.**

9.12 Tim believes that the D.F.O. should have a list of approved biologists that proponents can go to for assistance. This should result in more consistent input. Art Groenveld suggested that Tom Hoggarth should be made aware of the proposed actions.

9.13 Davin advised the Committee that Conservation Ontario has a Fact Sheet on changes to the D.F.O. He can send this to the Committee. **Action by Davin.**

9.14 Davin noted that some C.A.’s have taken action to issue Class Authorizations until March 14th for maintenance work only.

9.15 There is the D.A.R.T. (Drainage Act Regulations Team) protocol for maintenance projects and one for new reports that is being worked on. There is another meeting next week. John Kuntze observed that there is not much going on yet. Davin said that there is a plan to survey Drainage Superintendents. It is expected that the forms will change. Davin stated that he may sit back on the D.A.W.G. (Drain Action Working Group) at the request of Tom Hoggarth.

9.16 The Southwest Conservation Authorities are holding a session on Wednesday March 5th. Davin has been invited to discuss drain enclosures. There will be several other speakers. There are about 12 Conservation Authorities involved and the meeting will likely be held in London. There should be a notice going out soon. It is expected to be a brainstorming session. Tim Oliver noted that there are benefits to some enclosures. Davin stated that they want to establish the “drivers” for enclosures.

**10.0 Liaison Report – Fisheries and Oceans Canada - Thomas Hoggarth**

10.1 Tim Oliver observed that Tom had not called in and there was no report submitted.

**11.0 Liaison Report – Ministry of Agriculture and Food - Sid Vander Veen**

11.1 Tim Oliver observed that Sid had not made an appearance nor submitted a report. Sid is expected to be here for the conference tomorrow.
12.0 D.A.W.G. (Drain Action Working Group) Update - Mike Devos

12.1 Mike did not submit a report.

13.0 D.A.R.T. (Drainage Act Regulations Team) Update - John Kuntze

13.1 The status of the Team was discussed in Davin Heinbuck’s presentation under Item 9.15 above.

13.2 The development of a Protocol for new reports under the Drainage Act is up in the air. Drainage Superintendents are in favour of moving ahead while M.N.R. is holding back. The survey of Drainage Superintendents noted in Item 9.15 may establish the course of action.

14.0 New Business

14.1 The L.D.C. website has been upgraded to comply with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (A.O.D.A.). Pat Shaver provided this information in her January 21st email to the Committee.

14.2 The expansion of the L.D.C. website was discussed with regards to providing additional resources and learning material.

14.3 Tim noted that the training courses have been very successful and there has been a lot of help from Sid Vander Veen. He understands that Sid is interested in maintaining the 3 year cycle.

14.4 Bill Dietrich stated that some firms wanted all courses given in 1 year. He believes that this would require a week long course to be scheduled similar to the Drainage Superintendent course. Tim believes that the firms that participated would know the extent of work needed.

14.5 Bill observed that there was 40 attendees the first year and 48 at the last training session. Gerard commented that firms should not expect the course to make a person a drainage engineer. Tim agreed that mentoring is needed and suggested that we may need to emphasize this in any information that is circulated. Jeff Dickson suggested that the course can be a supplement or it could be an introduction and should not be considered a complete training program.

14.6 Tim suggested that attendees can bring their questions on drainage matters to the course. Bill is not sure that there is enough time for answering questions and having a thorough discussion. He noted that there was a lot of information provided in the course that should be helpful.

14.7 The discussion on future training courses was initiated by Hugh Fraser of O.M.A.F. who contacted Sid Vander Veen. Tim suggested that we may want to send out a survey to see how much interest there is. A decision should be made on just contacting engineers and there
should be approximately 30 attendees to proceed. Bill said that if that is the case, we might consider doing the course in 1 year over 2-3 days. Tim suggested that Sid might be contacted about booking O.M.A.F. rooms to save on the cost.

