

DECISION AND REASONS

In the matter of a hearing under the *Professional Engineers Act*, and in the matter of a complaint regarding the conduct of ROBERT G. WOOD, P.ENG., a member of the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario, GREGORY J. SAUNDERS, P.ENG., a member of the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario, and M.R. WRIGHT & ASSOCIATES CO. LTD., a holder of a Certificate of Authorization.

This matter came for hearing before a panel of the Discipline Committee on November 17, 2008, and March 3, 4 and 5, 2009, at the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario (association) in Toronto. The association was represented by Neil J. Perrier. The members and Certificate of Authorization holder were represented by Gordon P. Acton. David P. Jacobs acted as independent legal counsel.

The parties attended a pre-hearing conference with a member of the Discipline Committee on June 17, 2008. Two referrals to discipline had been ordered by the Complaints Committee; one in respect of a complaint against Robert G. Wood, P.Eng. (Wood), and M.R. Wright & Associates Co. Ltd. (MRW), and the other in respect of a complaint against Gregory J. Saunders, P.Eng. (Saunders), and MRW. On consent of the parties, both referrals were combined into one proceeding before the Discipline Committee as, among other things, similar questions of fact and law were raised in respect of both referrals.

THE ALLEGATIONS

1. The association alleged that Wood and Saunders were incompetent under the definition in section 28(3)(a) of the *Professional Engineers Act* (act), and that Wood, Saunders and MRW were guilty of professional misconduct as defined in section 28(2)(b) of the act.
2. The association filed two Statements of Allegations in this matter. The particulars of the allegations against Saunders and MRW were that:
 - (a) Saunders and MRW provided a stamped (February 14, 2005) Kabinakagami Bridge Rehabilitation bridge design issued for tender for Modified CL-635-ONT Truck Loading design code–CAN/CSA-S6-00 (code), for a 91 tonne (100 ton) capacity, which greatly exceeded the actual capacity and which, itself, did not meet the CHBDC minimum unposted capacity of 62.5 tonnes. Additionally, site work was reported by Wood as completed;
 - (b) Saunders and MRW provided a stamped (September 20, 2005) Kabinakagami Bridge Rehabilitation bridge design issued for tender for CL-625-ONT Truck Loading design code–CAN/CSA-S9-00, but did not meet the CHBDC minimum unposted capacity of 62.5 tonnes and which listed the attached drawings as “As built drawing reflecting construction”;
 - (c) Saunders and MRW provided a stamped (January 19, 2006) Kabinakagami Bridge Rehabilitation design issued for tender for CL-625-ONT Truck Loading design code–CAN/CSA-S6-00, but did not meet the CHBDC minimum unposted capacity of 62.5 tonnes;
 - (d) Saunders and MRW provided sets of stamped drawings that contained numerous errors, omissions or deficiencies, and were inconsistent with existing site conditions, MRW’s pile survey inspection notes and design notes provided in September 2005; and
 - (e) Saunders and MRW provided design briefs that did not follow the CHBDC CAN/CSA-S6-00 in the most appropriate manner and, in some cases, did not apply it in an appropriate manner, including:
 - (i) failing to appropriately apply the target reliability index and subsequent dead and live load factors when checking the wood stringers under “normal traffic” loading,
 - (ii) failing to evaluate bridge for “normal traffic” loadings to determine posting requirements. Rather, an inappropriate application of permit load live load factors was invoked such that no sign posting was recommended,

- (iii) applying the wrong table of the CHBDC [i.e. Table 9.11.2(b) instead of Table 9.11.2(c)] to determine the strength of the timber stringers,
 - (iv) failing to perform/provide calculations to evaluate the capacity of the laminated deck,
 - (v) failing to apply all data and measurements of the MRW September 2005 pile survey to the design brief analysis,
 - (vi) failing to apply the CHBDC 6.6.2.1 factor of 0.4 to the pile geotechnical resistance, and
 - (vii) failing to provide a complete analysis of the steel stringers, providing only a bending analysis, which itself was not reasonable.
3. The particulars of the allegations against Wood and MRW repeated the allegations against Saunders and MRW, with the following additional particulars:
- (a) Wood and MRW provided a stamped (November 29, 2004) Kabinakagami River Bridge Rehabilitation bridge design for tender using the Modified CL-625-ONT Truck Loading design code—CAN/CSA-S6-00 (100 ton) 91 tonne capacity, which greatly exceeded the actual capacity and that, itself, did not meet the CHBDC minimum unposted capacity of 62.5 tonnes; and
 - (b) Wood performed site inspections for work for which he knew or ought to have known that the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) was requiring a work permit.

