

Occupational Health & Safety Committee Training BCFED Health & Safety PREVENTION THROUGH EDUCATION

The BCFED Health & Safety Centre is the largest provider of Joint Occupational Health & Safety Committee training in British Columbia. We are funded by WorkSafeBC to provide quality, cost-effective, accessible OH&S Committee training across all regions of the province. Anyone interested can take our courses.

> To learn more about us, view our course descriptions or register for a course, please visit healthandsafetybc.ca.

2015 Course Schedule	OH&S Part 1	OH&S Part 2	Incident Investigations	Strains, Aches & Pains (Ergonomics)	Improving Committee Effectiveness	Stress in the Workplace	Supervisor Responsibilities in OH&S	Improving Return to Work Outcomes	Bullying & Harassment	Emergency Preparedness	Violence in the Workplace	Occupational Hygiene Monitoring	Researching Workplace Health Hazards	Risk Assessment *NEW*	Women's Health & Safety in the Workplace *NEW*
Lower Mainland	5-May	6-May	7-May		7-May	7-May	8-May	5-May	6-May	8-May	4-May			6-May	8-Mav
New Westminster	8-Dec	10-Dec	15-Dec	10-Dec	17-May	9-Dec	17-Dec	8-Dec	16-Dec	11-Dec	3-Dec	1-Dec	2-Dec	16-Dec	8-May 15-Dec
Surrey	5-Oct	14-Oct	7-Oct	16-Oct	9-Oct	8-Oct	16-Oct	9-Oct	14-Oct	9-Oct	7-Oct	1-Dec	Z-Dec	6-Oct	15-Dec 15-Oct
Sarrey	17-Mar	11 000	7 000	10 000	3 000	0 000	10 000	3 000	11000	3 000	7 000			0 000	13 000
Vancouver	11-Jun			27-Feb				19-Mar	18-Mar						
Whistler	7-Jan	8-Jan		27-Feb											
BC North					ı			I	l			1			
Fort St. John	29-Sep	30-Sep	1-Oct		30-Sep	29-Sep	29-Sep	1-Oct	30-Sep		2-Oct			1-Oct	
Dawson Creek	8-Apr				10-Apr				9-Apr						
Mackenzie	15-Oct	16-Oct			·			16-Oct	15-Oct						
Prince George	23-Jun	25-Jun	25-Jun	25-Jun	28-May	27-May	26-May	23-Jun	24-Jun	24-Jun	28-May	24-Jun		27-May	26-May
Kitimat	15-Sep	16-Sep	17-Sep	18-Sep	16-Sep	17-Sep		15-Sep	16-Sep			17-Sep		15-Sep	18-Sep
Prince Rupert	14-Apr		15-Apr		16-Apr	16-Apr		15-Apr	14-Apr				A		
Terrace	25-May	26-May								100		1/2			
Smithers	20-May	21-May	22-May		20-May		20-May	22-May	21-May		Don't se	e your	Comm	unity o	n
Fort Nelson	17-Mar			18-Mar						0	ur publ	ic sched	dule? Ir	itereste	ed
Fraser Valley											in in-ho	use tra	ining o	ptions	?
Abbotsford	29-Apr	30-Apr	1-May	26-Feb	29-Apr		30-Apr	1-May	30-Apr		If you h	iave a n	ninimu	m of 10	,
Okanagan				1	ı		•	1	1		peopl	e, we ca	in resp	ona to	
Penticton	9-Jun	8-Jun									С	ustom i	reques	lS.	
Vernon	10-Jun	11-Jun													
Kelowna	24-Nov	25-Nov	26-Nov	26-Nov	25-Nov	18-Nov	24-Nov	24-Nov	25-Nov	17-Nov	19-Nov	26-Nov		26-Nov	20-Nov
Kootenays		•			1		1	1	1	1					
Golden	26-Feb			27-Feb								1			
Castlegar	2-Jun	3-Jun	4-Jun		3-Jun	5-Jun	2-Jun	2-Jun	3-Jun	3-Jun	4-Jun			4-Jun	
Cranbrook	22-Sep	23-Sep	24-Sep	10-Sep	24-Sep	9-Sep	23-Sep	23-Sep	24-Sep	8-Sep	25-Sep			21-Sep	
Vancouver Island	04.0			1	22.0		1	22.0	04.0.1		1	1		1	
Campbell River	21-Oct	40.14	40.11	10.11	22-Oct		. =	22-Oct	21-Oct					10.11	
Nanaimo	12-May	13-May	12-May	12-May	14-May	15-May	15-May	13-May	14-May		14-May			13-May	
Vieterie	9-Jun	10-Jun	E Nov	27 505	12 Na.	12 Na::	12 No.	10 No.	C No:	2 Na	E New			O Nov	10 No.
Victoria Interior	3-Nov	4-Nov	5-Nov	27-Feb	12-Nov	12-Nov	13-Nov	10-Nov	6-Nov	3-Nov	5-Nov			9-Nov	10-Nov
Williams Lake	31-Mar	1-Apr			31-Mar				1-Apr						
Kamloops	27-Oct	28-Oct	29-Oct		31-Mar	29-Oct	28-Oct	27-Oct	28-Oct		30. Oct			29-Oct	
Quesnel	27-0ct 16-Jun	28-Oct 17-Jun	29-Oct 18-Jun		16-Jun	29-000	20-UCT	27-Oct 17-Jun	28-Oct		30-Oct			29-00	
Sunshine Coast	10-Juli	17-Jun	10-Juli		10-Juli		<u> </u>	17-Juil	10-Juij		l				
Powell River	23-Apr				24-Apr				24-Apr			23-Apr			
Gibsons	9-Sep				10-Sep				9-Sep		10-Sep	23-Ahi			
SIIDSUIS	a-seb				10-2eb				9-2eb		10-2eb				