14.8 Bill noted that he took the first training course in 1980 and training was well overdue. Jeff suggested that we may want to get input from Sid. Gerard noted that we also have the Drainage Practitioners meeting which provides a venue for engineers to bring forward questions and discuss drainage procedures.

14.9 Bill asked if the course acted as a draw for the Conference. John suggested that Pat might be able to cross check the training attendance with the conference attendance. John suggested that it might also be interesting to see the background of training attendees as he saw one farmer had attended. Bill thought that Sid might have screened who was registered for the courses. **Action by Pat & Sid.**

14.10 Tim concluded that we need to establish if a training session will be done and discuss the details at the June meeting. Bill commented that the purpose of the courses was training engineers.

14.11 Bill suggested that we could do all course training at O.M.A.F. He would be in favour of Sid circulating a questionnaire to determine how much interest there is in a course for this year. John suggested that we could ask in the questionnaire if a 2 day session or the 3 year cycle would be preferred.

14.12 Art Groenveld suggested that the first day could be a C.E.U. (Continuing Education Unit) day followed by the drainage conference the next day. If there is less than 25 people interested in the training, the course would not be offered.

14.13 Art also suggested that speakers should be provided with a scope for their presentation and the purpose for their attendance. Gerard noted that most of the training went to the case study method. Art believes the presentations need to be geared to the audience and some that were done at the last training session did not follow this protocol. The speakers should be asked to focus on what is of interest or applicable to drainage when providing training at the courses.

14.14 Bill Dietrich thought that future courses may need to spread out. The course material is good stuff. He would use the same case study if doing a future course but do a better presentation. Art believes that third training session was the most problematic. Jeff Dickson suggested that it may help if we develop a template for the speakers. Art thinks that the speaker should show a practical application to drainage work. Jeff said that he would be willing to work with Art to prepare a template for training session and conference speakers. He noted that D.S.A.O. has a template that he might be able to refine for the Committee. He will bring information to the June meeting. **Action by Jeff & Art.**
14.15 Bill reiterated that we need Sid Vander Veen to send out a questionnaire. This may establish how many would attend another training session. The questionnaire could ask if the respondent prefers a whole day or 3 year cycle session. It could ask what questions the attendee wants answered or which topics to cover. He suggested that we need to alert O.S.P.E. that the course is an introduction and not intended as comprehensive training. Perhaps O.S.P.E. could include a link on their website to previous presentations.

14.16 John Kuntze believes that the third session was too comprehensive. He noted that there were 12 speakers during the afternoon training. The Conference lasts all day and we only have 8 speakers. He does not want to see the Thursday session become another Conference day. He believes that the training should be for engineers involved with preparation of drainage reports.

14.17 Art suggested that Thursday could be set as a C.E.U. for drainage engineers. This would make Thursday a training day for engineers or young engineers who want to get information. The Conference day can deal with specific topics and be geared to a broader audience. The Committee could consider setting up a module method. At the beginning of the year a request for interest could be sent out. The training session could then be done on the module that is of most interest to the people who respond.

14.18 Bill Dietrich recommended that Gerard Rood contact Sid Vander Veen about doing a survey at the end of March or in early April. The survey could give engineers about 1 month to respond. This would allow for us to get feedback by the June L.D.C. meeting. Action by Gerard & Sid.

14.19 Bill advised the Committee that Tim Brooke of O.M.A.F. had asked him about a representative for the D.S.A.O. - L.I.C.O. Standards and Specifications meeting tomorrow. Bill said that he would go as the L.D.C. representative. He will mention that coring specifications for smaller connections to covered drains would be helpful.

15.0 Review of the “Design and Construction Guidelines”

15.1 John Kuntze has told Kenn Smart to coordinate posting of information on the L.D.C. website with Pat Shaver. Copyright is always a concern for the University when asked to post information.

16.0 Office of Open Learning - University of Guelph - Pat Shaver

16.1 Information from Pat was discussed above. A copy of her email submission is included as an attachment to these minutes.