The association said it would not be presenting any evidence in respect of the allegation set out in sub-subparagraph 2(e)(vii).

PLEA OF THE MEMBERS AND THE HOLDER

Wood, Saunders and MRW initially denied the allegations.

In the course of the cross-examination of Wood, the parties presented a plea agreement that included an agreement as to penalty. Wood, Saunders and MRW changed their pleas and admitted to the allegations set out in the following paragraphs in the allegations section above:

- (a) paragraph 1, regarding professional misconduct only;
- (b) subparagraphs 2(a), (b) and (d); and
- (c) sub-subparagraphs 2(e)(i), (ii), (iii), (v) and (vi).

In addition, Wood and MRW admitted to the allegations set out in the subparagraphs 3(a) and 3(b) in the allegations section above.

The plea agreement demonstrated the association's acceptance of the pleas, and the association presented no evidence as to those allegations that were disputed.

EVIDENCE

As stated, the panel did hear some evidence and, in reviewing the evidence, the panel noted that the designs entered into evidence in this matter show that the bridge was a single-lane, wood structure with steel beams across the central span, and that the bridge was 4.88 metres wide and 48.8 metres long. The bridge was located on a private logging road.

The association called two witnesses, Robert Wilson, P.Eng. (Wilson), and Kevin Brown, P.Eng. (Brown), from the MNR of the Government of Ontario. Wood testified in his own defence up to the entry of his plea of guilty.

FINDINGS

It was unchallenged that Wood and Saunders were members of the association and that MRW was a holder of a Certificate of Authorization at all times relevant to this matter and the panel so finds.

The panel inspected the notes on the drawings stamped by Wood and Saunders on February 14, 2005, and January 19, 2006, and found that they purport that the design complies with the code. The panel found that the design did not comply with the requirements of the code.

The panel noted that the association had said it would not present any evidence in regard to the allegation set out in sub-subparagraph 2(e)(vii) above. In accordance with the plea agreement, the association did not present any evidence as to the allegations of incompetence against Wood or Saunders. The panel, thus, does not find Wood, Saunders or MRW liable for the matters alleged in sub-subparagraph 2(e)(vii) and does not find Wood or Saunders guilty of incompetence.

DECISION

On the basis of the admissions made by the members and holder, the panel finds Wood, Saunders and MRW guilty of professional misconduct as set out in section 28(2)(b) of the *Professional Engineers Act* as defined in sections 72(2)(a) and 72(2)(d) of Regulation 941 under the *Professional Engineers Act*, for their actions as set out in the findings section above. The panel's decision was buttressed by the evidence heard, confirming the admissions made.

The association did not pursue the allegation of incompetence, and the panel does not find either Wood or Saunders guilty of incompetence.

The panel noted that, since Wood, Saunders and MRW admitted to the allegations, the association did not have to prove every element in the Statement of Allegations.

PENALTY

The parties made a joint submission as to penalty. The panel considered the joint submission and decided the proposed penalty would protect the public, maintain public confidence, provide a general deterrence to actions by other members, provide specific deterrence against similar actions by the members in this matter, and rehabilitate the members in this matter. The panel adopts the joint submission.

In coming to this decision, the panel noted that, in respect of Wood, an aggravating factor was that he had a number of opportunities to reconsider the elements of his design and failed to do so, and his conduct created avoidable work for the MNR. The panel considered the fact that the members admitted to the bulk of the allegations, that the submission as to penalty was agreed to by the parties, and that the penalty would not impose a burden on the other employees of MRW, as mitigating factors in its decision.

The panel found that the joint submission as to penalty proposed sanctions that were within the reasonable range for contraventions of the *Professional Engineers Act* and Regulation 941. The penalty is not contrary to the public interest.

