

Alberta Builders' Lien Act Update – Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act (Bill 62)

May 03, 2021

Background

In BLG's [October 23, 2020](#) and [November 4, 2020](#) articles, we discussed Bill 37, the Builders' Lien (Prompt Payment) Amendment Act, 2020 and its proposed amendments to the Alberta Builders' Lien Act (the Prompt Payment Amendment). In addition to changing the name of the Alberta Builders' Lien Act to the Prompt Payment and Construction Lien Act (the PPCLA), the Prompt Payment Amendment also contains new rules and adjudication procedures that will have a transformative impact on the construction industry in Alberta. The PPCLA is anticipated to come into force on July 21, 2021, although the regulations have not yet been released.

On April 8, 2021, Bill 62, the Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act (Bill 62) received its first reading in the Alberta legislature. Bill 62 contains important information and guidance on the adjudication provisions in the Prompt Payment Amendment, a key feature of the PPCLA. Most critically, Bill 62:

- outlines the application and scope of the PPCLA; and
- provides further definition to the adjudication provisions in the PPCLA.

Scope of the PPCLA

Bill 62 excludes construction projects involving the provincial government from the PPCLA, including projects involving crown corporations. Bill 62 also references other entities and agreements to be excluded from the PPCLA's scope. While Bill 62 states that the PPCLA will apply to "a prescribed class of professionals acting in a consultative capacity", the Government of Alberta has not yet published guidance or regulations about which professions would fall within this "prescribed class".

Adjudication

More importantly, Bill 62 makes significant changes to the adjudication provisions in the PPCLA (the Adjudication Process). Bill 62 stipulates that parties cannot use the Adjudication Process where a court action has been commenced or where the contract

is complete. As such, the Adjudication Process appears to be exclusively intended for disputes occurring during the execution of a project.

Completed projects

While these changes highlight the primary goal of the adjudication provisions of the PPCLA (the faster resolution of disputes during a construction project), they also create **uncertainty and potential for delay and inconsistent results**. When a project is “complete” is often a point of contention between parties in a construction dispute. Uncertainty stemming from whether a project is complete may result in more court applications, which could result in fewer disputes being subject to the Adjudication Process and create further delays. Notably, as drafted, warranty or remedial work that is usually completed close to or after project completion, may be excluded from the Adjudication Process altogether.

Court actions

Carving out construction disputes that are the subject of a court action may generate unintended consequences. For example, parties may be incentivized to commence court actions to avoid the Adjudication Process altogether in an attempt to ensure they are able to select the forum for the dispute. Further, there could be instances where a broad court action touches on the subject matter and potentially the same parties involved in an Adjudication Process. This raises the possibility of inconsistent results. Without more guidance from the Government of Alberta, the incentive to race to the courthouse and the potential for inconsistent results between courts and adjudication panels adds to the uncertainty that the adjudication provisions of the PPCLA will create.

Adjudication orders and judicial review

Prior to Bill 62, the PPCLA attempted to make adjudication decisions final by making **judicial review the only way to challenge an adjudicator’s decision**. To further reinforce the PPCLA’s adjudication provisions against delays associated with court involvement, the PPCLA makes adjudication decisions enforceable despite the filing of a **judicial review application**. **Bill 62 walks back the limits on the court’s ability to become involved** in a dispute that is subject to the Adjudication Process. Specifically, the order of an adjudicator stemming from a dispute will not be binding where:

- The Court makes an order in respect of the dispute;
- An application for judicial review of the determination is made by one of the parties;
- The parties proceed to arbitration by entering into a written agreement; or
- The parties settle the dispute by written agreement.

(The Exemptions)

In addition to raising serious questions about the strength of any order stemming from an Adjudication Process, the Exemptions also act as a bar to the registration (and enforcement) of an adjudication order. The Exemptions create significant uncertainty about how arbitration/mediation clauses, commonly found in construction contracts, will apply to the Adjudication Process. If a party commences an arbitration, are they barred

from using the adjudication provisions? If during the course of an Adjudication Process, one party seeks to activate the arbitration clause of their agreement, does this trigger one of the Exemptions? Moreover, do the Exemptions mean that, at any time, a party can make an application to the court in respect of a dispute? As drafted, the Exemptions may provide parties an avenue to engage the court even if they have failed to win the race to the courthouse.

Procedural guidance

Finally, Bill 62 includes mechanical and procedural provisions required to enforce an order stemming from the Adjudication Process. A party must register an adjudicator's order with the Clerk of the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta (the Clerk of the Court) and provide a written notice to the other party within 10 days from the date that the Clerk of the Court registers the adjudicator's order. Once the Clerk of the Court registers the adjudicator's order it has the same effect as a court order. Bill 62 also includes two important limitations dates that stipulate that an adjudicator's order cannot be registered:

- Two years after the order is issued; or
- Two years after the court has rendered a decision on an application for judicial review.

Conclusion

Bill 62 raises further uncertainty about the applicability of the PPCLA. As a result, we expect that additional changes in the form of further amendments or publication of draft regulations will be required to better frame the purpose and scope of the PPCLA.

We will continue to monitor the progress of Bill 37 and Bill 62 as both pieces of legislation receive further consideration by the Alberta legislature and provide updates as they become available. It remains clear that construction industry players, of all sizes, will need to take proactive steps to prepare for and mitigate against the uncertainty and new risks created by these reforms to the Alberta Builders' Lien Act.

By

[Rodney A. Smith](#), [Patricia L. Morrison](#), [Marin Leci](#), [Bill Woodhead](#)

Expertise

[Construction](#)

BLG | Canada's Law Firm

As the largest, truly full-service Canadian law firm, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (BLG) delivers practical legal advice for domestic and international clients across more practices and industries than any Canadian firm. With over 725 lawyers, intellectual property agents and other professionals, BLG serves the legal needs of businesses and institutions across Canada and beyond – from M&A and capital markets, to disputes, financing, and trademark & patent registration.

blg.com

BLG Offices

Calgary

Centennial Place, East Tower
520 3rd Avenue S.W.
Calgary, AB, Canada
T2P 0R3

T 403.232.9500
F 403.266.1395

Ottawa

World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street
Ottawa, ON, Canada
K1P 1J9

T 613.237.5160
F 613.230.8842

Vancouver

1200 Waterfront Centre
200 Burrard Street
Vancouver, BC, Canada
V7X 1T2

T 604.687.5744
F 604.687.1415

Montréal

1000 De La Gauchetière Street West
Suite 900
Montréal, QC, Canada
H3B 5H4

T 514.954.2555
F 514.879.9015

Toronto

Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower
22 Adelaide Street West
Toronto, ON, Canada
M5H 4E3

T 416.367.6000
F 416.367.6749

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to constitute legal advice, a complete statement of the law, or an opinion on any subject. No one should act upon it or refrain from acting without a thorough examination of the law after the facts of a specific situation are considered. You are urged to consult your legal adviser in cases of specific questions or concerns. BLG does not warrant or guarantee the accuracy, currency or completeness of this publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced without prior written permission of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. If this publication was sent to you by BLG and you do not wish to receive further publications from BLG, you may ask to remove your contact information from our mailing lists by emailing unsubscribe@blg.com or manage your subscription preferences at blg.com/MyPreferences. If you feel you have received this message in error please contact communications@blg.com. BLG's privacy policy for publications may be found at blg.com/en/privacy.

© 2024 Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP is an Ontario Limited Liability Partnership.