B.C. Federation BCFED of Labour (CLC)

Course cost: \$115 per person

All courses are eight hours in length from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm. Course dates and offerings are subject to change, please check healthandsafetybc.ca for updates.



200-5118 Joyce Street (by Joyce Skytrain) Vancouver BC V5R 4H1 Phone: 604.430.1421





Features

Ask an Officer Tips for preventing rollovers

Kelowna-based WorkSafeBC occupational safety officer Steven Marino pitches the importance of proper training in the safe use of farm equipment.

By Gord Woodward

On the Cover Return to work a safer prospect

Keith Plumbing and Heating crews are recovering from their injuries on the job through a new and improved company-wide program.

By Helena Bryan

Departments

- 4 | From the editor
- 12 | WorkSafeBC update
- 20 | What's wrong: you tell us
- 23 | Policy notes
- 24 | Penalties

Safety Talks Smart phones take a back seat

Safe working drivers strive for minimal distractions on the road.

By Lynn Welburn

Centre Pullouts

Day of Mourning

—Events pay tribute to 173 fallen workers during 2014

What's wrong with this photo?

—Ski hill staff on a slippery slope

On the front cover: (From left to right), WorkSafeBC account manager Cheryl Nomura chats with injury management coordinator Derek Costa and construction manager Kevin Collier of North Vancouver's Keith Plumbing and Heating Co. Ltd. about the company's return-to-work successes in partnership with WorkSafeBC.

Safer workplaces start with worker buy-in

Health and safety measures vary from workplace to workplace. But the successful ones share one crucial feature — worker input.

Whether it's customized gear or equipment or a new process or system, the best way to get buy-in — as well as long-term results — is to consult with the people who know their jobs best.

Keith Plumbing and Heating recognized this basic principle when it asked for feedback and suggestions from its own employees to create effective alternative duties for its new return-to-work program (see page 7). Rimex Supply also understood its importance when it asked workers to come up with a safer way to reduce the risks of musculoskeletal injuries while lifting and moving 50-kg lock rings (see page 12).

Not all companies take the time to involve workers in the health and safety initiatives designed to protect them. But those that do benefit from improved health and safety, lower premiums, and higher morale.

Ultimately, it's a small investment in time and energy for priceless returns.



Editor-in-chief

WorkSafe

Editor-in-chief: Terence Little | Managing editor: Dana Tye Rally

Assistant editors: Laine Dalby and Monika Wierzbicki

Graphic designers: Graham Coulthard

Photographer: Khalid Hawe | Photo safety advisor: Andrew Lim

WorkSafe Magazine is published by the WorkSafeBC (Workers' Compensation Board of B.C.) Communications department to educate workers and employers about injury and disease prevention, promote positive safety culture, and provide links to WorkSafeBC resources for safer workplaces.

Disclaimer WorkSafeBC strives for accuracy; however, the information contained within WorkSafe Magazine does not take the place of professional occupational health and safety advice. WorkSafeBC does not warrant the accuracy of any of the information contained in this publication. WorkSafe Magazine and WorkSafeBC disclaim responsibility for any reader's use of the published information and materials contained in this publication. WorkSafeBC does not warrant or make any representations concerning the accuracy, likely results, or reliability of the contents of the advertisements, claims made therein, or the products advertised in WorkSafe Magazine. WorkSafeBC does not warrant that any products advertised meet any required certification under any law or regulation, nor that any advertiser meets the certification requirements of any bodies governing the advertised activity.

WorkSafe Magazine is published six times a year by WorkSafeBC. The yearly issues include January/February, March/April, May/June, July/August, September/October, and November/December. The magazine can be viewed online at worksafemagazine.com.

Contact the magazine Email: Dana.TyeRally@worksafebc.com. Telephone: Editorial 604.232.7194. Subscriptions 604.231.8690. Mailing address: WorkSafe Magazine, PO Box 5350 Station Terminal, Vancouver, B.C. V6B 5L5. Courier: WorkSafeBC Communications, 6951 Westminster Highway, Richmond, B.C. V7C 1C6.

Subscriptions To start or stop a free subscription to WorkSafe Magazine, or to update mailing information, follow the "Subscribe" link on our website at worksafemagazine.com. You can also email worksafemagazine@worksafebc.com or call 604.231.8690.

Editorial enquiries/feedback If you'd like to comment on an article or make a suggestion, please email Dana.TyeRally@worksafebc.com.