Therefore the panel orders the following:

- (a) that Wood be reprimanded and that the fact of the reprimand be recorded on the register of the association;
- (b) that Saunders be reprimanded and that the fact of the reprimand be recorded on the register of the association;
- (c) that MRW be reprimanded and that the fact of the reprimand be recorded on the register of the association;
- (d) that Wood's licence be suspended for two months from December 1, 2010 to January 31, 2011;
- (e) that Wood and Saunders must each write and pass the association's professional practice examination between March 3, 2009 and 12 months after the date of this decision;
- (f) that the licence of Saunders be suspended for 12 months on the day after 12 months from the date of this decision if Saunders does not pass the association's professional practice examination between March 3, 2009 and 12 months after the date of this decision;
- (g) that the licence of Saunders be revoked on the day after 24 months from the date of this decision if Saunders

does not pass the association's professional practice examination between March 3, 2009 and 24 months after the date of this decision;

- (h) that Wood must write and pass the following technical examinations set by the association between March 3, 2009 and 12 months after the date of this decision: 98 CIV V1 and V2, advanced structural analysis and design;
- (i) that the licence of Wood be suspended for 12 months on the day after 12 months from the date of this decision if Wood does not pass the association's professional practice examination and the technical examinations 98 CIV V1 and V2 and advanced structural analysis and design, between March 3, 2009 and 12 months after the date of this decision;
- (j) that the licence of Wood be revoked on the day after 24 months from the date of this decision if Wood does not pass the association's professional practice examination and the technical examinations 98 CIV V1 and V2 and advanced structural analysis and design, between March 3, 2009 and 24 months after the date of this decision;
- (k) that the panel's Decision and Reasons will be published with the names of the members and the holder with reasons in the official publication of the association, and that the association may edit the Decision and Reasons to fit the publishing standards and available space in the publication;
- (l) that Wood, Saunders and MRW pay \$10,000 in total to the association immediately in costs, if this amount has not already been paid; and
- (m) that the association will make reasonable efforts to accommodate and facilitate the members in complying with this order, including providing the members with the ability to write the examinations ordered at a location near the members' locations.

The written Decision and Reasons was signed on November 15, 2010, by Glenn Richardson, P.Eng., as chair on behalf of the other members of the discipline panel: Santosh Gupta, P.Eng., Daniela Iliescu, P.Eng., Len King, P.Eng., and Henry Tang, P.Eng.

DECISION AND REASONS

In the matter of a hearing under the *Professional Engineers Act*, and in the matter of a complaint regarding the conduct of ABRAHAM BUECKERT, P.ENG., a member of the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario, and AB ENGINEERING INC., a holder of a Certificate of Authorization.

This matter came on for hearing before a panel of the Discipline Committee on September 27, 2010, at the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario (association) in Toronto. All parties were present. The association and Bueckert were represented by legal counsel. David Fine acted as independent legal counsel to the panel.

THE ALLEGATIONS

It is alleged that Abraham Bueckert, P.Eng. (Bueckert), is guilty of incompetence and/or professional misconduct as defined in the *Professional Engineers Act*.

It is alleged that AB Engineering Inc. is guilty of incompetence and/or professional misconduct as defined in the *Professional Engineers Act*.

OVERVIEW

At all material times, Bueckert was licensed as a professional engineer pursuant to the *Professional Engineers Act*. At the time of completing the reports at issue, as set out in the allegations, Bueckert was a holder of a Certificate of Authorization (C of A) in the name of Abe Bueckert Engineering.

AB Engineering Inc. was issued a C of A on or about February 2, 2007. At all material times, Bueckert was the engineer responsible for the C of A.

On or about January 2007, Bueckert was retained by Nagata Auto Parts Canada Co. Ltd. (Nagata) to conduct three pre-start health and safety inspections. The following reports were prepared subsequent to each review:

- (a) Report No. 2006A-038-01, dated January 26, 2007—Review of Robot Welder identified as GMT193—Back Pillar;
- (b) Report No. 2006A-039-01, dated January 26, 2007—Review of Robot Welder identified as GMT193 W/H 2nd process; and
- (c) Report No. 2006A-040-01, dated January 26, 2007—Review of Robot Welder identified as GMT193 W/H 1st process.

Each of these reports was signed and sealed by Bueckert.

On or about March 20, 2007, the Ministry of Labour inspected the guarding of the welding robot cells at Nagata and issued an order to comply. The inspection revealed that the guarding, as installed, did not comply with section 24 of the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* (OHSA), R.S.O. 1990, Regulation 851.

A subsequent review by an independent expert revealed possible errors, omissions and discrepancies with respect to the safety issues identified in the aforementioned three reports signed and sealed by Bueckert.