16.2 Bill Dietrich suggested that we should let Pat know if she can cancel the Thursday room at the Holiday Inn if Sid has booked rooms at the O.M.A.F. building.
16.3 It was discussed that it would be good to have all conference papers on the website for easy searching. Gerard stated that many paper documents would need to be converted to a suitable electronic format. Jeff Dickson suggested that we could do this in phases.

17.0 Next Meeting

17.1 The next meeting of the LDC will be 9:00 a.m. Friday June 6, 2014 at the O.M.A.F. offices on Stone Road in Guelph. Sid Vander Veen will be asked to book a conference room and advise L.D.C. members.

18.0 Adjournment

18.1 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:15 p.m. Moved by Bill Dietrich and seconded by John Kuntze. Carried

Tim Oliver, Chairman

Gerard Rood, Secretary

Att.
OSPE – Land Drainage Committee Meeting

Drainage Engineers Conference Update

Report – Pat Shaver
Open Learning and Educational Support
University of Guelph
January 20, 2014

Drainage Conference 2013

- Drainage Engineers Course – 48 participants
- Typical turnout at the 2014 Conference, 104 participants and 8 Exhibitors
- Proceedings are at the printers. Expected mailing date: January 24, 2014
- Income statement is in progress – will be completed once proceedings are shipped
  - Drainage Course – instructors paid $60 per participant plus travel expenses.
  - LDC Committee travel expenses paid
- Evaluations attached to email

Drainage Conference 2014: Thursday and Friday, Oct 23 and 24

- Guelph Holiday Inn booked for Thursday course and meetings and Friday Conference

Land Drainage Engineers Website

(http://www.landdrainageengineers.com)

- New website is posted and meets AODA Accessibility requirements
- Content update is in progress: recent minutes need to be added and background description and keywords updated to improve Search Engine Optimization
- Discussed posting of reports and past conference proceedings with Kay Palmer/Kenn Smart. I’ve copied an email I sent to Kay on October 24, 2014 summarizing the requirements to post documents on the LDC website:

From: Pat A Shaver [mailto:pshaver@uoguelph.ca]
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 4:23 PM
To: 'Kay Palmer'
Subject: LDC website

Hi Kay

The Land Drainage Engineers Conference (LDC) website www.LandDrainageEngineers.com is in need of an update. As of January 1, 2014, all University of Guelph connected websites must be fully accessible. The LDC website is ten years old and I am unable to make changes to the website template to meet the accessibility requirements. In terms of web design, ten years is the equivalent of a lifetime or two.
There are two issues concerning posting content on the LDC site – content must be accessible and it must not contravene any copyright permissions.

1. **Accessibility** – all documents must be accessible. At the very minimum, images must have alt tags (alternative description), websites must be hyperlinked, and text should follow the style guidelines (e.g., in Microsoft Office, use the Styles options: Title, Heading 1, heading 2). Office 2010 has an accessibility checker. Documents posted on the website should be in pdf format and Adobe Professional has a accessibility checker (Advanced, Accessibility, Full Check).

2. **Copyright Clearance** – all images and text taken from other sources (e.g., copied maps or pictures, quotes from textbooks etc.) must be copyright cleared from the original source. The copyright permission citations must be included with images and text. I cannot post any documents which include images or text from other sources that have not been copyright cleared.

For the Drainage Conference, speakers sign a waiver that they take responsibility for clearing copyright in their presentation. With the waiver, we will prepare the proceedings which are sent to conference attendees. The signed waiver allows preparation of the proceedings but does allow the conference presentations to be posted on the website.

The LDC website can post links to other sites. If Sid can post the Guide on the OMAF website, then I can link to the OMAF site. It’s probably best that one version of the Guide is posted on one site (Master) and all other sites link to the Master location. If any revisions are made to the Master, updates will not be required on other websites as long as they link to the Master location.

I’ll ask our copyright folks how to deal with copying or posting old documents – when electronic versions are not available.

