PILECONNECT

STANDARDS

PCS 103:26

Model Municipal Provision for Helical Pile Permitting

Adoption-Ready Permitting Requirements for Canadian Municipalities, Synthesized from Leading Canadian Practice

First Edition, June 2026

Recommended Practice (Voluntary Model Provision)

Published by PileConnect

pileconnect.com

Authored by Cory Goulet, P.Eng., Canvas Engineering Ltd., St. Catharines, Ontario

Legal Notice

This document is a voluntary recommended practice published by PileConnect. It is a model provision offered for consideration and voluntary adoption by Canadian municipalities and authorities having jurisdiction. It is not a building code, is not part of the National Building Code of Canada or any provincial building code, and is not referenced by or binding under any statute or regulation unless and until a municipality elects to adopt it, in whole or in part, through its own lawful process.

Nothing in this document relieves any party of the obligation to comply with the applicable building code, to retain a professional engineer licensed in the applicable province or territory, or to obtain a CCMC evaluation or other product acceptance where required. All design, acceptance, and interpretation decisions remain the responsibility of the engineer of record and the authority having jurisdiction. PileConnect and the author disclaim all liability arising from the use, adoption, or interpretation of this document.

This document is provided without warranty of any kind, and PileConnect specifically disclaims any implied warranty of merchantability and any implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose. A municipality considering adoption should obtain its own legal and engineering review to confirm consistency with its governing provincial code and local conditions.

Nothing in this document shall be construed as endorsing or disparaging any manufacturer, franchise network, training provider, or installer. References to CCMC, CSA standards, and provincial codes are made solely to anchor the model provision to the existing Canadian regulatory framework.

This document may be reproduced verbatim, in whole or in part, with attribution to PileConnect. A municipality or authority having jurisdiction may also adapt or modify the provision for the purpose of local adoption, as contemplated by Clauses 1.4 and 11.2; where it does so, the adapted text should be attributed as based on PCS 103:26 and should not be represented as the unaltered PileConnect provision.

Nothing in this document grants any license, express or implied, under any patent, trademark, or other intellectual property right, and no such license should be inferred from its publication or use.

Preface

Helical piles, also referred to as screw piles or auger-installed steel piles, are widely used across Canada for residential, commercial, and light industrial foundations. Acceptance of these systems in Canada rests substantially on the National Research Council's Canadian Construction Materials Centre (CCMC) evaluation framework together with the relevant CSA standards for steel, welding, and corrosion protection. Individual municipalities, however, have been left to translate that national framework into local permitting requirements on their own.

The result is uneven. A small number of Canadian municipalities have published thorough, well-constructed guidance, while many others have little or no helical-pile-specific direction and rely on general engineering requirements. A building department wishing to establish clear, defensible permitting requirements has had no common reference to adopt, and has had to construct one from first principles or by informally copying another jurisdiction.

This model provision is intended to fill that gap. It synthesizes the requirements that leading Canadian jurisdictions already impose, expressed as adoption-ready provision text that a municipality may incorporate into its permitting requirements, in whole or in part, with local modification. It does not introduce new engineering theory and does not displace the CCMC framework, the applicable CSA standards, or the governing provincial code. It organizes what credible Canadian practice already requires into one coherent, proportionate, and defensible set of requirements.

The synthesis underlying this provision is drawn from a comparative review of published Canadian municipal helical pile guidance, in which the City of Winnipeg's commercial and housing bulletins, the Rocky View County guideline, the City of Brandon residential building regulation (BLDREG-003), and the Regional District of North Okanagan submittal requirements were identified as the most substantive Canadian examples, each anchored to the CCMC technical bulletin and the CSA standard suite. The structured risk-based waiver mechanism is adapted from comparable North American practice identified in the same review. Because that review covered a representative rather than exhaustive sample, weighted toward the Prairie provinces, this First Edition is published for comment and trial use through December 31, 2026, and municipalities are encouraged to adapt it to provincial code and local conditions. Feedback may be submitted through pileconnect.com.