The association alleges that Bueckert and AB Engineering:

- (a) conducted a pre-start health and safety review of the robot welding cells that contained errors, omissions and discrepancies;
- (b) failed to make reasonable provision for safeguarding of life and health of a person who may be affected by the work for which the practitioner was responsible by conducting an inadequate and incomplete pre-start health and safety review;

- (c) conducted safety inspections and provided safety review reports with errors, omissions and discrepancies that would not be expected of an engineering practitioner experienced in conducting pre-start health and safety reviews; and
- (d) failed to make responsible provisions for complying with applicable regulations and standards in connection with the guarding of the welding robot cells.

PLEA BY MEMBER AND HOLDER

Bueckert and AB Engineering pled not guilty to the allegations as presented by the association in the Statement of Allegations.

AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS

Bueckert, AB Engineering and the association presented an Agreed Statement of Facts. It is agreed that:

At all material times, Bueckert was licensed as a professional engineer pursuant to the *Professional Engineers Act*. At the time of completing the reports at issue, as set out in the allegations, Bueckert was a holder of a C of A in the name of Abe Bueckert Engineering.

AB Engineering was issued a C of A on or about February 2, 2007. At all material times, Bueckert was the engineer responsible for the C of A.

On or about January 2007, Bueckert was retained by Nagata to conduct three pre-start health and safety inspections. The following reports were prepared subsequent to each review:

- (a) Report No. 2006A-038-01, dated January 26, 2007—Review of Robot Welder identified as GMT193—Back Pillar;
- (b) Report No. 2006A-039-01, dated January 26, 2007—Review of Robot Welder identified as GMT193 W/H 2nd process; and
- (c) Report No. 2006A-040-01, dated January 26, 2007—Review of Robot Welder identified as GMT193 W/H 1st process.

Each of these reports was signed and sealed by Bueckert.

On or about March 20, 2007, the Ministry of Labour inspected the guarding of the welding robot cells in Nagata and issued an order to comply.

A subsequent review by an independent expert revealed possible errors, omissions and discrepancies with respect to the safety issues identified in the reports 2006A-038-01, 2006A-039-01, and 2006A-040-01 as follows:

- (a) Spot welder: The hazard and recommendation for improvement of the spot welder circuitry description was not presented clearly. The report explicitly indicated that there was no deficiency when prior information was documented as being indeterminate;

- (b) Guard at light curtains: Why deficiencies exist with respect to the guarding and why specific recommendations were made were not presented clearly;
- (c) Guarding between RH and LH load stations: Which aspect of the guard was deficient was not presented clearly;
- (d) E-stops: Whether the e-stop device on the robot will cause the external e-stop MCR circuit to fault and thus deactivate all hazards was not presented clearly;
- (e) Light curtains: The function/interaction of the light curtain circuitry was not presented clearly; and
- (f) Guard door lock: Lockout procedures were not discussed.

Bueckert agreed that he:

- (a) conducted a pre-start health and safety review of the robot welding cells that contained errors, omissions and discrepancies;
- (b) conducted safety inspections and provided safety review reports with errors, omissions and discrepancies that would not be expected of an engineering practitioner experienced in conducting pre-start health and safety reviews; and
- (c) failed to make responsible provisions for complying with applicable regulations and standards in connection with the guarding of the welding robot cells.

The panel requested an explanation of the extent and severity of the errors, omissions and discrepancies that were admitted. Counsel for the association stated that the reports prepared by Bueckert did not present clear statements that corrective measures must be taken to comply with the OHSA regulations. There were no errors or discrepancies cited. Rather, there were only omissions cited by the expert in assessment of the reports prepared by Bueckert.

DECISION OF THE PANEL

Bueckert admitted to stated facts that support the allegation of professional misconduct. The panel finds such admission to have been made freely, voluntarily and unequivocally, with full understanding that the discipline panel has discretion in the ordering of a penalty.

Having considered the agreed facts and the submissions of counsel, the panel decided that Bueckert, a member of the Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario, committed an act of professional misconduct as defined by section 72(2)(d) of Regulation 941/90.

REASONS FOR DECISION

In the Agreed Statement of Facts, the member admitted he failed to make responsible provisions for complying with applicable regulations and standards in connection with the guarding of the welding robot cells. His omissions constitute professional misconduct as defined in section 72(2)(d) of Regulation 941/90.

SUBMISSIONS ON PENALTY

The parties' joint submissions as to penalty were as follows:

- (a) Bueckert shall be reprimanded and the fact of the reprimand be recorded on the register for two years;
- (b) Bueckert shall, within 12 months of the date of today's date (September 27, 2010), successfully complete a CSA standards approved course or workshop in the area of pre-start health and safety reviews, and shall provide written confirmation of same to the registrar within five days of successful completion of the course;
- (c) There shall be publication, with names, of the Decision and Reasons of the panel; and
- (d) There shall be no order with respect to costs.

