

<p><b>9:00 am</b></p>	<p><b>Membership Introductions &amp; Housekeeping Items</b></p> <p><b>Attendees: Malcolm Brown, Barry Buchanan, Mel Fruitman, Tony Poirier, Rob Smith, Maurice Tucci, Eerik Randsalu, Phil Lasek, Vladimir Gagachev, Ted Olechna</b> <b>On Phone – Pierre McDonald, George Chelvanayagam, Chris Magnusson</b></p> <p><b>Absent: Shawn Paulsen, Dave Sinclair, Pete Olders</b></p> <p><b>Guests: Tatjana Dinic, Nansy Hanna, Carita Edwards, Farrah Bourre, Mary Beth Fazzari, Bill Bryans</b></p>
<p><b>9:15 am</b></p>	<p><b>OESC Ontario Amendments</b> <i>Nansy Hanna – Director, Engineering &amp; Programs Development, ESA</i> <i>Tatjana Dinic – Code Engineer, Engineering &amp; Programs Development, ESA</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presented by Tatjana Dinic</li> </ul> <p>Proxy for voting – Dave Sinclair to Malcolm Brown Pete Olders to Rob Smith Quorum has been met</p> <p><b>2-004(4)</b> No comments received during the public review Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>: Tony – Discussion:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion on whether we need more prescriptive language with "in writing" being removed.</li> <li>Concern over confirmation of receipt of application.</li> </ul> Voting result – All Agreed</p> <p><b>2-004(7)</b> No comments received during the public review Motion: Vladimir 2<sup>nd</sup>: Barry Voting result – All Agreed</p> <p><b>2-005: Application for Inspection not Required (4 changes)</b> 2 Comments received &amp; reviewed. Appendix B note clarifies requirements for LEC for installation of a meter mounted transfer device.</p> <p><u>Complete Proposal</u> Motion: Vladimir 2<sup>nd</sup>: Tony</p>

Discussion:

- Who owns the transfer device – Homeowner
- Remove “AS” from beginning of Appendix B Note - *Removed*

Motion to vote on the 3 changes separately

Motion: Phil Lasek 2<sup>nd</sup>: Tony

*Change 1 – LEC Definition*

Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>: Phil

Voting result – All Agreed

*Change 2 – Addition of Subrule (g)*

Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>: Phil

Voting result – All Agreed

*Change 3 – Appendix B Note Clarification to 2-005(f)*

Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>: Phil

Voting result – All Agreed

**2-022 – Approval Requirements**

No Comments received

Motion to Separate changes to ballot - Approved

*Subrule 1*

Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>: Tony

Voting result – All Agreed

*Subrule 2(b) and Subrule 3 (as amended with Appendix B Reference to 16-222)*

Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>: Phil

Discussion:

**Bill Bryans:** Decorative Light Strings; concern that low voltage strings when attached together in multiples can exceed the capacity and flammability rating of the string. If they are stringable, they need to be approved. (Change is included in Amendment proposed in 16-222). Should there be a reference to 16-222; could be added in the Appendix B Note. Clarification using similar wording to the Section 16 Proposal.- *OA Appendix B note to 16-222 has been amended per Bill's comments*  
Voting result – All Agreed

*Subrule 2(c) & (d) and Subrule 4 (as amended to remove title of ANSI standard)*

Motion: Phil 2<sup>nd</sup>: Barry

Discussion:

Phil Lasek: Appendix B note; Should we just reference the Standard number and remove the full name of the document – *Accepted*

Voting result – All Agreed

- Tony/ Phil- Motion to deletion in Appendix B note- Unanimous  
*All other changes (Editorial, new Subrules 2(a) and (d) & Subrule 5)*

Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>: Phil

Voting result – All Agreed

**16-222 (deleted in previous code)**

- Requests made to revise the rule and add back into code to cover items not included in 2-022
- EFC Commented – Has been addressed with 16-222 reference in Appendix B note in 2-022

Motion: Phil 2<sup>nd</sup>: Barry

Discussion:

Bill Bryans: 1(a) “acceptable for the application”; Should this be clarified?

