



Safety Codes Council

MINUTES OF THE FIFTH BUILDING SUB-COUNCIL MEETING OF 2021

DATE: November 18, 2021

TIME: 8:30 a.m. to 2:22 p.m.

LOCATION: videoconference

PRESENT: *Sub-Council Members*

Andy Smith, Chair
David Flanagan
Rick Gratton, Vice-Chair, South
Keith Jansen
Corey Klimchuk, Vice-Chair, North
Matthew Kramer
Grace O'Brien
Laura Ritchie
Darin Sceviour
Darrin Harsch
Justin Pockar

Safety Codes Council

Allison Karch, Kathryn Derkach

Alberta Municipal Affairs

Paul Chang, James Orr (at 9:40 a.m. – 10:40 a.m.)

REGRETS: Terry O'Flaherty, Stephen Hill, Colin Belliveau, Keven Lefebvre, Zachary Walker

GUESTS: Chris Taylor (FSC Liaison), Karen Muir (BFSC Liaison), Gerry Wiles (ESC Liaison), Claudette Fedoruk (CAPP, until 9:30), Jim Lytle (CAPP, until 9:30), Frank Lohmann (CHBA - National, for item 4.1. only), Kathleen Maynard (CHBA - National, for item 4.1. only), Scott Fash (BILD Alberta, for item 4.1. only), Paul Duffy (Spray Foam Coalition, for item 4.4 .only), Stephen Wieroniey (Spray Foam Coalition, for item 4.4. only)

RECORDER: Allison Karch

2022 MEETINGS: January 13, March 10, May 12, September 22, November 10

1. Meeting Opening

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m. A round table introduction was held and members were reminded that their primary duty is to act in the interest of safety in the built environment for Albertans.

1.1 Agenda Adoption

Rick Gratton / Grace O'Brien moved that the agenda be adopted, as circulated; CARRIED

1.2 Agenda of the September 23 Minutes

Keith Jansen / Justin Pockar moved to adopt the minutes of the September 23, 2021, meeting, as circulated; CARRIED

2. Matters for Decision

2.1. Closed Session

Justin Pockar / Darin Sceviour moved to enter into closed session; CARRIED

Grace O'Brien / Rick Gratton moved to leave closed session; CARRIED

2.1.1. Nomination of Andy Smith to represent Professional Engineers

Justin Pockar / Keith Jansen move to recommend to the Board reappointment of Andy Smith to the Building Sub-Council to represent Professional Engineers for a term ending January 31, 2025, effective February 1, 2022; CARRIED

2.1.2. Nomination of Keith Jansen to represent Builders & Developers

Rick Gratton / Corey Klimchuk recommend to the Board reappointment of Keith Jansen to the Building Sub-Council to represent Builders & Developers for a term ending January 31, 2025, effective February 1, 2022

2.1.3. Nomination of Cam Buskell, Jason Phill, Yichao Chen or Phil Parker to represent Energy Efficiency

Grace O'Brien / Darin Sceviour recommend to the Board appointment of Cam Buskell to the Building Sub-Council to represent Energy Efficiency for a term ending January 31, 2025, effective February 1, 2022; CARRIED

2.2. NECB 2017 Exemptions for the Oil and Gas Industrial Buildings Draft STANDATA

Background was given on the development of this STANDATA, including work that Municipal Affairs has done with assistance from the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP) to identify building types appropriate for exemption from the NECB, as allowed by criteria in the NECB. Appropriate building types are listed in the STANDATA, but others could be added.