1 Scope and Application

1.1 This model provision establishes permitting requirements for the design, product acceptance, installation, and verification of helical piles (also known as screw piles or auger-installed steel piles) used to support buildings and other structures within a municipality that adopts it.

1.2 This provision is written for adoption by Canadian municipalities and authorities having jurisdiction (AHJs). It is intended to operate alongside, and subordinate to, the governing provincial or territorial building code and the evaluation and product-acceptance framework of the Canadian Construction Materials Centre (CCMC). Where any requirement of this provision conflicts with the governing code, the governing code prevails.

1.3 This provision applies to permanent helical pile foundations supporting buildings and structures. It does not

(a) prescribe the design methodology for the foundation, which remains the responsibility of the respective design professionals identified in Clause 4;

(b) apply to the manufacture of helical pile products, which is addressed through CCMC evaluation or equivalent professional review; or

(c) apply to temporary works, except where a municipality expressly extends this provision to them.

1.4 A municipality may adopt this provision in whole or in part, and may impose requirements more stringent than those stated here. Bracketed values in this document (for example, load thresholds and area thresholds) are recommended defaults that a municipality should confirm against its provincial code and local conditions before adoption.

1.5 In this document, *shall* indicates a requirement of the provision as adopted; *should* indicates a recommendation; and *may* indicates an option.

> ***Note:*** *This provision synthesizes requirements already imposed by leading Canadian municipalities. It is designed so that a building department can adopt clear, proportionate, and defensible helical pile requirements without constructing them from first principles, while remaining anchored to the CCMC framework and the applicable provincial code.*

2 Reference Documents

Where reference is made to the following, it shall be to the edition adopted or in force under the governing provincial or territorial building code at the time of permit application, including amendments.

- National Building Code of Canada and the applicable provincial or territorial building code
- CCMC (Canadian Construction Materials Centre) evaluation reports and the CCMC technical bulletin applicable to auger-installed steel pile foundations
- CSA S16 - Design of steel structures
- CSA G40.20/G40.21 - General requirements for rolled or welded structural quality steel
- CSA W59 - Welded steel construction (metal arc welding)
- CSA W47.1 - Certification of companies for fusion welding of steel (CWB certification)
- CSA G164 - Hot dip galvanizing of irregularly shaped articles (or ASTM A123 where accepted)

- ASTM D1143/D1143M, D3689/D3689M, D3966/D3966M - static axial compressive, axial tensile, and lateral load testing of deep foundations, where load testing is required
- The CCMC evaluation report or professional engineering evaluation for the specific helical pile product used
- The manufacturer's installation instructions for the specific helical pile product used

3 Definitions

The following definitions apply in this provision:

Application Class - the classification of a project by consequence of failure (Class 1, 2, or 3) under Clause 6, which determines the proportionate requirements that apply.

Authority having jurisdiction (AHJ) - the municipal body responsible for administering and enforcing the building code and this provision.

CCMC evaluation - an evaluation issued by the Canadian Construction Materials Centre confirming that a helical pile product conforms to stated conditions and limitations of use, identified by a CCMC registry number.

Engineer of record (EOR) - the professional engineer, licensed in the applicable province or territory, responsible for the design of the structure that the helical piles support.

Field review - review of the installed work by a professional engineer, in general conformance with the field review provisions of the governing provincial code, to ascertain whether the work substantially conforms to the design.

Geotechnical engineer - a professional engineer, licensed in the applicable province or territory, responsible for the site-specific geotechnical report and the geotechnical parameters used in pile design.

Helical pile - a steel shaft with one or more helical bearing plates that is rotated into the ground to support axial and, where designed, lateral loads; also referred to as a screw pile or auger-installed steel pile.

Installation torque - the torque measured during installation, used as the production verification of capacity in accordance with the applicable CCMC evaluation or engineering design.