Advertising For information about advertising your product or service in WorkSafe Magazine, please contact OnTrack Media at 604.639.7763 or worksafebc@ontrackco.com.

Shannon Ward OnTrack Media

Copyright The contents of this magazine are protected by copyright and may be used for non-commercial purposes only. All other rights are reserved and commercial use is prohibited. To make any use of this material, you must first obtain written authorization from WorkSafeBC. Please email the details of your request to Dana.TyeRally@worksafebc.com. WorkSafeBC™ is a registered trademark of the Workers' Compensation Board of B.C.

WORK SAFE BC







Contributors



Helena Bryan

North Vancouver writer Helen Bryan has written for WorkSafe Magazine for more than a decade.



Jeff Dewsbury

Langley writer Jeff Dewsbury's work has appeared in Outdoor Canada, Faith Today, Boys' Life, and more.



Helen Plischke

Metro Vancouver writer and editor Helen Plischke produces newspaper and magazine articles and technical documents.



Lynn Welburn

Lynn Welburn is a former Vancouver Island writer and photographer with a journalism background.



Gord Woodward

Gord Woodward is based in Nanaimo and writes for a variety of magazines and websites.

Ask an Officer

Cultivate the safe use of farm equipment



Steven Marino WorkSafeBC occupational safety officer

Region: Kelowna Years on the job: 7

As part of our ongoing effort to support health and safety education in agriculture, we talked with WorkSafeBC occupational safety officer Steven Marino about equipment safety on farms and ranches.

Q. Our family farm is small and independently run. Do we really have that many safety issues?

A. Farms and ranches of all sizes contain many potential hazards. These can be objects, locations, or conditions. As an industrial workplace, you have to protect your workers. Since 2007, close to 1,200 workers have been seriously injured on B.C. farms and ranches — 14 of these workers died.

Q. What's the biggest safety hazard on a farm or ranch?

A. Most of the serious injuries come from mobile equipment. Your chances of being killed are higher while driving your tractor than during any other activity. Tractor rollovers and equipment entanglements account for a tragic number of deaths and serious injuries every year.

Q. How can I reduce risks when using my equipment?

A. First, make sure your equipment is suitable for the work you're doing. Tractors tip very easily, so they're dangerous on sloped ground. Second, don't just jump on the machine and go. Always do a pre-shift inspection. Check the brakes, clutch, and lighting. Make sure all implements and safety gear are properly attached and working. And third, do regular maintenance. Tractors are the workhorses of a farm and require regularly scheduled and recorded maintenance.

When you're on the machine, be safety conscious. Don't ever take off the rollover protective structure. Maintain and use the guards on power take-offs, and wear tight-fitting clothing to reduce the chances of getting entangled in the external shaft. Don't climb inside or on top of any of the implements without first powering them down and shutting them off.

Q. My family and workers have been with me for years. Why train them?

A. Whether workers are new or experienced, they all require proper safety training and ongoing education. Not everybody is aware of what could happen, and as the business owner it's your legal responsibility to be duly diligent and protect your workers. Think of safety training as part of your business system.

Q. How do I get started on a safety plan?

A. Do a workplace assessment. I like to suggest you draw a map of your property. Identify areas where there's a chance of equipment rollover. Select the appropriate equipment for each job. Assess and record the competency of all your workers for each piece of equipment, and require everyone to use the manufacturers' manuals, which list do's and don'ts for safe operation.

Q. Where can I get help in making my farm or ranch safer?

A. You can easily access the following free resources:

WorkSafeBC's Safety at Work Centre provides videos, checklists, and safety tips specific to agriculture at www2.worksafebc.com/Portals/ Agriculture/Home.asp

The Farm and Ranch Safety and Health Association (FARSHA) offers on-site safety training. Call 1.877.533.1789 for information. Its website provides free downloads of booklets, posters, and decals at farsha.bc.ca/resources/ publicationsdecals

Looking for answers to your specific health and safety questions in WorkSafe Magazine? Send them to Dana.TyeRally@worksafebc.com and we'll consider including them in our next Ask an Officer feature.

•

WorkSafeBC prevention officers cannot and do not provide advice on specific cases or issues referenced in this article. WorkSafeBC and WorkSafe Magazine disclaim responsibility for any reliance on this information, which is provided for readers' general education only. For more specific information on prevention matters, contact the WorkSafeBC prevention line at 604.276.3100 or toll-free at 1.888.621.7233.





back from injury

By Helena Bryan

Stepping outside the box can be unsettling, but it's often worth the risk.

Just ask North Vancouver-based Keith Plumbing and Heating Co. Ltd., which recently revamped its standard return-to-work program according to current best practices for injury management and recovery at work.

That willingness to change things has already paid off for the company and its 200 or so employees, mostly plumbers, pipefitters, and shop workers.

Barely a year after the revamp, Keith Plumbing and Heating's tracking indicates they've seen a 66-percent reduction in employees' total workdays lost due to illness or injury, as well as a 60-percent decrease in the average number of employee workdays lost per lost-time incident. This has resulted in improved morale and higher employee retention rates, as well as lower premiums for the company.