I’ve found web links regarding website Accessibility deadlines which apply to public and private websites and how to create accessible documents with the various Office products.

- Accessible Digital Documents - [http://adod.idrc.ocad.ca/#partnership](http://adod.idrc.ocad.ca/#partnership)

Let me know if you have any questions. I’m off on Friday – give me a call next week if I can be of assistance. Pat
EVALUATION SUMMARY

Response Rate: 42/48 = 88%

Please rate the following:

The Course overall was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Course content was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the speakers were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the topics were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Too many presenters – took too long. Too much for an afternoon conference.
- Lengthy
- Timing was the only issue
- SAR lady and conservation – need to remove the history of the acts
- Too many presenters simply read their slides – not that effective.
- Good variety
- Ask presenters not to read their slides, but discuss their content. Art from MTO was good and Hal from MOE
- With past years being so helpful for Drainage Engineers, the legislation and Acts was not as helpful for me, but may have been helpful for others.
- I think that the course, in general (all sessions) is great and essential for young drainage engineers.
- Topics were very good.
- Too much content. Rushed. Went overtime
- All topics were informative
- More connection to Drainage Act
- Lots of new topics; good to know and were addressed well
- Presenters need to be more respectful to time for later presenters.
- Speakers may wish to ensure that their presentations can be completed within their designated time. MTO Speaker interesting and useful to info presented.
- All presentations were informative. Case studies always helpful.
- New Drainage Engineer: more info on who needs to be contacted and what info they require when working on drains.

How would you describe:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals/Refreshments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding today’s Course topics, do you feel that any related subject matter was not adequately addressed? Please comment.

- Relevance to drainage issues
- Very thorough
- Sect. 65 – more time. Also more information
- Yes
- No
- It was a little heavy on legislature
- More time for questions would have been nice, but I understand the circumstances.
- Have engineers make their reports first.
- How to use mapping tools
- Would like more in-depth coverage. Speakers limited by time. Consider supplemental material.
- Time

What topics would you like to see in future sessions of the Drainage Engineers Courses?

- SWM in Municipal drainage
- Topics related to SWM and Drainage Act eg. Design, assessments
- Urban applications of the Drainage Act
- Tribunal, C.O.R, consideration meeting
- More topics on the Act
- Aboriginal consultations
- Case studies
- Difference in agriculture and Agri-business related to water issues and waste
- Step by step examples from petition through to 1st maintenance
- Good to have law included but more Drainage Act material
- Assessments and special benefits. (covered in other sessions)
- More interaction

What can we do to improve Session 3 of the Drainage Engineers Course?

- Make sure the presenters stay within their allocated time slot
- Group all sessions together – closer – 6 months apart?
- Timing
- Delete one speaker to another session
- Clearly, there seems to have been a scheduling problem. Perhaps there were too many speakers scheduled with not enough time. As a result, the Q&A and the open discussion component of the course suffered. This was unfortunate. I would suggest either being less ambitious with the number of speakers (all of which were good, by the way) or keep them to a set time.
- Try to make it more concise and relevant to Engineers
- Stay on time
- Make it a day long course – longer time slots for presenter. Examples of reports are good.
- More time or fewer speakers. Too far behind. Not enough time for speakers to cover their content.
- Length of session was too late into the day. Try starting earlier.
- For me, in particular, the Acts and Legislation was not very helpful, and is fairly well known at this level of Engineering. I would have preferred more time for more questions.
- Allow more time for the engineers to make presentations on the sections of the Drainage Act
- A few less topics
- Have the Drainage Act portion of the course 1st; Ministry after
- Consider a full day – allow time for further detail with same lineup; would help if ministry reps could expand more on process for applications for approval; could use one example project (real or not) and have each speaker discuss how approval processes would/should proceed.
- Shorten the presentations a little
- Stay on time
- Identify points of conflict between various acts
- "Stay the course"
- Maintain time limits and stay on time
- Try not to cram so much into such a short time and spend more time on fewer topics
- Time management
- Flow charts/notes of recommended steps for approvals
EVALUATION FORM