Pile design engineer - the professional engineer responsible for the design of the helical piles and the preparation of sealed pile design documentation; may be the same person as the engineer of record where the governing code permits.

Site-specific geotechnical report - a report prepared by a geotechnical engineer addressing subsurface conditions, design parameters, and corrosion potential at the project site.

Special inspection - inspection of the installation by a qualified inspector or inspection agency engaged for that purpose and independent of the installing contractor, where a municipality adopts an independent-inspection verification model in place of engineer field review.

4 Professional Responsibility

4.1 A permit application for a helical pile foundation under this provision shall identify, by name and seal, the professional engineers responsible for each of the following functions. One engineer may hold more than one role where the governing provincial code permits.

4.2 Allocation of responsibility

(a) Geotechnical: the geotechnical engineer is responsible for the site-specific geotechnical report, including subsurface characterization, geotechnical design parameters, and an assessment of soil corrosivity.

(b) Pile design: the pile design engineer is responsible for the selection, capacity, number, spacing, and configuration of the helical piles, and for the sealed pile design documentation, including the minimum installation torque corresponding to the design capacity.

(c) Structure: the engineer of record is responsible for the loads and reactions delivered to the foundation, including ultimate limit state and serviceability limit state reactions, and for confirming that the pile design is compatible with the structure.

(d) Field review: a professional engineer is responsible for field review of the installation in general conformance with the governing provincial code, and for the final installation report under Clause 8.

4.3 The permit application shall state which engineer holds each role. Where a single engineer holds multiple roles, this shall be stated expressly. The objective is that no required function is left unassigned.

> ***Note:*** *Clear allocation of responsibility is the single most valuable element of a helical pile permitting framework. The most common source of dispute in practice is uncertainty over which seal covers which function. Stating the allocation on the application removes that ambiguity at the outset.*

5 Product Acceptance Basis

5.1 The helical pile product used on a project under this provision shall be accepted on one of the following bases:

(a) a valid CCMC evaluation, with the product bearing its CCMC registry number and model identification, installed within the conditions and limitations of that evaluation; or

(b) for a product without a CCMC evaluation, including specialty or high-capacity systems, a professional engineering evaluation in which the pile design engineer certifies the capacity basis, supported as applicable by load testing in accordance with ASTM D1143/D3689/D3966 and by an assessment of soil suitability, with the relevant provincial code clauses cited.

5.2 A manufacturer's statement of capacity, on its own, is not a sufficient basis for product acceptance under this provision. Acceptance shall rest on a CCMC evaluation or on sealed professional engineering certification as described in Clause 5.1.

> ***Note:*** *This two-path approach mirrors the most developed Canadian residential frameworks: the CCMC evaluation is the normal basis, and a sealed professional engineering pathway handles non-evaluated and specialty products so that the absence of a CCMC listing does not become a gap in the requirements.*

6 Application Classes and Proportionate Requirements

6.1 The requirements of this provision shall be proportionate to the consequence of failure of the structure the helical piles support. A municipality adopting this provision shall assign each application to one of the three Application Classes in Table 1, consistent with the consequence-based classification used across the PileConnect standards series.

Table 1 - Application Classes by consequence of failure

Application Class	Typical applications	Required submittals and verification
Class 1 (low consequence)	Uncovered decks, ramps, accessory and ancillary structures, and single-storey additions, at or below the low pile-load threshold [e.g. 22 kN / 5,000 lb per pile], with no significant lateral or moment demand.	The Class 1 baseline of Clause 6.4: product acceptance (Clause 5), sealed plans, torque records (Clause 8.4), and disclosure (Clause 10). No site-specific geotechnical report and no full field review. Exempt by class; the Clause 9 waiver does not apply.
Class 2 (ordinary consequence)	Houses, low-rise dwellings, dwelling additions and underpinning, and comparable occupancies.	Full submittals under Clause 7, including site-specific geotechnical report (subject to the Clause 9 waiver), sealed pile design, structural reactions, field review, and sealed final installation report under Clause 8.
Class 3 (high consequence)	Commercial and industrial buildings; telecommunication; transmission and distribution; essential and high-importance facilities; any foundation designed to resist significant lateral load or moment; and any site with known or suspected geohazards.	Full submittals under Clause 7, a site-specific geotechnical report with NO waiver available, and full or continuous field review. Where the product evaluation does not cover the structure type, the project defaults to Class 3.