"This is a big deal," says Derek Costa, project manager for Keith Plumbing and Heating, "particularly for a company in the construction industry where multiple jobsites — often far apart — make it very challenging to manage return-to-work placements."

In addition to the bottom-line benefits, the company also earned a Vancouver Regional Construction Association Award of Excellence for Construction Workplace Health and Safety Innovation.

Streamlining speeds recovery time

In early 2013, Keith Plumbing and Heating met with WorkSafeBC account manager Cheryl Nomura to review their performance in injury prevention and injury management. The company's senior management then made a commitment toward improving these processes. "Health and safety and injury management is an ongoing priority," Costa says.

"We're always striving for zero incidents through collaborative incident investigations, for example. We're trying to identify the root causes of injuries and allow us to come up with corrective measures," he says. "But when injuries do happen, we need to manage them effectively."

So WorkSafeBC's account management consulting team developed an improvement plan, beginning with a three-month working relationship with WorkSafeBC

return-to-work specialist-nurse Rupel Amershi to create and implement a new recover-at-work program.

According to a wealth of research, a timely and safe return to work can help injured employees recover faster. In fact, "the best thing for soft-tissue injuries like sprains and strains is staying active," Amershi says.

Yet traditional return-to-work programs, like the one Keith Plumbing and Heating had in place, require employers to complete multiple time-consuming documents and steps to get an injured employee back on the job. "It was a convoluted process and could take days or even weeks to complete," Costa says.

With the help of the WorkSafeBC account management team, and Amershi's ongoing consultation, the company's new program is much more streamlined. "Our goal, if possible, is to get our employees safely back to work the next day, with zero lost time," Costa says.

Making that happen didn't just mean cutting down on the paperwork, however. It also meant doing some hefty workplace analysis up front, and required the expertise of Amershi.

In March 2014, Amershi met with Costa to do an in-depth assessment of the company's return-to-work program. "It was a traditional, reactive system without an adequate list of alternative duties and no clear roles and responsibilities for staff," Amershi says.

After completing job-site experiments and assessing a range of work tasks, Amershi and Costa compiled injury-specific, return-to-work plans to provide to injured employees before they saw a physician. "The employer can take more ownership of the process by presenting the worker with suitable and appropriate options for modified work," Amershi says.

To address the issue of unclear roles and responsibilities, Amershi recommended that Keith Plumbing and Heating train its supervisors and foremen to be responsible for on-site return-to-work management. Since then, the company has taught all of its supervisors to use the new system and plans to retrain them annually. In addition, it's educated all of its employees on the intent and benefits of the new program.

Now, when a worker suffers a back sprain, for example, the on-site supervisor can quickly select a

YOW Canada Inc. **Health and Safety Training Online**



www.yowcanada.com 1.866.688.2845 info@yowcanada.com

Courses include: **WHMIS** Fall Protection Workplace Violence & Harassment and many more! Visit our website for a full list of courses and products available.

Safety Compliance Made Easy!



modified work plan tailored to the injury, providing a detailed description of modified duties, job demands, and special accommodations, such as a sit/stand stool, rest breaks, and self-paced work. "It's the only form a doctor needs to see," Costa says. "And it's clear that we've put a lot of thought and effort into it already. We can then move forward with the plan much sooner."

Admittedly, compiling the injury-specific work plans was labour-intensive, Costa says, but the pain was short term. "And the benefits — cost savings, reduced recovery times, and higher morale — will continue well into the future."

WorkSafeBC occupational hygiene officer Steve Tye values the fact that this company remains committed to its prevention goals — an important consideration in any plan for improving return-to-work programs.

"When you implement health and safety systems to prevent worker injuries, you're helping to make return-to-work programs redundant," he says.

"But sometimes workers get hurt in spite of all the best health and safety measures. And, having an effective return-to-work program in place benefits everyone in the workplace."

Return-to-work program need a tune-up?

Derek Costa, project manager for Keith Plumbing and Heating Co. Ltd., offers the following five tips for companies wanting to improve return-to-work programs:

- Don't be shy about getting the support of WorkSafeBC's Industry and Labour Services' account management team. "They have a wealth of clinical and policy knowledge."
- Designate one person to lead the program and establish internal and external communications.
- Involve supervisors. They are often the first line of contact with workers, particularly in the construction industry. And be sure to provide adequate training.
- When developing alternative duties, involve employees. "They are the experts on what they do and you also get buy-in."
- Take advantage of the many WorkSafeBC resources on return-to-work programs at www.returntoworkbc.com. The Injury Management Roadmap includes a step-by-step guide and templates you can use to develop your own programs.

Online tool empowers employers

Information is power, but only if you know how to harness it.

Enter the Employer Safety Planning Tool Kit, a suite of interactive tools launched in the summer of 2014 and available for free on worksafebc.com. It's designed to help employers of 50 workers or more reduce workplace injuries and lower costs at the same time. And it's easy to use: the tool allows senior leaders to access and analyze claims data for an overview of the company's performance. What's more, no one has to be a computer whiz to use it.