- This is CEC wording – *Decided to keep it*
- If circuit exceed 100 VA, it is then required to be approved.
- Appendix B Note further clarifies requirements for “acceptable”

Voting result – All Agreed

**2-102 – New Subrule (5)**

No Comments received

Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>: Phil

–Discussion

- Discussion regarding what is meant by “ conforms to the requirements of the Inspection Department”
  - Contractor/ Installed needs to confirm what the requirements are for the installation
- Change 1<sup>st</sup> “approved” to acceptable or remove it entirely. Other option, remove approved and add an Appendix B Note to Clarify what is acceptable for a retrofit kit.
  - If changed to “acceptable” could the kit end up being not approved, but acceptable to ESA.
  - Intent was to distinguish between Approved and not Approved Kits

Motion to remove “approve”: Phil 2<sup>nd</sup> Barry

Voting result – All Agreed

**10-004 - Editorial- removal of rule reference to deleted rule**

Motion: Malcolm 2<sup>nd</sup>: Tony

Voting result – All Agreed

**3-002 - Deletion of Section 3/ Appendix B note to 2-024(1)**

- As amended with change from Product to Equipment wording.

Motion: Mel 2<sup>nd</sup>: Eerik

Voting result – All Agreed

**20-034 – Cylinder Exchange Facilities**

No comments received.

Motion: Vladimir 2<sup>nd</sup>: Tony

Discussion

Phil – 1.5m radius? Direction of TSSA.

- Propane would settle and go further.
- TSSA is the AHJ in Ontario

Voting – *Phil Negative (based on the distance)*

Voting result – Amendment Passes as is, with 1 negative.

**Action: Since 1.5 m radius is specified in PROPANE CODE ADOPTION DOCUMENT published by the Technical Standards and Safety Authority and dated August 1, 2014, Phil is advised to discuss his concerns with TSSA**

**20-060 – VRA changes Based on TSSA Requirements**

Comment received from ESA Inspector; rule amended as per suggestion.

Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>- Eerik

Voting result – All Agreed

***24-744 - proposed Amendment has been withdrawn based on Comments received not in support from public and industry.***

- 80-90% of stove purchased and installed in Ontario are Electric
- You cannot retrofit a gas installation as a homeowner, you can do the electrical, which could be a safety issue.
- ESA agrees that the Electrical Outlet will be continued to be mandated in the code for Safety Reasons.

**30-200 – Additional requirements & Appendix B Note for Combustible material**

- Comment from Consumer Advisory Council in Support for benefit to Public Safety
- Harmonizes with NEC and has been published in an OESC Bulletin

Motion: Barry 2<sup>nd</sup>; Malcolm

Discussion:

Barry – Does the NEC look at fixture temperatures, as opposed to distances?

- UL standard has a provision for listing luminaires for use in Clothes Closets or where combustibles are stored.
- Part 2 is looking at these provisions as well.

Voting result – All Agreed

**30-1400 to 13-1410: New LED Luminaires rules (as amended in meeting)**

**Discussion:**

- ESA Comment questioning why it is limited to Residential Occupancies, Harmonizes with the Building Code requirements.
- Direction required for Installation of Class 2 wiring and products for safety reasons, particularly with lighting installations

Tony – Will this be included in definitions or Special Terminology (LPS)?

- LPS is a certified Product. And the expanded wording is in the Code in numerous locations

Motion: Dave 2<sup>nd</sup>: Malcolm

**Discussion:**

Barry – Should there be an Appendix B Note regarding Modification of an LED system.

Rob Smith – Why is wiring methods being limited to NMSC for both combustible and noncombustible locations.

- This is not talking about the cable, but the installation methods as related to support, distance etc.