Discussion included the following:

- Some industrial processing buildings that do not fall under Part 10 are considered temporary but are utilized for several years. They are intended to be demolished once the project is complete
- These buildings are built to protect equipment and are not intended for human occupancy, but workers may access the buildings on occasion for maintenance, repairs, etc.
- If an industry other than oil and gas had similar buildings, they could make their case to be included as well.
- The vast majority of these buildings are heated by the process equipment itself, so there is no need for a heating system but ventilation systems are often needed.
- The City of Calgary has received numerous requests for guidance on this topic.
- While the NECB Division C allows an AHJ to exempt all or part of a building if the nature or duration of occupancy makes it impractical to apply the code, this STANDATA will allow for consistency province-wide and eliminate the need for each AHJ to make exemptions on a case-by-case basis.
- It was suggested the Discussion section of the STANDATA should include indication of why the exemptions are being permitted (ex. heat generation by the equipment) to provide guidance for others who might want a similar exemption as well as to justify why the exemptions are being granted.
- In the Interpretation section, it was suggested that the wording be changed to focus on what a building does rather than what it's called; for example, change "compressor building" to "building that exclusively houses compressors".
- It was suggested that more clarity is needed about what is meant by "relocatable" and that Part 10 structures are excluded from the scope of this STANDATA.
- Discussion was held about the definition of temporary buildings and why 5 years or less is indicated as temporary. This was proposed by industry based on major project timelines to ensure that structures would be considered temporary for the duration of construction. It was suggested this may set a precedent for defining temporary for other types of buildings and disciplines.
- It was suggested that, rather than "temporary", these be referred to as buildings constructed solely for housing equipment and not for human occupancy, since the code speaks to use rather than duration.
- It was suggested to restrict the exemption to Part 3 of the NECB (building envelope) and exemptions for other systems such as lighting could be on a case-by-case basis, but it was felt that this would not provide for province-wide consistency, which is the aim of this STANDATA.

Keith Jansen / Darin Sceviour moved to support issuance of the NECB 2017 Exemptions for the Oil and Gas Industrial Buildings STANDATA with comments; CARRIED.

2.3. Off-Site Review of Buildings used at Oil and Gas Facilities Draft STANDATA

Background was given on the development of this STANDATA, with Municipal Affairs again working with CAPP. Industry is finding inconsistency in some buildings that may be built off-site. The code stipulates that the off-site construction be built to CSA A277; however, it was clarified that this was intended to be an option, but industry could also use other means such as inspection by registered professionals. This STANDATA will help provide consistency across the province by clarifying for AHJs that there are acceptable alternatives to compliance with CSA A277.

Discussion included the following:

- It was questioned whether the wording could be revised to say that any one of the methods listed is acceptable and clarified that a combination of methods may be needed, for example to cover both structural and mechanical aspects.
- This STANDATA is specific to smaller process buildings that are not assembly-line produced, are one-offs or one of a few.
- It was suggested that it may not be clear that the “steel box” buildings that would be required to comply with CSA A660 wouldn’t have any mechanical aspects within them, so asking for compliance with CSA A277 wouldn’t provide any additional safety benefit.
- A question was raised about the definition of “oil and gas facility”. While no written definition was noted, it is generally understood that these are facilities specific to extracting and refining natural resources, usually in a remote location and restricted from access by the public. Oil and gas related retail and office locations would not be included. It was suggested that clarity could be added to the STANDATA about what types of facilities it would apply to.
- It was suggested that this approach could be used in other industries (ex. cell towers, modular hotels, etc.) and the STANDATA could simply speak to off-site review of pre-manufactured buildings. The Administrator agreed to consider a more generic application. [Chang]
- Specific wording changes were suggested for accuracy and consistency with requirements regarding professional involvement.

Keith Jansen / Darin Sceviour moved to request a revised STANDATA that considers the sub-council’s comments, for review at a future meeting; CARRIED

3. Review Matters Arising/Action List

	Item	Description	Action	Responsible	Date Initiated	Priority	Status/Update
1.	Off Site Review Clarification re: Pre-manufactured Structures	Development of an Information Bulletin on pre-manufactured structures.	Info Bulletin	Chang	Sep 3/15	High	Discussed during Item 2.3 on agenda; a revised STANDATA will be reviewed at a future meeting.
2.	Professional Schedules	Proposed revision to schedules have been prepared.	With AMA	Orr		High	APEGA and AAA are meeting shortly to discuss comments from the last BSC meeting.
3.	Farm Buildings in NBC(AE) Code	Harmonization with 2020 Code		Council Staff/Orr	Mar 19/20		Decision pending with Government, no timeline available.