Responses: 53 / 98 = 51%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the following:</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The conference overall was:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conference content was:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the speakers were</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the topics were</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Nice mixture of topics
- The Gordon Ave talk was fantastic, especially the lessons learned
- Good mixture of speakers this year
- An informative and diverse conference. One of the best ones in the last few years.
- Mainly speakers did not tie their material to drainage practice. It would be good to show the application.
- A nice variety of topics provided in the agenda
- Speakers well organized and knowledgeable in their fields. One speaker (#2) appeared combative and hostile towards audience, which devalued his message
- Enjoyed Harry Reinders topic and discussion!
- Great Job!
- Good mix of topics
- Topics could have been more practical (better mix)
- Really enjoyed listening about environment data with regards to our climate change and how to target future design goals. In my opinion, the best topics and speakers ever.
- Good job by facilitator keeping on time and agenda – tough to do, but impacts on the overall effectiveness and feedback.
- Great Job! Best one I’ve been at.

Describe the registration process: 38 - Efficient 6 - Acceptable 0 - Not acceptable 1 - Needs improvement

Comments:
- Too many emails asking me to sign up even after I had already signed up.
- Online never seems to work, still having to fax….online with a credit card would be ideal.
- Create a better e-version for registration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you describe:</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals/Refreshments</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Limited refreshments

How did you learn about this conference?

2 - Internet 29 - Email notice 7 - Club/Association 1 - Newsletter 1 - Friend 16 - Work/colleague
What topics would you like to see in future conferences?

- Urban municipal drains
- Another topic from a tiling contractor as a speaker to speak about processes that they undertake when approached by landowner to improve tiling of lands
- Agronomy and its relationship with drainage
- Social media and communication of drainage topics
- Water quality research case studies
- Presentation by new or International Drainage Engineers
- More example case studies
- More innovation within the arena of drain implementation and maintenance
- Natural Channel Design in drainage projects
- Tribunal decisions
- Keep the case studies and contractor mix
- More info on techniques for drainage as well as environmental mitigation measures
- Continue with the variety of topics as per this (2013) conference; and the “HOT” and “RELEVANT’ TOPICS
- Attracting the next generation of drainage engineers. Training? Mentoring? Sub consulting?
- Tile grants and IDIP Policies. Review.
- Nutrient movement in drains
- Innovations in drain design and drain maintenance
- Climate change and implications for drain design criteria
- How to prevent invasive species while doing drain cleanouts – if you do get them….then what?
- Include a contractor’s perspective in the next conference. Maybe a tile drainage contractor.
- More on erosion control and natural channel work.
- Nutrient management plans – understand nutrient loading and subsequent discharge.
- More case studies focusing on problems encountered during construction and how the solutions were worked.
- Holland Marsh case study.
- Maybe more than one case study of real life construction projects along with the trials and tribulations are very interesting
- Methods for water quality
- Updates on water quality research
- SWM and the Drainage Act x 2
- Hydrology
- Urban applications of Drainage Act
- More construction-related or design-related material

What can we do to improve the conference?

- One less topic/speaker and give the attendees more time to visit the supplier tables.
- Would be nice for evaluation to ask question about effectiveness eg. Will you change something in your job as a result of what you learned today?
- Start at 8:30am
- More examples on techniques that can be applied
- Try to get speakers to be more practical/concise. Keep high level to inform and teach
- Not convinced that the panel discussion is continuing to be effective. Might want to eliminate panel and add more speakers/presentations.
- Wrapping up before 4pm on a Friday is helpful. Do we look at another weekday?
- Shorter breaks. No need for panel discussion when questions are allowed after presentations. The day could end earlier
- Great to combine with the course and committee meeting.
- Provide more variety of beverages at lunch.
- Upgrade chairs (probably not possible).

If an electronic evaluation was sent to you after the conference, do you think that you would have time to complete it? (please circle your answer) 14-No response 29-Yes 10-No