Minutes of Meeting Held on June 3, 2009
1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
at PEO Offices
25 Sheppard Avenue West
Toronto, Ontario

Attendees:  
Paul Roth, OAA (Chair)  
Gina Cody, PEO  
David Dengler, PEO  
John Dorris, OBOA  
Bernie Ennis, PEO  
Tim Moore, TACBOC  
Mike Seiling, OBOA  
Sheena Sharp, OAA  
Dave Tipler, CEO

Regrets:  
David Craddock, OAA  
George Kotsifas, LMCBO

1.0 Opening of Meeting

B. Ennis reported that D. Dengler was added to the Committee as a PEO representative.

T. Moore reported that he has asked the Building Officials to consider a replacement for him.

Additions to the agenda:

- T. Moore asked to add an item on the PEO draft position clarifying the practice of engineering related to the Ontario Building Code.

- S. Sharp asked to add an item on the ASHRAE Form.

The agenda was accepted, with the revisions noted above.

2.0 Minutes/Notes from Previous Meeting

J. Dorris noted that the fourth paragraph of Item 6.0 should refer to Parts 10 and 11, not Parts 11 and 12.

The minutes were accepted, subject to revision above.
3.0 Shop Drawings

T. Moore revised the letter on professional design and review coordination, and it has been sent to MMAH, OAA and PEO.

4.0 UL/ULC Rated Products and Tests

The Committee decided to remove this item from the agenda.

5.0 Explanation of OAA Discipline Process

S. Sharp provided an overview of the OAA procedures for dealing with complaints against architects. There are three OAA committees that deal with complaints.

PIRC (Public Interest Review Committee)

- Recent addition.
- Person can present issue to PIRC, who will review facts and decide to send to Complaints Committee under their name so that the original complainant remains anonymous.

Complaints Committee

- Mediation process.
- Can only deal with offences under the Architects Act.

Discipline Committee

- Tribunal involving OAA as a prosecutor with lawyer, defendant with lawyer.
- Tribunal also has independent legal counsel.

S. Sharp reported that OAA will also act informally on issues brought to the attention of the practice advisor.

General discussion ensued on the subject of the OAA complaints handling process.

T. Moore reported that the PEO Complaints and Discipline process was discussed at the LMCBO conference. The Building Officials expressed their frustration with the PEO process. T. Moore noted that the discipline of professionals is not that important for Building Officials as they have other mechanisms for dealing with issues of non-compliant design.
T. Moore reported that he had good experience with the OAA process. A complaint made to PIRC lead to a disposition by the Complaints Committee within two weeks.

M. Seiling suggested that OAA should provide an article on the complaints handling process for the OBOA Journal.

D. Dengler suggested that this article be posted on the OAA website.

Professional designers and the public can make complaints against Building Officials to OBOA. Also, complaints for offences against the OBC Code of Conduct can be made to the Municipality.

6.0 Report on PEO Guidelines and Standards

B. Ennis reported that PEO’s Professional Standards Committee had approved a policy statement for a standard requiring professional engineers to include a design data matrix on drawings when providing architectural design for industrial buildings.

T. Moore said that creating the standard will minimize requests from municipalities for additional information.

T. Moore suggested that the standard should be revised:

1) to make the design matrix mandatory for all buildings less than 600m², other than single-family residential

2) to add Item t), Barrier-Free Access

The Committee also suggested that the OAA design matrix be attached to the policy statement as an example.

S. Sharp asked that paragraph 3 of Section 1 be revised by deleting “big box retail stores and shell buildings that may later be used for various occupancies”. These buildings are not classified as industrial occupancies and, therefore, cannot be designed by professional engineers alone.

7.0 Meeting with MMAH

M. Seiling provided a summary of the presentation by Ministry staff regarding potential changes to the Building Code Act.

T. Moore noted that the Building Code focuses on completion of forms under concept of complete applications. Suggested that there should be a framework included in the OBC defining the drawing expectations. Lengthy discussion ensued. It was concluded that the criteria for complete drawings should not be included in the OBC.
8.0 New Business

8.1 PEO Draft Position Statement

T. Moore noted several items in the statement that required revision or clarification.

**Action:** EABO members are asked to provide comments on the statement to PEO directly.

8.2 ASHRAE Form

S. Sharp wants to keep this issue on the agenda because the standard forms are not applicable to most projects. Suggests a simple addition to the matrix that asks about design methodology used rather than details of the design.

Lengthy discussion ensued on the matter of identifying compliance with energy standards in the Building Code.

It was suggested that the issue be parked until the issuance of the regulations for the *Green Energy and Green Economy Act*.

J. Dorris suggested that a practice bulletin or guideline issued by OAA and PEO would be the best means of achieving the goal of compliance with an awareness of applicable energy standards.

**Action:** S. Sharp to provide the proposed documentation to the Committee for review.

8.3 General Review Issues from PEO

B. Ennis noted that the owner is required to notify Building Officials on commencement of footings and asked that the Building Department notify design professionals as well. Alternatively, the Building Code could be revised to require the owner to notify design professionals providing general review when construction begins.

T. Moore will communicate to Building Officials that design professionals may not be performing general reviews because the professionals do not know that construction is underway.

8.4 Seismic Design Information Requested by City of Ottawa

D. Tipler reported that the City of Ottawa is requiring engineers to provide all design data and calculations on the drawings or in an attached letter.
P. Roth noted that this is really an issue of what is the role of the plan reviewer. Is the plans review a peer review? How do the roles of Building Officials and the professional designers intersect? This issue should be added to the agenda at some time.

G. Cody suggested that B. Ennis call the City of Ottawa to question their reason for asking for this.

9.0 **Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The Committee discussed potential dates for the next two meetings. The next meeting will be in September (but not the week of September 22). The following meeting will be in late November.

**Action:** B. Ennis to poll members for dates in these timeframes.