4. Matters for Discussion

4.1. BILD Alberta presentation: upcoming changes to NBC 2020

BILD Alberta, along with its parent organization, CHBA – National, would like to voice concerns with the tiered energy code that is expected in the upcoming National Building Code (NBC), which is expected to be published in the next few months. The presenters, Frank Lohmann and Kathleen Maynard from CHBA and Scott Fash from BILD Alberta were introduced and an overview of their respective industry backgrounds was given.

Highlights of the presentation included:

- Historical background of CHBA and an overview of the scope and scale of its participation in the building industry across Canada and in Alberta, including its support of the development of national building and energy codes.
- CHBA – National has concerns about proposals at the national code development level for energy efficiency—in CHBA’s view, adopting the upcoming NBC 2020 introduces risk not seen in prior codes.
- 4 Issues:
 - De-risking energy efficiency provisions
 - Standing Committee on Energy Efficiency identified the need to address significant issues prior to publication of NBC 2020, but the presenters believe this was not done---CHBA appealed on the basis the code development process was not completed, but the appeal panel found the process was followed.
 - CHBA believes these risks need to be addressed prior to the code being in force.
 - Up to now, all net zero buildings were built by specialists who intended to follow best practices, but when mandating tiers, jurisdictions must ensure all builders are able to build this way and comply with the requirements.
 - Overheating is an issue—there is a calculation relative to a reference house to determine whether air conditioning is required and many homes fail, most by only a few percentage points. CHBA shared this issue with NRC but it was not acted on.
 - Report by Builders for Climate Action produced for NRCan proposes a new metric to evaluate performance. The report found that using lower-carbon materials can outweigh the impacts of moving up in energy code tiers. Tier 5 may create too much embedded carbon in homes in places with energy from a clean electrical grid.
 - Capacity and enforcement
 - Builder readiness, building official capacity/understanding, energy advisor availability (testing equipment, qualified testers, etc.), industry and sector-wide issues have ben identified.
 - The presenters believe the code is not the best policy tool to use to address these issues.
 - Proposed tier 5 and actual net zero
 - Tier 5 equates to the Net Zero Energy Ready program
 - Tier requirements speak to proposed vs reference house

- Results of comparison: 100% of the homes in the CHBA study prove they are net zero, only 9% of homes built in compliance with Tier 5 are actually net zero
 - Tier 4 is most representative of net-zero readiness, though it's recognized that the homes in the study were not attempting to meet net zero
- Affordability
 - The cost for Tier 5 can go up to \$40,000—higher tiers offer diminishing returns
 - The cost curves are exponential
 - Tier 5 is overshooting effective regulation and the intended goal of net zero energy levels of performance
- Considerations for BSC
 - Health and safety and durability risks need to be resolved
 - Tier 4 reflects proven net zero ready performance
 - Industry readiness
 - Enforcement implications (lack of inspectors and advisors)
 - Supply chain issues
 - Factory based construction (many in alberta—significant proportion—on-site airtightness testing is prohibitively expensive)
 - Increase in cost may not justify the potential benefit

A question was asked about implementation of tiered energy codes in Alberta. The Director, Standards Development, Building/Fire, Energy & Accessibility at Municipal Affairs reported that the province would look at starting with adoption of Tier 1 and working forward from there, and any recommendations on implementation from the BSC would be considered. He gave an overview of timely code adoption of the NBC(AE) and NFC(AE), noting that the 12 months between publication of the code and its in-force date provides flexibility to consider a delay to the in-force date if needed. It was further reported that, to date, all Canadian provinces and territories have indicated that they're comfortable moving forward with NBC Section 9.36 as written.

Clarity was sought about the presenters' opinion about the concept of tiered codes versus specific concerns with the contents of each tier. It was clarified that the presenters support a tiered approach but believe implementation must be thoughtful, and have some concerns that provinces will move to mandating higher tiers too quickly. Tier 5 presents the most concerns in terms of the specific provisions it contains, with concerns tapering to fewest in Tier 1.