The panel is satisfied the member has had independent legal advice with respect to his agreement to this penalty.

DECISION AND REASONS ON PENALTY

Counsel for the member stated that Bueckert had not been in trouble before and had learned from this experience. He also indicated that the process of this complaint and this discipline hearing has cost Bueckert significant time and money.

The panel agreed with the penalty as submitted. It is reasonable and in the public interest.

The oral reprimand provided the opportunity for the panel to reinforce the positive lessons that the member could gain from having his work reviewed through the discipline process.

Recording the fact of the reprimand on the record for two years and the publication of the Decision and Reasons, with names, would serve as a message to professional engineers that they need to make reasonable provision for complying with applicable statutes, regulations, standards, codes, bylaws and rules in their practice. However, the two-year record and the publication are not anticipated to have an overly severe effect on Bueckert's business.

The panel believes that Bueckert is genuinely interested in improving the quality of his pre-start health and safety reviews and would have undertaken at least one course or workshop on the practice on his own volition. Providing evidence of this to the registrar within 12 months is not a burden for Bueckert, while adding a measure of accountability that strengthens the regard of our association on members' continuing education.

A Notice of Waiver of appeal was obtained from the member and the oral reprimand was delivered by the panel on September 27, 2010, immediately after the conclusion of the hearing.

The written Decision and Reasons was signed November 15, 2010, by John Vieth, P.Eng., as chair on behalf of the other members of the discipline panel: Ishwar Bhatia, P.Eng., Ken Lopez, P.Eng., Phil Maka, P.Eng., and Brian Ross, P.Eng.

ENFORCEMENT EXPLAINED

This Q & A column aims to educate members about some of the issues PEO faces in protecting the public against unlicensed individuals who engage in the practice of professional engineering, and in enforcing the title protection provisions of the *Professional Engineers Act (PEA)*.



By Steven Haddock

Q. Are there any particular actions PEO's enforcement department will be taking against individuals and companies now that the *Open for Business Act* is in effect?

A. The *Open for Business Act* expands the practice protection and title protection provisions of the PEA. As such, certain activities that were legal for anyone to perform prior to the act's royal assent may now be performed only by professional engineers.

SAFEGUARDING THE ENVIRONMENT

Although PEO treated the environment as something that was protected as "public welfare" under the old definition of professional engineering in the PEA, now any act of planning, designing, composing, evaluating, advising, reporting, directing or supervising, or the managing of any of these acts, that requires the use of engineering principles to protect the environment, is considered the practice of professional engineering.

SAFEGUARDING ECONOMIC INTERESTS

Ontario's securities laws allow any professional engineer licensed anywhere to certify results of testing mining properties. Because protecting "public welfare" couldn't necessarily be considered to include safeguarding economic interests under the old definition of professional engineering, prior to the *Open for Business Act* PEO could not insist that such engineers be licensed by PEO, even if a mining property or company had a connection to Ontario. In addition, activities such as the calculation of energy use and energy savings, the design of building

envelopes, and capital planning for multi-unit residential buildings are now explicitly covered as relating to the safeguarding of economic interests under the new definition.

MANAGING PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING

Under the old definition of professional engineering, overall control of a team of engineers and other technical professionals working on an engineering project

could fall to a non-engineer. Under the new definition, only professional engineers may have direct management control over such a project. However, this change does not mean that non-engineers cannot have some managerial control over professional engineers. Professional engineers may still have to report to non-engineers as part of a mixed professional team (such as one that includes architects or planners), and there is no prohibition against non-engineers holding a management interest in a Certificate of Authorization holder.

NATURAL SCIENCE

Although the language relating to natural science has been removed from the definition of professional engineering, PEO has, in fact, never exempted natural scientists from the requirement to be licensed as, or under supervision and responsibility of, a professional engineer when they were doing work that falls within the practice of professional engineering. The previous language said simply the practice of professional engineering did not include practising as a natural scientist. PEO did not before and will continue not to prosecute people engaged in pure science.



THE INDUSTRIAL EXCEPTION

The industrial exception, first placed in the PEA in 1984, is being eliminated, although this provision of the *Open for Business Act* will not be effective until proclaimed by the lieutenant governor. Once in force, all professional engineering work relating to production machinery used in the facilities of an engineer's employer to produce products by that employer will have to be performed by a professional engineer or someone supervised by a professional engineer. In fact, the exception never applied outside this narrow scope of work. People doing other acts of professional engineering for their employers were always required to be licensed unless they were supervised by a responsible professional engineer. PEO council and the Enforcement Committee have put together a task force to implement a smooth transition for unlicensed people over a period of approximately six months.