Derek Costa, project manager for North Vancouver's Keith Plumbing and Heating Co. Ltd., uses the tool regularly to identify gaps in health and safety planning and encourage senior management to make improvements. "The graphs let you see immediately where improvements are needed and what the return on investment is — as well as the costs of doing nothing. The tool provides hard numbers so that suggestions for improvement are based on more than just 'my

Using the tool, Costa was recently able to calculate that for

opinion," he says.

every dollar spent on claim costs, the company was paying three times that in premiums. "Beyond the human implications, the cost implications of an unsafe workplace become clear pretty quickly," he says.

"It can be a real motivator," says WorkSafeBC account manager Cheryl Nomura, who first introduced Costa to the tool. "If you compare your performance with your peers and see that you're not competitive with respect to your duration times or injury rate, there's no denying you need to make improvements. This tool also provides easy analysis to determine where you should concentrate your efforts first, to ensure good results."

Nomura suggests using the entire suite of tools to get a complete picture of the company's performance. "You'll be able to see exactly how operational and workplace health and safety changes can make a difference. You'll get the whole story in colourful graphs and visuals, in addition to regular report cards that encompass your last

> five years' performance," she says. "When presenting the business case for a safe and healthy workplace, there's no better tool."



Your rates

— The above links can be found in the Employer Safety Planning Tool Kit on the employer portal at worksafebc.com



YOUR EMPLOYEES ARE COUNTING ON YOU

When your employees are working alone, you have a moral obligation and legal requirement to ensure their safety.

They're counting on you to provide them with the best working alone safety solution you can find.

CheckMate, from ProTELEC, is a proactive, automated communication service designed to check on people who are working alone:

Simple to use

CheckMate

No hardware or software to purchase

24/7 Monitoring

Trained professionals

Advanced technology

To arrange for your Free Assessment and Free 15-Day Trial, call us toll-free at **1-866-775-6620**, or visit us online at **proteleccheckmate.com**





Dale Quipp has more energy these days to spend with his young kids, playing soccer, hockey, and building Lego, unlike days when he would come home sore from handling steel parts in a manufacturing plant.

As a skilled worker for Rimex Supply, Quipp attributes his increased energy levels to significant changes in his daily work processes. And he credits his employer for supporting that change.

It's improved his job, he says, "with less grunt work." Now Quipp describes having more quality time with his sons, ages eight and five, and his seven-month-old daughter. "At the end of the day my body is less tired, physically. I can take that little extra time to relax, then go play with my kids."

"I couldn't be happier, and the guys are happy that their backs aren't hurting anymore."

- Lloyd MacDonald, Rimex Supply department lead hand

Rimex plant manager James Read says the company recognized the need to improve ergonomics within a department of its Agassiz, B.C., plant, so it recently launched an employee-driven change program, bringing in new equipment and greatly reducing the number of times workers like Quipp have to lift cumbersome steel lock-rings — components of industrial wheel assemblies.

Its innovative approach to injury prevention made Rimex the winner of WorkSafeBC's 2014 Ergonomic

Innovations contest, an award given each year in October as part of B.C.'s Occupational Ergonomics Month. The award honours employers deemed to offer their workplaces the best and safest ergonomic design improvements.

Heavy lifting puts workers at risk

Before it introduced departmental changes, Read says pinch-type injuries and soreness among employees in the lock-ring department were far too common. The full lock-rings they handle are between 64 cm (25 in.) and 160 cm (63 in.) in diameter, and weigh up to 50 kg (110 lbs.).

Previously, workers had to heft the rings — about 27 over the course of a day — from pallet to table and from station to station 12 times each during the manufacturing process. It left them open to the risk of musculoskeletal injuries (MSIs).

So Read says the company began an open, honest dialogue with its employees to gather ideas about how to improve comfort, efficiency, and safety in the department. Employees took the lead in conceiving,

evaluating, and implementing a new process, correcting necessary mistakes along the way.

Key among their recommendations was the installation of a manual conveyor belt, which now links the three work stations and allows workers to push the lock-rings through the manufacturing process rather than lifting and moving them. Each ring now requires just two lifts.

"It works so beautifully," says Lloyd MacDonald, department lead hand. "I couldn't be happier, and the guys are happy that their backs aren't hurting anymore."

Read credits the program's success to the fact that workers felt empowered. "The changes were always heartfelt and done carefully, because they're the ones working there."

They installed a conveyor belt for \$6,000. And, since the company completed its renovations in September 2014, they've yet to record a minor or lost-time injury. Productivity is up 30 percent, while warranty complaints and quality issues have "stopped overnight," he says.



Safer handling process reduces injuries

Poor occupational ergonomics contributes to MSIs, or injuries to the muscles, nerves, and other soft tissues. MSIs are common, and account for almost one third of all lost-time injuries in B.C. on an annual basis.

In terms of Rimex's approach to improving ergonomics, contest judges liked the level of employee engagement a key element in ergonomics design — says WorkSafeBC ergonomist Gina Vahlas.

"That's one of the number-one things we're looking for — other than risk reduction, of course," she says. "We also liked their approach. They tried things, and sometimes they didn't work, and they went back and tried something else."

