

NEW ZEALAND TIMBER PRESERVATION COUNCIL

Incorporated

PO Box 308, Wellington, New Zealand Ph: +64-4 473 5200 Fax: +64+4 473 6536 Email: inquiries@nztpc.co.nz Website: www.nztpc.co.nz

NEWSLETTER

Issue 18
July 2005

Circulate to:

G.M. Site Mgr Plant Mgr Plant Op Sales Mgr

TimberSaver

We are really concerned about the publicity and controversy that has arisen over TimberSaver T1.2.

To our mind this has been another bout of media frenzy that has done no good for the timber industry at all. Judging by the calls we have received in the office consumers and house owners are generally uneducated about the finer details of timber treatment. To them, treated timber is treated timber. Any negative publicity about a particular product is just viewed as a negative for treated timber generally.

Because it does not conform to the requirements of NZS3640:2003 TimberSaver product does not qualify for inclusion in our

WOODmark® programme. However, we can't believe that the Building Industry Authority (now Department of Building & Housing) would have accredited the product without rigorous trials and testing. After all the Authority had been under considerable fire for two years over the leaky home issue and they would surely have done everything in their power to guarantee there were not going to be any hiccups with TimberSaver.

To us the sensationalism that has occurred can only have reinforced prejudices against timber as a reliable, quality building material. Attacks on one treated timber product don't necessarily translate into increased sales for alternative treated timber products. Rather, the whole timber industry suffers.

Best Practice Guideline

We know it has taken longer than we initially thought but the Guideline is on the way. We expect to publish it late-August. There are just a few finishing touches to be signed off by the Committee supervising the revision.

In our last newsletter we invited all licensees to read the draft Guideline which was loaded on to our website www.nztpc.co.nz. We received a small number of comments for consideration.

The matter of holding times for CCA and LOSP are likely to be of greatest interest to licensees. The CCA requirement is based on a need to ensure environmental protection and the LOSP requirement is to minimise any health and safety effects. The relevant regulators in both cases (ERMA and OSH) are keenly aware of the issues and industry's responsibilities.

1

AS/NZS2843 – Design & Operation of Timber Treatment

A review of this standard is underway. The standard is complementary to the Best Practice Guideline and its requirements match those of the Guideline. Licensees should make themselves familiar with its provisions.

If you would like a copy please contact the TPC office.

Tank Certification

We held a meeting We held a meeting on 5 July 2005 to try and clarify for all time the exact requirements for tank certification.

Some matters clarified were:

- Treatment cylinders do need to be certified and inspected from both a health and safety and an environmental protection perspective.
- Critical dates are 31 March 2006 for completion of assessments and 31 March 2007 for compliance.

Issues that still require clarification include:

- Definitions and therefore requirements for working tanks – as distinct from concentrate storage tanks as ERMA imposes controls on hazardous substances in concentrate form and not diluted formulations.
- Degree of work required to certify pressure vessels – will depend on availability of information, specifically design drawings.
- Definition of "fit for purpose".

TPC is aiming to develop a short list of engineers who are qualified to certify tanks used in the timber treatment industry. We are wanting to ensure there is a uniform

requirement and there is consistency in the certification process across the country.

Another major concern is the certification of treatment cylinders recognising that some are quite old and haven't been inspected in recent years. These cylinders are also unlikely to have any manufacturers' drawings. In such cases the cost of certification could be quite horrendous. Our advice to all affected licensees is to ensure that you have the engineering drawings and specifications for your cylinders. It will make life a whole lot easier.

OSH have indicated that they will be taking a "strategic" approach to certification by which we think they will administer their responsibilities in a practical way and will not be "hard line" in the way they deal with the timber treatment industry. At the same time they are likely to be firm with their requirements. They have confirmed that there is no such thing as an "exemption" for treatment cylinders from the regulations.

We will be working with OSH and the engineering companies to ensure that compliance for treaters is as painless as possible.