ENGINEERING INTERNS (EITs)

The EIT designation is being explicitly protected for the first time. Once this section of the *Open for Business Act* is proclaimed, only engineering interns, i.e. people enrolled in PEO's engineering intern training program, will be entitled to use the designation. Previously, PEO lacked the authority to ensure the title was used only by those who were qualified, with the potential for misuse and confusion by the public.

TRANSITION

PEO's enforcement policy is to seek compliance before proceeding to prosecution and, given the nature of these changes, this policy is more important than ever before. Individuals who are affected by these changes will be given ample opportunity to comply before legal action is considered. In addition, PEO Enforcement Officer Marisa Sterling, P.Eng., will be working hard to communicate these changes to those who may be affected by them.

Please report any person or company you suspect is violating the act. Call the PEO enforcement hotline at 416-224-9528, ext. 1444 or 800-339-3716, ext. 1444. Or email your questions or concerns to enforcement@peo.on.ca.



Publications Order Form

	\$	No.	Total
The Professional Engineers Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.28	N/C		
Ontario Regulation 941/90	N/C		
Ontario Regulation 260/08	N/C		
By-law No. 1	N/C		
Practice Guidelines			
Acting as Contract Employees (2001)	10.00		
Acting as Independent Contractors (2001)	10.00		
Acting Under the Drainage Act (1988)	10.00		
Acoustical Engineering Services in Land-Use Planning (1998)	10.00		
Building Projects Using Manufacturer-Designed Systems & Components (1999)	10.00		
Commissioning Work in Buildings (1992)	10.00		
Communications Services (1993)	10.00		
Engineering Services to Municipalities (1986)	10.00		
Environmental Site Assessment, Remediation & Management (1996).....	10.00		
General Review of Construction as Required by Ontario Building Code (2008)	10.00		
Geotechnical Engineering Services (1993)	10.00		
Guideline to Professional Practice (1998)	10.00		
Human Rights in Professional Practice (2009).....	10.00		
Land Development/Redevelopment Engineering Services (1994)	10.00		
Mechanical & Electrical Engineering Services in Buildings (1997).....	10.00		
Professional Engineer as an Expert Witness (1997)	10.00		
Professional Engineer's Duty to Report (1991)	N/C		
Project Management Services (1991).....	10.00		
Reports on Mineral Properties (2002)	10.00		
Reports for Pre-Start Health and Safety Reviews (2001).....	10.00		
Roads, Bridges & Associated Facilities (1995)	10.00		
Selection of Engineering Services (1998)	10.00		
Solid Waste Management (1993).....	10.00		
Structural Engineering Services in Buildings (1995).....	10.00		
Temporary Works (1993).....	10.00		
Transportation & Traffic Engineering (1994).....	10.00		
Use of Agreements Between Clients & Engineers (2000) (including sample agreement)	10.00		
Use of Computer Software Tools Affecting Public Safety & Welfare (1993)	10.00		
Use of the Professional Engineer's Seal (2008)	10.00		
Business Publications			
Agreement Between Prime Consultant & Sub-Consultant (1993) per package of 10	10.00		
Licensing Guide & Application for Licence (2007)	N/C		
Required Experience for Licensing in Ontario (2007).....	N/C		
Schedule of Fees for Engineering Services (2001)	10.00		

Fax to: 416-224-8168 or 800-268-0496 Phone: 416-224-1100 or 800-339-3716 Mail to: Professional Engineers Ontario 40 Sheppard Ave. W., Suite 101 Toronto, ON M2N 6K9	Shipping and handling is included. Please allow 10 days for delivery.	Subtotal				
		13% HST				
		Total				
Name _____ Shipping Address _____ City _____ Province _____ Postal Code _____ Tel _____ Fax _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Please charge to VISA number <table border="1" style="width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-top: 5px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;"> </td> <td style="width: 25%;"> </td> <td style="width: 25%;"> </td> <td style="width: 25%;"> </td> </tr> </table> <small>(please list all numbers on card) Expiry Date</small>					Signature _____ <input type="checkbox"/> I have enclosed a cheque or money order made payable to Professional Engineers Ontario. Membership # _____