Changes in its lock-ring department are only some of Rimex's noteworthy safety improvements in recent years, says John Fraser, client services manager for WorkSafeBC's Account Management. The company, which employs 72 people, is working toward elevating their health and safety standards through the COR (certificate of recognition) program this year, and has goals of achieving international standards for its safety management system in the future.

"Rimex Supply has already overcome one of the greatest hurdles in safety: achieving a strong safety culture among its employees," Fraser says.

Ask for ergonomic assistance

Ergonomics is the science of fitting workplace conditions and job demands to workers' capabilities. And, as much as ergonomic improvements contribute to a safe workplace, employers should consult with a WorkSafeBC prevention officer as a first step.

Andrew Kidd, WorkSafeBC occupational safety officer for the Agassiz area, advises employers to ask a prevention officer to assess their proposed improvements. Officers will then call in an ergonomist, if necessary. "As officers, we go there with a fresh set of eyes."

Fresh eyes are important, Kidd says, because what seems like an improvement can actually be a hazard in disguise.

If you'd like to learn more about the risks involved in lifting and carrying tasks in your workplace, start with WorkSafeBC's online calculators, then contact WorkSafeBC for more information:

The lift/lower calculator is at www2.worksafebc. com/calculator/llc/default.htm

The push/pull/carry calculator is at www2.

Register now!

2015 BC MUNICIPAL OCCUPATIONAL **HEALTH & SAFETY CONFERENCE**

June 14 to 16, 2015 Whister Conference Centre www.pacificsafetycenter.com/bcmsa

HEALTH & SAFETY TRAINING

A wide variety of courses offered onsite and online

Benefits of onsite courses include: we send our instructors to you • face-to-face interaction

• hands-on demonstrations and activities

Benefits of online training include: convenient • relevant • immediate • affordable

GET CONNECTED www.bcmsa.ca









CONTACT US

Cathy Cook, Executive Director P: 778-278-3486 F: 778-278-0029 E: ccook@bcmsa.ca

Steep slope roofing Stay on top



Steep Slope Roofing Safety Symposium

Who should attend?

If you work in the steep slope roofing industry as a roofer, supervisor, employer, contractor, estimator, consultant/inspector, or supplier, this safety symposium is for you.

Safety culture sessions

- Safety responsibilities in the roofing industry
 Safety is everybody's responsibility! Learn how brokers, owners, managers, supervisors, contractors, workers, and regulatory personnel play a part in ensuring that the worksite is safe.
- Fall protection planning and procedures
 Walk through the planning process and discuss work procedures, fall prevention methods, and the use of fall protection equipment.
 You also receive tools and resources to help with fall protection planning and procedures.
- Regulatory requirements for roof inspections and estimating
 Discuss the regulatory requirements for short duration roof
 inspections with one of WorkSafeBC's prevention officers and
 learn what to do when guardrails, fall restraint, or fall arrest
 systems are not practical for your inspection.

Practical sessions

- Planning for safety
- Fall protection options
- Fall protection equipment inspection
- And more!

With the support of WorkSafeBC prevention officers, practice planning your steep slope work from start to finish. Using a mock roof, local suppliers will demonstrate and discuss fall protection equipment options. You'll also get to inspect harnesses, lanyards, and other key equipment.

Register today!

When?

Saturday, April 25, 2015 8:30 a.m.-4:30 p.m.

Doors open at 7:30 a.m.

Space is limited, so register today!

Where?

The Q Centre 1767 Island Highway Victoria, BC

How to register

Go to www.bccsa.ca/
roofingsymposium or email
steepsloperoof@worksafebc.com
for more information.

Cost

\$30 (including lunch and taxes)

Resources for you

All delegates will receive a free information package containing safety resource materials for steep slope roofers.









lan Emery has vivid memories of attending an incident involving an articulated rock truck (ART), where a young, inexperienced driver was killed while attempting to negotiate difficult terrain.

"I can still visualize it today," says the contract manager for Interfor, a B.C.-based wood products manufacturer. "What the site looked like, what it smelled like, what the truck looked like."

Emery says the tragedy of that worker's death — along with the recognition of a task too often given to junior crew members with limited training — prompted Interfor to reach out to WorkSafeBC for help in developing ART safety materials. The most recent result is a comprehensive training manual for these drivers and their employers in forestry, oil and gas, and construction industries — workplaces most likely to encounter the hazards associated with rock trucks. such as tipping and brake failure.

"A.R.T. — Health and Safety for Articulated Rock Truck Owners and Drivers" is an easy-to-access "info-flip," designed to give ART owners and drivers the information they need to operate these machines and their systems safely.

Drivers prepare to handle B.C.'s steep terrain

Emery says the extra guidance is critical. "Surprisingly, 'rock truck driver' is one of the entry-level positions in forestry," he says. "Owners and supervisors do the training and ride along with drivers, starting out on flat ground, then putting them in steeper areas as they gain experience. This guide is a great summary that gives them direction as they do that. It's not like being handed a big binder."

At first glance, ARTs are deceptively simple. "They're like a big Tonka truck; they look fun to drive," Emery says. "There's a brake, a gas pedal, and a steering wheel. Anyone can operate them on flat ground. But as

soon as you put them on steep logging roads, you have to know what you're doing."