It was asked whether it's expected that the cost gap between Tiers 4 and 5 will start to close. It is hoped that all costs will go down with more products being available, but noted that the absolute cost of every tier is significant. In the last two years, the pandemic has shown that other factors can have impacts. BILD Alberta is focused on helping all builders get up to speed, but it will take time.

A question was asked about the assumptions that the CHBA Net Zero Home Label is based on. The technical requirements were reviewed and the presenters noted that they provided their data to NRC with the suggestion that there is an opportunity for an independent validation.

The presenters are concerned that there are net zero homes, Energuide rated at 0 gigajoules, which would not comply with Tier 4 or 5 of the code, and some of those homes wouldn't meet any tier due to the cooling concern. It was suggested this may not be an issue since the code doesn't speak to

renewables, and any building could be considered net zero if it has enough energy generation (ex. solar panels), which is not the intent of the code.

Discussion was held about unintended consequences, such as overheating when high solar heat gain windows are used, and it was suggested that some builders may not understand how best to design using such elements. Builders who are currently constructing net zero buildings do understand what they're doing, but not all builders have the same experience with net zero buildings—there is a learning curve, which needs to move quickly to meet code compliance. It was clarified that the root of the presenters' concern is not that industry doesn't understand, but that the building envelope is changing dramatically.

It was asked whether any lessons have been gleaned from the implementation of a tiered energy code in British Columbia. The BC step code was a major input into development of national codes. CHBA – National has observed that the BC government is very motivated to support industry, is proactive in resolving issues, and devotes a lot of resources to this support. With that kind of support, many of CHBA's concerns are lessened—for example, BC Hydro pays for onsite airtightness testing so the builder doesn't have to.

The presentation will be included in the documents for the next BSC meeting for further discussion. [Council Administration]

4.2. External Non-combustible Insulation

It was reported that external insulation will likely become a reality in the near future to help provide for energy efficiency. The main concern is that in a small home, walls are getting thicker and the current code doesn't allow cladding to intrude into the side yard. The member who brought this forward wants to gauge the BSC's interest in developing a code change request to allow for non-combustible insulation to intrude into the side yard. This would make a big difference for builders and developers in providing for energy efficiency in new homes without needing bigger lots, and would assist existing homes in increasing energy efficiency without major renovations such as increasing the thickness of walls.

It was clarified that there is currently no action on this topic at the national level. There is a new standing committee on retrofits that may look at this topic in the future, but there hasn't been a code change request submitted for the next code cycle.

Caution was expressed about the potential for this to open the door for situations like the Grenfell Tower fire, where approved products may be assembled in a way that may be problematic.

Rick Gratton / Keith Jansen move to create a working group to investigate external non-combustible insulation with regards to limiting distances; CARRIED

Grace O'Brien / Corey Klimchuk move that members will include Rick Gratton, Keith Jansen, David Flanagan (chair) and member(s) from FSC; CARRIED

Grace O'Brien / David Flanagan move that the working group will bring an initial report in May 2022; CARRIED

FSC will be invited to participate as a joint working group.

[Taylor]

4.3. Occupancy without completed exteriors

The member representing Consumer Protection reported on complaints from homeowners who are being granted occupancy without completed exteriors because of supply issues. A lack of exterior stucco and trim were noted, as well as eavestroughs and downspouts, which (although they are not a code item) has caused basement flooding by runoff coming in through a window.

It was asked whether members believe this is an item that could result in a safety concern and would be within the BSC's purview, and whether document could be considered about what can and can't be left unfinished during occupancy. An example was given of possible impacts to the envelope in homes using stucco exterior wherein the secondary planes of protection (i.e. building paper) won't last through the winter without the stucco. It was questioned whether this may lead to leaks in the future because the product has degraded. It was noted that the code doesn't describe a situation where you can omit any of the planes of protection. This section of the code could be referred to, but it's not specific that occupancy cannot be granted without all those planes of protection.

To manage this type of situation, some municipalities have occupancy inspection separate from the final inspection, with the occupancy inspection being for life safety items and the final inspection coming later, potentially at an extra cost. Other municipal representatives noted they wouldn't promote that their SCOs grant occupancy prior to the final inspection as there may be issues down the road and potential liability. It was noted that one municipality has a policy that the insulation inspection cannot be passed until at least 75% of the building paper has been applied because of past issues with water ingress and the health risks (ex. mould) that can result.