6.2 Where the correct Application Class is uncertain, or where the product evaluation does not cover the structure type, the higher class shall apply, defaulting to Class 3 where consequence of failure is high. A municipality may set additional or more stringent requirements within any class.

6.3 The low pile-load threshold for Class 1 is a value the municipality confirms against its provincial code and local housing stock. Class 1 is limited to structures that are not life-safety critical and are not normally occupied; a pile supporting a normally occupied dwelling is Class 2 or higher regardless of pile load. For the purposes of this clause, a normally occupied structure includes any building intended for residential use, whether seasonal or year-round, including secondary suites, garden suites, and detached dwellings.

6.4 Class 1 baseline requirements

6.4.1 A Class 1 application requires only the following, and is exempt by class from the site-specific geotechnical report, the full submittals of Clause 7, the verification models of Clause 8.5, and the sealed final installation report of Clause 8.6:

(a) product acceptance under Clause 5;

(b) sealed plans showing the pile layout, design capacities, and the minimum installation torque;

(c) installation torque records under Clause 8.4;

(d) the disclosure required under Clause 10; and

(e) corrosion protection as provided for Class 1 in Clause 8.3.2.

6.4.2 Verification of a Class 1 application is satisfied by the installation torque records. A municipality may, at its option, require periodic observation by a professional engineer or a sealed final installation report for Class 1 work, but neither is required by this provision. Because Class 1 is exempt by class, the Clause 9 waiver does not apply to it.

Note: *Scaling requirements to consequence of failure, rather than to pile load alone, is what keeps the framework proportionate and aligns it with the rest of the PileConnect series. A deck on lightly loaded piles should not carry the same package as a hospital foundation. The Class 1 occupancy limit in 6.3 closes the gap that would otherwise let a high-load pile under a dwelling fall into the lightest class, and the explicit baseline in 6.4 keeps Class 1 genuinely light rather than routing it through the heavier waiver conditions of Clause 9.*

7 Submittal Requirements

7.1 For applications in Class 2 and Class 3, the following shall be submitted with the permit application, subject only to the waiver available under Clause 9. For Class 1 applications, the product acceptance basis and sealed plans of Clause 6 apply, and the items below apply only to the extent the municipality requires them.

7.2 Site-specific geotechnical report

7.2.1 A site-specific geotechnical report, sealed by the geotechnical engineer, addressing subsurface conditions, the geotechnical design parameters used for the piles, and an assessment of soil corrosivity. The report shall identify whether corrosion protection beyond the default of Clause 8 is required, or whether reduced protection is justified.

7.3 Sealed pile design documentation

7.3.1 Sealed drawings and supporting documentation prepared by the pile design engineer, stating the manufacturer and model, the CCMC registry number or the engineering evaluation basis, the design capacities (axial compression, axial tension, lateral, and moment as applicable), the pile layout, and the minimum design installation torque corresponding to the design capacity.

7.4 Structural reactions

7.4.1 The ultimate limit state and serviceability limit state reactions delivered to the foundation, provided by or reconciled with the engineer of record, demonstrating a complete load path from the structure to the piles.

7.5 Insurance evidence

7.5.1 Where the municipality requires it, evidence of the professional liability insurance of the engineers undertaking the design and field review functions.