LOSP Treaters Group

Earlier this year TPC formed an LOSP Treaters Group as a vehicle for discussing, considering and resolving various issues and common concerns facing the industry. We were very pleased to get 100% support for the formulation of the group from licensees who are LOSP treaters and also their total participation in the group's activities. So far the group has met twice and not only dealt with issues such as health and safety and standards but group members have also been able to discuss and bring themselves up-to-date with developments such as solvent recovery and recycling projects. In addition a link with the LOSP Treaters Association of Australia is being established so that we can foster greater co-operation and exchange of views across the two countries.

The next meeting of the group will be held on 12 September at the Wellesley, 2-8 Maginnity Street, Wellington.

We understand that a meeting of an alternative LOSP treaters group was held on 13 July in Rotorua with minor representation of treaters. We are concerned that the development of a splinter group such as this can cause confusion and be detrimental to the cause of the timber treatment industry.

There are 27 LOSP treaters in New Zealand of which 25 are participants in the TPC group.

CCA Update

ERMA New Zealand have confirmed to us that they do not intend to review or revise their position on the use of CCA treated timber at this stage in spite of the outcome of the APVMA revision.

It is good to see that our own Authority is standing firm in their original conclusions on the subject. One possible loop hole open to

New Zealand suppliers is that unless the Australian building authorities restrict it, there is nothing to prevent New Zealand from supplying say CCA decking into Australia. That is because the APVMA decision relates to the production of CCA treated timber not its use.

Food for though?

Australia

APPROVAL OF AZOLES

We understand from Charlie Herbert that the azole formulations for LOSP H3A and H3 applications are being assessed for approval.

Indications are that approval may not be too far away. We expect that this will be a good development for LOSP treaters exporting to Australia in that it will overcome concerns about the new tin retention levels.

We will advise as soon as we hear because treaters who will be looking to supply LOSP azole treated timber into Australia will need to register with Forestry NSW and DPI Queensland.

TIN

NSW and Queensland are going their separate ways as far as adoption of the elevated tin retentions for LOSP H3 are concerned.

Our information is that Queensland is not about to adopt the elevated tin requirement in their Timber Utilisation and Marketing Act (TMA) until issues to do with health and safety have been resolved.

On the other hand NSW is proceeding towards adoption of the new levels following consultations over the transition period required to run out of existing stocks treated to the old standard. Data from a survey conducted by TABMA has been collated and will shortly be submitted to Charlie Herbert. Indications are that a ten month transition is required although whether Forestry NSW agree remains to be seen.

Publicity

We continue We continue to market the WOODmark® brand, in particular targeting those in the business of specifying and using treated timber. Next month we will be exhibiting at the annual conference of the **Frame & Truss Manufacturers Association** being held.

The Frame & Truss industry is another critical group which we need to ensure completely understands the WOODmark® programme and the benefits it brings to them in terms of their responsibilities and potential liabilities vis-à-vis timber durability.

During May we conducted a **roadshow** in combination with Verified Timber through the length of the country at 14 venues to promote WOODmark® to territorial authorities, frame & truss manufacturers, architects, engineers, builders and merchants. This follows on from representation at the **Annual BOINZ Conference** held in New Plymouth.

Although attendances were mixed there was certainly a lot of interest in treated timber and its identification and uses. It all pointed to a need to maintain a programme of education and information. At an individual level licensees are in a position to do their bit towards educating their customers about the correct use of treated timber. We have material to assist so if you have any need for brochures, information sheets, etc please contact the TPC office. We would be pleased to assist.

If you are conducting any newspaper or other print advertising, remember to incorporate the WOODmark® logo. This helps to keep to the brand out in the public eye. We can provide your newspaper with the necessary artwork to use. A recent example was an advert placed by John Larsen of Larsen Sawmilling in the Gisborne Herald in which the WOODmark® logo featured prominently. Well done John, thanks for your support.

www.nztpc.co.nz

Our website now has a complete range of information regarding timber treatment issues.

Recently we have just included a HSNO Section which outlines all updated requirement relevant to timber preservative chemicals.

All news, all events and all publications will be posted via our website. Please feel free to contact us should you think any additional information would be useful.

Regards

Kevin Hing