



ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE MODEL REVIEW

SASKATCHEWAN BUILDING OFFICIALS

October 22nd, 2015 Meadow Lake, SK

WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE MODEL?



- On October 8th, 2015, SBOA along with other industry stakeholders received a “Consultation Package” from the office of the Chief Building Official.
- The package outlines an initiative being pursued by the Government of Saskatchewan for an Alternative Model for Building Standards Compliance.
- We are told that the initiative is being driven by concerns from the mining industry.

WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE MODEL?



- Brief Summary:

- An owner can, at their discretion, opt out of the traditional third party, Municipality driven code enforcement permit model (i.e. plan reviews, inspections by Municipal appointed Building Officials).
- The 'Alternative', is the owner provides the Municipality with a series of assurance letters from their own designers and consultants.

WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE MODEL?



- Consultation Package Concerns:

- The “Consultation Package” presents a very one-sided, biased picture of the issues.
- The reader is lead to believe that this model will no doubt assure compliance, and that the proponent is justified in asking for this.
- The SBOA has presented to the Minister, and informed all the stakeholders, that we believe the document should be withdrawn and replaced with one that offers a fair, impartial platform to debate from.

WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE MODEL?



- Alternative Compliance Model Concerns:

An owner's self-enforcement program will never offer the same level of assurance for safe, accessible, compliant buildings, or reduce the risk of liability for Municipalities, as effectively as an experienced, trained, appointed Building Official working solely on behalf of the Municipality!

KEY QUESTIONS



- How can this “Consultation Package” be presented without any discussion on liability?
 - We work to ensure safe accessible compliant buildings. Next to providing public safety, the most critical service we provide is reduced risk of liability to the Municipality. Local authorities are very aware of this when they thoughtfully determine they should have a building bylaw, and enforce building standards within the framework of the legislation.

KEY QUESTIONS



- How does self-enforcement align with the UBAS legislative framework principal that no Building Official shall:
 - assist in the laying out of any work,
 - assist in any construction work,
 - or act in the capacity of an engineering or architectural consultant
 - UBAS Regs – 9(1)

KEY QUESTIONS



- Page 1 of 1, third paragraph implies that the entire mining sector has raised a concern with the current model, and that “*they, in particular*” would like to see adoption of this alternative compliance model.
- Correspondence to the SBOA initiated by the Saskatchewan Mining Association would suggest as an Association, they have not been involved at all to this point with the initiative for an alternative compliance model.

KEY QUESTIONS



How does the writer justify or explain the following 'advantages'? Who are they advantages for, and what information were the statements were founded on?:

- improved relationships between project proponent and local authorities;
- reduced onsite need for building officials;
- more timely progress on permit issuance and construction schedules;
- decreased cost of compliance; and
- improved value for services rendered.

KEY QUESTIONS



The Government implies that there will be almost no advantage for housing and small buildings.

- Has the writer considered large developers that might see huge financial and scheduling advantages to retaining the services of a design professional to eliminate the need for building permit fees (or at least significantly lower fees) and onsite inspections? Is this a concern?

KEY QUESTIONS



The consultation package provides two questions listing and discussing 'advantages' of the ACM. There is no discussion on disadvantages.

- Is the Government implying there are no disadvantages to this initiative?
- Was there a reason they chose not to include any disadvantages?

SBOA STRATEGY AND ACTIONS



- Demonstrate to Government and all stakeholders that the document the Government has presented is unfair, biased, one-sided, and does not serve as an appropriate platform to debate from.
 - Letter to the Minister.
 - Cc'd all stakeholders that received the original Gov't Consultation Package.

SBOA STRATEGY AND ACTIONS



- Organize and execute our campaign...soon! Demonstrate our strengths and deliver our message.
 - Appoint a well-rounded, balanced, and comprehensive Response Co-ordination Committee.
 - Engage a Government Relations consultant.
 - Engage a professional Public Relations consultant.
 - Execute our public relations campaign for key stakeholders;
 - Meet face to face any chance we are given with key stakeholders; SUMA, SARM, Engineers, Architects, Fire Officials, Advocate groups for people with disabilities.
 - Produce professional information tools and packages for all stakeholders.
 - Engage the SBOA membership to relate their experiences.
 - Review programs, legislation, history and experience from across the country.
 - Consult with the legal community, and review the impact on exposure to liability for Municipalities.

SBOA STRATEGY AND ACTIONS



- Compose our official, organized, detailed, well thought-out Response by December 4th:
 - Summarize all our findings and inputs.
 - Co-ordinate uniform results with other stakeholders who share our views.
 - Compose our detailed Response, leaving no doubt as to our position on this initiative, and confirming our message...

An owner's self-enforcement program will never offer the same level of assurance for safe, accessible, compliant buildings, or reduce the risk of liability for Municipalities, as effectively as an experienced, trained, appointed Building Official working solely on behalf of the Municipality!