• Suggestion to add “minimum” in 30-1408 as relates to NMSC. - Accepted

- Remove “in accordance with wiring methods for NMSC”?
  - Motion to include Minimum – Barry 2<sup>nd</sup> – Vladimir

Voting result – All Agreed

**32-110(e) – Proposal has been withdrawn based on Public Comments.**

- Same proposal has gone ahead in the CEC and will be voted on in the CEC June 2015 Meeting.
- Products are currently not widely available at this time
- ESA will withdraw the amendment and monitor the National Code change to allow industry time to move ahead.

**72-114 – Pedestal requirement for RV’s**

- Comments received from Camping industry. Oppositions were reviewed and responded to for clarification and commenter’s now support changes.
- There is a requirement in the RV Standards for the length and location of the cord.
- Consumer council would like it to be retroactive; the Code is not retroactive.

Motion: Tony 2<sup>nd</sup>: Rob

Voting result – All Agreed

**Section 78 –New Rules - Docking facilities associated with Dwelling units.**

No comments received in Public Review

Proposal has been submitted to CEC for inclusion in the next code and is going forward with support.

Motion: Malcolm 2<sup>nd</sup>: Chris

Voting result – All Agreed

12:30  
pm

Additional comments received not related to Ontario Amendments and non Germaine to the current proposals.

- ESA will review and respond to additional comments.

### **AFCI – EFC request**

*Presented Ted Olechna, Director – Codes & Standards Support, Chief Engineer, ESA*

- EFC request to move up date for mandatory installation requirements to October 1, 2015 instead of May 2016 when new code takes effect
- Directors Order Process
  - 1 month for development
  - 60 days for consultation
  - 1 month for review of comments
  - 12 month interval for implementation.
  - We do not have this time to put out a DO's to adopt early.
- Contractor Associations do not support early adoption of this rule.
- Other Provinces are also not looking at early adoption due to Impact and/or timing.
- Some provinces have adopted the CEC in its entirety; others are still doing analysis of the changes and impact.
- Current ESA Bulletin permits AFCI Receptacles in renovations.
  - Possibility to add Recommendation to use Combination Type
- Possibility to further tighten timelines for grandfathering permits from the previous code.
  - Current code was 6 months for inspection;
  - new code, review is being done to determine if shorter window is required
- Technology currently available maybe dumped into the Ontario Market due to later adoption;
  - Malcolm Brown: Challenge to EFC to stop selling older technology, so Consumers/contractors will begin using the newer technology.
- Bill Bryans-Questions:
  - regarding a possible proposal for the 2018 code to eliminate exemptions.
    1. This is for the next code and will be reviewed once the 2015 OESC is implemented.
  - Can a proposal be submitted to be voted on at the CEC part 1 June 2015 meeting, then adopted into the new OESC?
    1. Agenda has already been set for the June meeting for 2015 and no other proposals will be reviewed/voted on
- False tripping was a very big concern with this proposal. Manufacturer's need to ensure this is not an issue with the new technology, or consumer/ contractors will resist installing.

**Action:** TED to make a formal response to EFC related to reasoning for declining to adopt the rule earlier than the proposed new OESC Implementation date.



Ontario Provincial Code Council  
Meeting Minutes

May 6th, 2015 9:00 am - 3:00 pm  
McKenzie Room - Holiday Inn  
2565 Argenta Rd, Mississauga, ON

<b>1:00 pm</b>	<p><b>Review of Terms of Reference</b> <i>Ted Olechna – Director, Codes &amp; Standards support</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 3 members will be asked to assist in reviewing the current membership statistics and what needs to be changed. (ie. Membership gaps)</li></ul> <p>Question regarding CSA Term limits – They do not apply term limits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Difficult depending on Industry to fill in gaps on industry councils</li><li>• Limiting terms may be a way of adjusting membership</li></ul> <p><b>Motion to conclude meeting: Malcolm 2<sup>nd</sup>: Vladimir</b></p> <p><b>Next meeting: October 22, 2015</b></p>
----------------	--