Note: *The insurance-evidence requirement reflects the practice of at least one reviewed Canadian jurisdiction and is offered as an option a municipality may include or omit.*

8 Installation, Verification, and Close-Out

8.1 Installer qualification

8.1.1 Helical pile installation shall be performed by an installer certified by the product manufacturer for the product being installed, carrying a verifiable certification credential (such as a CCMC-associated installer card) where one applies. A municipality may accept a documented equivalent experience standard where no manufacturer certification applies.

8.2 Welding

8.2.1 Steel shall conform to CSA G40.20/G40.21 or an accepted equivalent. Field and shop welding shall conform to CSA W59 and shall be performed by a fabricator or welder certified under CSA W47.1 (CWB certification). Pile design shall be in accordance with CSA S16.

8.3 Corrosion protection

8.3.1 For Class 2 and Class 3 applications, steel helical piles shall be protected against corrosion by hot dip galvanizing in accordance with CSA G164 or ASTM A123, to a minimum coating of [610 g/m2], or by an equivalent protection system justified by the engineer. Where the geotechnical engineer or pile design engineer documents non-corrosive site conditions, this protection may be reduced or omitted with documented justification.

8.3.2 For Class 1 accessory and ancillary structures, uncoated piles are permitted where the geotechnical engineer or pile design engineer documents either non-corrosive site conditions or a limited design life and consequence consistent with the structure served.

8.4 Installation torque records

8.4.1 Installation torque shall be recorded for each pile, including torque versus depth over the final length of installation and the final installation torque, in accordance with the applicable CCMC evaluation or the pile design. The achieved torque shall meet or exceed the minimum design installation torque stated on the sealed drawings.

8.4.2 Installation torque shall be measured by a calibrated instrument in accordance with the applicable CCMC evaluation or, where no measurement method is specified, by a method approved by the pile design engineer and documented in the installation records.

8.5 Verification

8.5.1 For Class 2 and Class 3 applications, the installation shall be verified under one of two models, and the authority having jurisdiction shall select a single model for adoption rather than requiring both. Class 1 verification is governed by Clause 6.4.

(a) engineer field review, in general conformance with the field review provisions of the governing provincial code, performed by a professional engineer; or

(b) independent special inspection, performed by a qualified inspector or inspection agency engaged for that purpose.

8.5.2 Under either model, the verifying engineer or inspector shall be independent of the installing contractor. For Class 2 applications, verification shall be by field review at the stages appropriate to the work, in general conformance with the governing provincial code. For Class 3 applications, verification shall be full or continuous rather than periodic.

8.6 Final installation report and close-out

8.6.1 For Class 2 and Class 3 applications, before final approval, a sealed final installation report shall be submitted, recording for each pile the type and model, the installed depth, the achieved installation torque, the achieved or verified capacity basis, any deviations from the design and their disposition, and a conformity statement by the reviewing engineer that the installed work substantially conforms to the design and to this provision. For Class 1 applications, the installation torque records of Clause 8.4 satisfy the close-out requirement unless the municipality requires more under Clause 6.4.2.

Note: *Verification reflects the principal Canada-United States divergence found in the source review: Canadian practice generally relies on engineer field review by a sealing engineer, while some jurisdictions use independent third-party special inspection. This provision adopts the engineer-field-review model as the Canadian norm but expressly permits the special-inspection alternative, so long as the verifier is independent of the installer.*

9 Risk-Based Waiver of the Geotechnical Report for Class 2

9.1 A municipality may permit the site-specific geotechnical report of Clause 7.2, and the associated full field review, to be waived for a Class 2 application only where all of the following conditions are met. Class 1 applications are exempt from these requirements by class under Clause 6.4 and do not use this waiver. The waiver is not available for Class 3 applications. This waiver does not alter the product acceptance, torque documentation, or close-out requirements.