When an articulated rock truck is fully loaded, it weighs about the same as a fully loaded off-highway logging truck, but with half the braking capacity, underscoring the importance of new drivers learning how to use torque converters and retarders in conjunction with proper braking techniques. If they don't, the brakes can fail, leading to a runaway truck.

ARTs also steer differently than conventional trucks, with rock-laden boxes prone to tipping on uneven surfaces. For example, during dumping, torque can cause the cab of the truck to fall to its side — another possibly fatal scenario.

Other tipping hazards include downhill dumping, where the box of an ART is raised high enough to cause the truck to flip over on a steep grade.

Training, knowledge, and experience come together

Because makes and models of ARTs differ, the new info-flip works in conjunction with the manufacturer's

operating manual. It includes a pre-trip inspection report sheet and detailed descriptions of how to perform inspections, as well as important in-the-field scenarios on everything from torque converter lock-up to confronting brake failure, runaway, and topple-over incidents.

The guide is available at the high school level to prospective ART drivers. "Commonly, an ART driver is a young worker — often a helper ("swamper") just out of school, who wants to work in the woods, but lacks the proper training to operate an ART safely," says WorkSafeBC occupational safety officer Branko Samoukovic.

"This new resource provides employers with the info and structure to progressively train young workers towards the safe operation of ARTs."

"Anyone can operate [ARTs] on flat ground. But as soon as you put them on steep logging roads, you have to know what you're doing."

> —lan Emery, contract mananger for Interfor in Campbell River

The info-flip is meant to go hand-in-hand with a thorough, graduated safety program. "You need training, knowledge, and experience — all three in place — to be competent," Emery says.

For a downloadable copy of the guide, see www.worksafebc.com/publications/health_and_ safety/by_topic/assets/pdf/BK150.pdf. You can also order printed copies from the WorkSafeBC Bookstore at www.worksafebcstore.com.





As a worker, you probably pride yourself on your ability to multitask: it keeps you connected to the day-to-day needs of employers and clients. But when your work takes you behind the wheel — driving becomes the only task.

WorkSafeBC industry specialist Kevin Bennett says distracted driving is now the second highest cause of crashes in B.C. So if you're working for one of the thousands of B.C. employers with fleet vehicles, you should view your driving work as a significant occupational hazard.

"If you drive a fleet or personal vehicle to work, your employer is responsible for providing you with information, instruction, and supervision related to protecting your health and safety," Bennett says. "Your role is to follow your company's safe work procedures, be alert to road hazards, and comply with the Motor Vehicle Act.

"When you're behind the wheel, driving is your only job."

"When you're behind the wheel, driving is your only job."

- Kevin Bennett, WorkSafeBC transportation industry specialist

Here are five major things to consider about staying safe while on the road:

1. Be prepared to drive safely

Safe driving is more than just avoiding distractions. Take the time to plan any necessary travel before leaving work. (Given the risks associated with driving, the safest plan is to conduct business by phone, email, or video conference, where possible.) Check traffic and weather services, consult online maps to learn the safest route (as well as alternate routes), learn where you'll need to make turns or what the destination looks like. Before starting your car, do a circle check to look for hazards. Adjust mirrors and seats, program your GPS, ensure you've safely secured any cargo. Most

important: since human error is a common factor in crashes, step back and assess the soundness of your own physical and mental state before driving.

2. The smartest phone is one that's turned off

Staying connected is important, and you may feel pressure to answer work-related messages, but there's a time and place for communication — and it's not while driving. Before you leave, record a voicemail saying you'll check messages at specified times. Then, turn your phone off, and, if it's just too tempting, put your phone in the trunk. Check messages when parked somewhere safe. And even though you can legally use certain hands-free devices, it's best to use them only after you've safely parked your vehicle.

3. Look ahead

Distracted drivers experience "attention blindness," and fail to spot many road hazards — or react to them too late — putting themselves and others at risk. When driving, scan the road environment for hazards. Be

especially attentive when you're driving through or near work zones, schools, crosswalks, and railway crossings.

4. Know the risks

Like many drivers, you might think you can effectively multitask and manage the risks associated with distracted driving. This just isn't true. Texting drivers are 23 times more likely to be involved in a crash or near-crash event, and 80 percent of collisions involve distraction as a contributing factor.

5. Know your rights

Follow your company's safe work practices regarding distracted driving. Keep in mind that you don't need to be available 24/7, and that your safety takes precedence over convenience. If you have any questions, speak with your supervisor or company safety representative.

Be safety savvy. And, before you get behind the wheel, check out the following sites for safe driving resources: roadsafetyatwork.ca, worksafebc.com, icbc.com, and



Distracted driving is dangerous. When your employees are driving for work, their safety is your responsibility. Make sure their phones are off.

Road safety is smart business.

Be part of Road Safety At Work Week, March 2-6



RoadSafetyAtWork.ca





Barry Manfield, safety consultant and general manager for Sylva Management Services Ltd. in Kamloops, is the winner of the January/February "What's wrong with this photo?" contest.