It was reported that this occurs commonly in commercial construction and can be problematic as it can be hard to motivate the owner to correct the deficiencies if they already have been granted occupancy.

It was noted that degradation of partially-complete buildings can happen regardless of occupancy, which may be an issue to deal with separately from this topic.

The Provincial Building Administrator noted there is a STANDATA about occupancy under construction for other types of buildings, but Municipal Affairs may not be in a position to issue a bulletin on the topic of occupancy of residences under construction.

4.4. Unvented Roof Assemblies Engineering Report

The presenters from the Spray Foam Coalition were welcomed to the meeting and noted they have commissioned studies to be referenced as a generic system for spray foam insulation that would be acceptable as alternative solution in Alberta.

Presentation highlights included:

- Chemistry and background of spray foam use as insulation in buildings.
- The industry is organized around material types, and each type has a specific CAN/ULC standard. Some standards are already referenced and others are being developed. All products are CCMC listed, though CAN/ULC is listing products now as well.
- In unvented attics, there are some differences in how these products are applied.

- There are many benefits for Alberta—for example, raw materials (petroleum) are Alberta-sourced but not burned and thus don't contribute to GHGs, and it is manufactured on-site which provides employment locally.
- The historical rationale for venting attics is moisture control, but the national code has exceptions where venting is not required: lower portions of Mansard or Gambrel roof, and attics in some factory-built structures if they are sufficiently airtight. The NBCC also allows an engineering report to qualify for a waiver, though this can slow construction.
- The presenters would like to have specific prescriptive pathway to allow for this.
- Benefits of unvented attics—ducting/HVAC in attic; could improve energy efficiency and resistance to extreme weather, secondary barrier to moisture ingress.
- Misconceptions: insulation on the inside of the roof is not a significant factor in roof failure; foam has minimal impact on trusses.
- Unvented attics have been prescriptively described in US codes since 2003. The key feature is strategic use of air impermeable insulation.
- There are many unvented attics in the Northwest Territories, and thousands were built in Whistler for the Olympics.
- There is currently no prescriptive description in NBCC or NBC(AE) of how to build an unvented attic—builders/homeowners need to engage an architect or engineer to oversee them.
- Proposal for STANDATA: working to refine the proposal initially made in March 2020 and have worked on an “engineered solution” for design of an unvented attic.

Discussion included:

- At the national level, code change requests on this topic are in the works. The proponents have already submitted one.
- Some shingles manufacturers' warranties are voided if they're not installed over a properly vented attic—this would need to be aligned. There was a similar situation in US when the code change was made there. The proponents are confident that manufacturers will be amenable to adjustments to allow for unvented attics and plan to engage in outreach on this.
- A question was asked about the report referencing a Professional Engineer's involvement but is not authenticated. It was clarified that the final version will have one.
- It was clarified that the code change request going to the national code takes exactly the same approach as what was presented to BSC.
- If supported by the BSC, the STANDATA would be similar to the one about thin masonry veneers one—it would reference a third party document that has a PEng authentication. It was noted that the masonry document was very prescriptive and suggested that this one would have to be as well.
- “High performance roof underlay” is referenced, but it's not clear what the criteria is for that term, and it was suggested that this is one example where more clarity is needed to make this a truly prescriptive solution. The presenter welcomes this type of feedback and can make corresponding changes to the document.
- Concern was expressed that since unvented attics may be conditioned spaces, people may use them for storage, etc., when it wasn't originally designed for such uses. It was clarified that if homeowners use them that way, they would be required to have a thermal barrier (ie. drywall). If there is limited access for maintenance only, a thermal barrier would not be needed.

- A question was asked regarding qualifications for installers. There are credentials for sprayfoam applicators, unlike other insulation installers. Like any construction trade, there are instances of non-performance but there are mechanisms to deal with that.
- Major municipalities have documented approaches to this, and moving forward with a consistent province-wide approach would be helpful to builders.