(a) the product has a valid CCMC evaluation covering the intended use and soil conditions;

(b) the piles carry axial load only, with no design lateral or moment demand;

(c) the site is not within a mapped landslide, flood, or other geologic hazard area designated by the municipality;

(d) the site is not known or suspected to contain soft, organic, fill, or otherwise problematic soils that would require engineering review;

(e) the design capacity is within the limits established by the CCMC evaluation;

(f) the minimum installation torque corresponding to the design capacity is stated on the sealed drawings;

(g) a professional engineer provides periodic observation of the installation in place of full field review; and

(h) a sealed final installation report under Clause 8.6 is provided confirming the achieved torque and capacity.

9.2 If any condition in Clause 9.1 is not met, the geotechnical report and full field review requirements apply. A municipality may decline to offer this waiver, or may add conditions to it.

9.3 For the purposes of Clause 9.1(d), knowledge or reasonable suspicion of problematic soils is assessed from the perspective of a competent professional engineer familiar with local soil conditions, and the applicant bears responsibility for disclosing any known or apparent site conditions. The authority having jurisdiction is entitled to rely on that disclosure.

Note: *This structured waiver is adapted from the strongest single mechanism identified in the source review: a defined, condition-based off-ramp that states exactly when the geotechnical report and continuous review may responsibly be omitted, rather than leaving the decision to unguided discretion. It gives applicants a predictable path for genuinely low-risk work while protecting the cases that need full scrutiny.*

10 Disclosure on Quotations, Drawings, and Submissions

10.1 Every permit drawing and submission for a helical pile foundation under this provision shall state, in one legible place:

(a) the pile product and model, and its acceptance basis (the CCMC registry number, or the basis of the sealed engineering evaluation under Clause 5);

(b) the capacity basis for the design;

(c) the verification model that will apply (engineer field review or independent special inspection under Clause 8.5); and

(d) the Application Class assigned under Clause 6.

10.2 Every quotation for helical pile work should state the same information, to facilitate early clarity in the chain. A municipality cannot compel the content of a private commercial quotation, so this is a recommended practice rather than a permit requirement.

10.3 No substitution of the pile product, the capacity basis, or the Application Class shall be made after permit issuance without the written acceptance of the engineer of record.

> ***Note:*** *Disclosure is the central obligation that makes the rest of the provision legible to everyone in the chain: the owner, the contractor, the engineer of record, and the authority having jurisdiction. Stating the product, capacity basis, verification model, and Application Class in one place, and freezing them after permit issuance, is what prevents a quietly substituted product or a downgraded class from slipping through after approval. The disclosure on permit drawings and submissions is enforceable by the authority having jurisdiction; the same disclosure on quotations is recommended, because it gives the owner clarity before commitments are made, but it is not something a municipality can compel. This mirrors the disclosure obligations in the companion PileConnect standards.*

11 Model Adoption Language

11.1 A municipality may adopt this provision by reference using language substantially as follows. Bracketed items are to be completed by the municipality.

> *"Helical pile (screw pile) foundations within [Municipality] shall be designed, accepted, installed, and verified in accordance with PCS 103:26, Model Municipal Provision for Helical Pile Permitting, as adopted and modified by [Municipality], together with the governing [Provincial] Building Code and the applicable CCMC evaluation. A permit application shall identify the responsible professional engineers under Clause 4, establish the product acceptance basis under Clause 5, provide the submittals required for the applicable Application Class under Clauses 6 and 7, disclose the information required under Clause 10, and result in a sealed final installation report under Clause 8 before final approval."*

11.2 A municipality may incorporate the provision text directly into its permit requirements rather than adopting by reference, and may modify the Application Class thresholds, the waiver, and the verification model to suit its provincial code and local conditions.

> ***Note:*** *Adoption by reference keeps the municipality's own document short and lets it inherit future editions; direct incorporation gives the municipality full control of the text. Either approach is acceptable. The objective is that Canadian municipalities converge toward a common, proportionate set of helical pile requirements rather than each authoring one in isolation.*

Annex A (Informative) Municipal Adoption Checklist

A municipality considering adoption of this provision may use the following checklist.

Before adoption

- Confirm the governing provincial or territorial building code and reconcile any conflicting requirement (the governing code prevails)
- Confirm the Class 1 low pile-load threshold against the provincial code and local housing stock, and confirm the Class 1 occupancy limit (Clause 6.3)
- Decide whether to require professional liability insurance evidence, and if so limit it to Class 2 and Class 3 (Clause 7.5)
- Select one verification model, engineer field review or independent special inspection, not both (Clause 8.5)
- Decide whether to offer the Class 2 risk-based geotechnical waiver, noting Class 1 is exempt by class and the waiver is never available for Class 3 (Clauses 6.4 and 9)
- Identify and map any local landslide, flood, or geologic hazard areas referenced by the waiver
- Obtain local legal and engineering review of the adopted text

On each application

- Application Class assigned by consequence of failure, defaulting to the higher class where uncertain (Clause 6)
- For Class 1: product acceptance, sealed plans, torque records, and disclosure only, with no geotechnical report or full field review (Clause 6.4)
- Responsible engineers identified by role and seal (Clause 4)
- Product acceptance basis established, CCMC evaluation or sealed engineering certification (Clause 5)
- Required submittals received for the Application Class (Clause 7)
- Disclosure of product, capacity basis, verification model, and Application Class provided (Clause 10)
- Installer qualification, welding, and class-appropriate corrosion protection confirmed (Clause 8)
- Installation torque records received, and for Class 2 and Class 3 a sealed final installation report before final approval (Clause 8.6)

Annex B (Informative) Basis and Source of the Provision

This annex records the basis for the model provision so that adopting authorities can see what it is built on.

B.1 Source of the synthesis

The provision was synthesized from a comparative review of published Canadian municipal helical pile guidance. The documents identified as most substantive, and therefore most influential on this provision, were the City of Winnipeg commercial bulletin (responsibility allocation among the geotechnical engineer, pile design engineer, and engineer of record) and housing bulletin (proportionate requirements scaled to the structure and the treatment of non-CCMC products), the Rocky View County guideline and the City of Brandon residential building regulation BLDREG-003 (the CCMC product basis together with CSA welding, corrosion, and certified-installer requirements), and the Regional District of North Okanagan submittal requirements (clear allocation of design, field review, and geotechnical roles, with insurance evidence). The three Application Classes restate that proportionality on a consequence-of-failure basis, consistent with the rest of the PileConnect standards series.

B.2 Anchoring to the Canadian framework

Each of those Canadian documents anchors to the CCMC technical bulletin for auger-installed steel pile foundations and to the CSA standard suite for steel, welding, and corrosion protection. This provision therefore adopts the same anchors rather than introducing an independent technical basis. It is intended to sit beneath the governing provincial code, not to supplant it.

B.3 The waiver mechanism

The structured, condition-based waiver of the geotechnical report in Clause 9 is adapted from the strongest single mechanism identified in the broader North American review underlying this work: a determination that defined the specific circumstances under which the geotechnical report and continuous inspection could responsibly be waived. The conditions have been expressed here in terms compatible with the CCMC framework and Canadian field-review practice.

B.4 Scope and limitations of the basis

The comparative review covered a representative rather than exhaustive sample of Canadian municipalities, weighted toward the Prairie provinces, where dedicated helical pile guidance is most developed. A number of provinces, including much of Ontario, Quebec, and Atlantic Canada, had little or no dedicated municipal helical pile guidance in the sample. This provision should therefore be read as a synthesis of leading Canadian practice offered for trial use and refinement, not as a definitive national standard. Municipalities are encouraged to confirm consistency with their provincial code and to submit comment through pileconnect.com so that future editions can broaden the basis.

B.5 Relationship to other PileConnect standards

This provision addresses the municipal permitting layer. It is complementary to PCS 102:26, which addresses installer qualification and quality assurance, and to PCS 101:26, which addresses pile shaft material. A municipality or engineer may reference these together, but each stands on its own and adoption of one does not require adoption of the others.