This will remain on matters arising list and the BSC may discuss further at the next meeting.
[Council Administration]

Members were asked to provide comments through Council staff, who will submit them to Municipal Affairs and provide a compiled list for review at the next meeting. [All]

4.5. Liaison Reports

4.5.1. Fire Sub-Council

No report was provided because the FSC meeting is next week.

4.5.2. Barrier Free Sub-Council

The following was discussed

- Awareness working group identified a number of items to add to the Barrier Free Design Guide.
- Technical working group is discussing curb cuts, for which details are not included in the code.
- Recommendations were made to make revisions to the upcoming NBC(AE) to eliminate conflicts between accessibility requirements in assisted living situations and the needs of seniors.

4.6. Working Group Reports

4.6.1. Resilient Roofing

The following was discussed:

- Continuing to work on a code change request to the NBCC, though this creates complexity about defining which parts of the country should be held to a resilient roofing standard.
- The group is working on how to define high-hail areas, in terms of both frequency of hail events and size of hail.
- Consensus of the group is that in high hail areas, requirement for a class 4 resilient shingle is likely reasonable as well as resilient underlay.
- Work continues on gathering data to define those areas.

4.6.2. Stacked Townhomes

A written report was included in the Portal and the following was discussed:

- The group identified 4 issues common to most AHJs as noted in the report and have dealt mostly with 1 and 3.
- Defining the terms soffit and combustible projection is an area of focus.
- There is reluctance to think about encroachment agreements and how AHJs may manage those items.

- There have been some suggestions that the code didn't consider the construction of a roof soffit that crosses a property line and this should be a code change request to the NBC.
- Soffits over jogs on exterior walls—two options were presented that could allow for encroachment (see report in the Portal for construction details and diagrams). This is the approach major municipalities are using in their zero lot line policies—it could be jurisdiction-wide variance or a provincial variance.
 - The group believes they should make a code change request to the NBC about this, and in the interim suggest a provincial variance.
 - Ownership should not determine what parts of the code apply, so this should apply to all structures to which 9.10.15 applies.
 - Another topic to address is soffits at side walls on row houses—there isn't consensus in the group about what a combustible projection is and it isn't defined in the code.

A request was made for the Provincial Building Administrator to provide clarification about whether a roof soffit enclosing an attic is a combustible projection. [Chang]

BSC and the Provincial Building Administrator expressed support of development of a code change request that simplifies the reading of 9.10.15.5 sentences 5-1. The working group will begin development of this code change request. [Jansen]

The draft code change request will be included with the January agenda documents for discussion. [Council Administration]

4.6.3. Interior Stairways for Roof Access

The group is waiting for the GSC's input on this topic. It was reported that this will be on the December GSC meeting agenda and input is hoped to be provided prior to the BSC's January meeting. [Council Administration]

4.6.4. Refrigeration

The group is waiting for membership from Refrigeration, Air Conditioning, Heating Association of Alberta (RAHA) in order to proceed. No issues have been reported from the Sheet Metal Contractors Association of Alberta.

4.6.5. Shipping Containers

The group is currently defining the issues and identifying questions, such as the definition of temporary use, code requirements, design of shipping containers, and concerns from fire first responders. They are looking at gaps that may exist in the code, such as innovative uses of shipping containers like residences. The member representing Large Industrial Developments has done research on existing inventory in large industrial settings and whether retroactivity would be considered.

Participation from FSC is requested. The FSC Liaison will suggest participation on this group at the next FSC meeting. [Taylor]

4.7. Administrator/AMA Report

The Administrator reported:

- NPARC- NRC Publications Archive. Free downloads with no log-in required.
<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/home/>
- ABOA's Virtual meeting was held on September 24th. Presentation followed the topic of "A Year in Review".
- CSA submitting Code Change Requests (CCR) to the National Research Council for inclusion of CSA-A277 "Procedure for Certification of Prefabricated Buildings, Modules, and Panels" in Part 3 and Part 9 of the National Building Code of Canada.
- Code Development process with NRC—we await the NBC 2020 from NRC and are expecting an announcement in late November about a publication date.
- Alberta Town Hall meeting held in October with members of the Modular Building Institute (MBI) dealing with Factory Built Construction and Part 10 Buildings (members from Canada & USA) had 15 stakeholder companies with 28 participants. Companies included CSA Group, QAI Laboratories Ltd., and Intertek Testing Services.
- Energy Code for AHJ's webinar was presented by Municipal Affairs and City of Edmonton, facilitated by the Council, and had approximately 60 attendees. This webinar video has been uploaded onto the Council's public website.
- New look for STANDATA in all disciplines going forward (new or revised/renewed) with consistent formatting and look across the disciplines. Colour differences indicate whether it is a Variance (orange), Interpretation (magenta), Bulletin/Errata (green) or Notices
- Combustible Dust Explosion Webinar for SCOs to be scheduled for January being presented by Vets Group

A question was asked about the variations in NBC(AE) that were discussed at the last meeting. When setting this meeting's agenda, it was decided that Municipal Affairs will reformat and weed out any minor items on which BSC's input isn't needed and bring the revised document to a future meeting. All the "and facilities" references will be removed—this amounts to over 100 variations from the NBC that are easily resolved without an impact to code users.

4.8. Council Updates

A written report was included in the portal and updates were provided on the following:

- Council office is anticipated to reopen in January 2022—subject to change
 - Staff may continue to work from home on some days.
- It was reported that the BSC has heard a number of appeals this year and only 6 BSC members have completed the mandatory appeal hearing training. Members are reminded that hearing appeals is a key function of sub-council members and all members who have yet to take the training are encouraged to do so when it is offered in the spring.

[All Members]

4.8.1. 2022/2023 Meeting Dates

Please see the finalized schedule document in the Portal. Calendar invites will follow shortly. May 12 and September 22 are anticipated to be in-person if possible; all others will be held virtually.

5. Meeting Finalization

5.1. Round Table

- Joe Healy, Technical Advisor at AMA, is retiring at the end of the year.
- A question was asked about the Council's COVID vaccination strategy in regards to the plan to return to in-person meetings in spring 2022. Council staff will provide an update to members when available. [Council Administration]

5.2. Next Meeting

The next meeting was reconfirmed for January 13, 2022 via videoconference at 8:30 a.m.

5.3. Meeting Adjournment

Keith Jansen / Darin Sceviour moved to adjourn: CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 2:22 p.m.

– NEW ACTION ITEMS –

2.3. Off-Site Review of Buildings used at Oil and Gas Facilities Draft STANDATA

It was suggested that this approach could be used in other industries (ex. cell towers, modular hotels, etc.) and the STANDATA could simply speak to off-site review of pre-manufactured buildings. The Administrator agreed to consider a more generic application. [Chang]

4.1. BILD Alberta presentation: upcoming changes to NBC 2020

The presentation will be included in the documents for the next BSC meeting for further discussion. [Council Administration]

4.2. External Non-combustible Insulation

FSC will be invited to participate as a joint working group. [Taylor]

4.4. Unvented Roof Assemblies Engineering Report

This will remain on matters arising list and the BSC may discuss further at the next meeting. [Council Administration]

Members were asked to provide comments through Council staff, who will submit them to Municipal Affairs and provide a compiled list for review at the next meeting. [All]

4.6.2. Stacked Townhomes

A request was made for the Provincial Building Administrator to provide clarification about whether a roof soffit enclosing an attic is a combustible projection. [Chang]

BSC and the Provincial Building Administrator expressed support of development of a code change request that simplifies the reading of 9.10.15.5 sentences 5-1. The working group will begin development of this code change request. [Jansen]

The draft code change request will be included with the January agenda documents for discussion. [Council Administration]

4.6.3. Interior Stairways for Roof Access

The group is waiting for the GSC's input on this topic. It was reported that this will be on the December GSC meeting agenda and input is hoped to be provided prior to the BSC's January meeting. [Council Administration]

4.6.5. Shipping Containers

The FSC Liaison will suggest participation on this group at the next FSC meeting. [Taylor]

4.8. Council Updates

Members are reminded that hearing appeals is a key function of sub-council members and all members who have yet to take the training are encouraged to do so when it is offered in the spring. [All Members]

5.1. Round Table

A question was asked about the Council's COVID vaccination strategy in regards to the plan to return to in-person meetings in spring 2022. Council staff will provide an update to members when available. [Council Administration]

– MOTIONS –

1.1 Agenda Adoption

Rick Gratton / Grace O’Brien moved that the agenda be adopted, as circulated; CARRIED

1.2 Agenda of the September 23 Minutes

Keith Jansen / Justin Pockar moved to adopt the minutes of the September 23, 2021, meeting, as circulated; CARRIED

2.1. Closed Session

Justin Pockar / Darin Sceviour moved to enter into closed session; CARRIED

Grace O’Brien / Rick Gratton moved to leave closed session; CARRIED

2.1.1. Nomination of Andy Smith to represent Professional Engineers

Justin Pockar / Keith Jansen move to recommend to the Board reappointment of Andy Smith to the Building Sub-Council to represent Professional Engineers for a term ending January 31, 2025, effective February 1, 2022; CARRIED

2.1.2. Nomination of Keith Jansen to represent Builders & Developers

Rick Gratton / Corey Klimchuk recommend to the Board reappointment of Keith Jansen to the Building Sub-Council to represent Builders & Developers for a term ending January 31, 2025, effective February 1, 2022

2.1.3. Nomination of Cam Buskell, Jason Phill, Yichao Chen or Phil Parker to represent Energy Efficiency

Grace O’Brien / Darin Sceviour recommend to the Board appointment of Cam Buskell to the Building Sub-Council to represent Energy Efficiency for a term ending January 31, 2025, effective February 1, 2022; CARRIED

2.2. NECB 2017 Exemptions for the Oil and Gas Industrial Buildings Draft STANDATA

Keith Jansen / Darin Sceviour moved to support issuance of the NECB 2017 Exemptions for the Oil and Gas Industrial Buildings STANDATA with comments; CARRIED.

2.3. Off-Site Review of Buildings used at Oil and Gas Facilities Draft STANDATA

Keith Jansen / Darin Sceviour moved to request a revised STANDATA that considers the sub-council’s comments, for review at a future meeting; CARRIED

4.2. External Non-combustible Insulation

Rick Gratton / Keith Jansen move to create a working group to investigate external non-combustible insulation with regards to limiting distances; CARRIED

Grace O'Brien / Corey Klimchuk move that members will include Rick Gratton, Keith Jansen, David Flanagan (chair) and member(s) from FSC; CARRIED

Grace O'Brien / David Flanagan move that the working group will bring an initial report in May 2022; CARRIED

5.3. Meeting Adjournment

Keith Jansen / Darin Sceviour moved to adjourn: CARRIED

– WORKING GROUP MEMBER LISTS –

WORKING GROUP	WORKING GROUP MEMBERS (<u>Chair</u>)
Resilient Roofing	<u>Justin Pockar</u> Keith Jansen, Zachary Walker, Rick Gratton Municipal Affairs: Mike Hill
Stacked Townhomes	<u>Keith Jansen</u> Rick Gratton, David Flanagan, Justin Pockar Municipal Affairs: Bruce Adair
Interior Stairways for Roof Access	<u>Terry O’Flaherty</u> Grace O’Brien, Corey Klimchuk, Hunter Langpap (FSC) Municipal Affairs: Joe Healy
Trade-Offs for Sprinklers in Part 9 Buildings	<u>Rick Gratton</u> Keith Jansen, Bruce Schultz, Terry O’Flaherty, Cammie Laird (FSC) Municipal Affairs: Roopendra Singh
Refrigeration	<u>Matthew Kramer</u> Terry O’Flaherty, Stephen Hill, Colin Belliveau RAHA representatives
Shipping Containers	<u>Corey Klimchuk</u> Keven Lefebvre, Laura Ritchie, Keith Jansen, Darin Sceviour, Zachary Walker
External Non-combustible Insulation	<u>David Flanagan</u> Rick Gratton, Keith Jansen