- The gas cylinder is not secured.
- The worker is using poor lifting practices.
- The hose on the floor is a tripping hazard.
- The liquids on the floor pose a slipping hazard.
- The car is improperly positioned on the hoist.
- The anti-freeze jug is placed inside the vehicle and is not secured, meaning it could fall or spill.
- The fire extinguisher is on the floor, rather than properly mounted or labelled.
- The wheel/axle of the welding cart appears damaged.
- Shelved materials are poorly stacked and stored.
- The oil drain pan is on the floor; the worker is likely to step back into it or spill it.
- The cutting torch is not secured and needs to be hooked over the regulator.

- The car lights are on, meaning the engine is either running or the ignition is turned on.
- The overhead lighting should be providing illumination (perhaps the bulb has burned out).
- A "notch" in the structural support beam shouldn't be
- The transmission appears precariously balanced on the jack/hoisting device.
- The engine parts leaning against a post could fall.
- The worker is smoking! (That's not a good plan.)
- The worker has no eye or hand protection.
- The work stand seems to have tipped over.
- There is debris on the floor a housekeeping issue.
- The shop is overcrowded, and the working space, inadequate.
- The pallet holding stacked items appears broken.
- The worker needs safety footwear.
- The compressed gas cylinder is not secured.
- The contents of the tipped-over pail have spilled on to the floor, posing tripping and slipping hazards.





For more information on how to get your workplace involved, visit naoshbc.com.





For resources and videos on the safe operation of equipment, visit worksafebc.com/agriculture.



Exposure limits to protect worker health

Are your workers exposed on the job to potentially hazardous substances? Are they at risk of activity-related soft-tissue disorders of the arm, neck, or shoulder? If so, you'll need to review recently approved changes to WorkSafeBC policies in these two areas.

New occupational exposure limits

What's changed?

Lower limits for worker exposure to eight substances came into effect February 1, 2015. These restrictions include new occupational exposure limits for diacetyl and carbonyl sulfide, as well as reduced exposure limits for ethyl formate, nonane, beryllium and compounds, vanadium pentoxide, alpha-methyl styrene, and Portland cement.

Why were the changes made?

The latest scientific findings recommend the new limits to further protect workers from adverse health effects of long-term exposure to these substances. WorkSafeBC began public consultation on the changes in 2013.

What does this mean for employers?

If your workers may be exposed to any of these substances in your workplace, review the relevant Materials Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) and current exposure control measures, including ventilation and respiratory protection, to make sure worker exposure to these substances is below the exposure limits.

Note that WorkSafeBC is maintaining existing exposure limits for allyl bromide, nitrogen dioxide, o-phthalodinitrile, and piperazine and its salts, due to sampling issues.

What does this mean for workers?

If exposure to these substances is kept below the exposure limits, most workers should be safe from harm for their working lifetimes. Due to individual susceptibility, though, some workers may still experience discomfort from these substances at concentrations at or below the exposure limit. Report to your employer any signs and symptoms of potential overexposure to a hazardous substance.



Claims for arm, neck, and shoulder entrapments and tendinopathies

What's changed?

Policy amendments provide clear guidance on the adjudication of claims for activity-related soft-tissue disorders. These changes took effect March 1, 2015.

Why were the changes made?

We made the changes to ensure that the medical terminology reflects current medical and scientific evidence, to update the general risk factors associated with these disorders, and, to introduce the principles for adjudicating activity-related soft-tissue-disorder claims.

What does this mean for workers?

The activity-related soft-tissue-disorder policies provide clearer and more concise guidance on the adjudication of these claims.

Where can you get more information?

Detailed information on all WorkSafeBC board of directors' 2014 policy and regulation decisions can be found at www.worksafebc.com/regulation_and_policy/ policy_decision/board_decisions/2014/default.asp ♥

Construction

1 Day Roofing Ltd. | \$5,000 | Abbotsford | October 29, 2014

This firm's worker was performing tasks on the flat roof of a commercial building. Access to this flat roof was by way of a ladder to the sloped metal roof of a lean-to. The worker had to cross the sloped metal roof, about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade at its eaves, and then climb about 1.4 m (4.5 ft.) onto the higher, flat roof. The worker was not using personal fall protection gear, nor was any other form of fall protection in place. The worker was exposed to a risk of falling anywhere from 5 to 6.4 m (16 to 21 ft.). The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required, a repeated and high-risk violation. It also failed to provide its worker with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure his health and safety. This was a repeated violation.

1 Day Roofing Ltd. | \$7,500 | Mission | November 7, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed two of this firm's workers installing roofing material on the steep roof of a two-storey house under construction. One worker was wearing personal fall protection gear and was connected to an anchor, but had too much slack in his lifeline. The other worker was wearing personal fall protection gear but was not connected to an anchor. The workers were exposed to a risk of falling 6 to 8.3 m (20 to 27 ft.). No written fall protection plan was in place, as required for work at 7.5 m (25 ft.) or more. The lack of effective fall protection and the absence of a fall protection plan were repeated and high-risk violations. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their health and safety, a repeated violation.

AA Insulation Depot Ltd. | \$25,021.87 | Richmond | November 7, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected two sites where this firm was conducting asbestos abatement and removal activities on pre-1990 houses that were to be demolished. Officers noted numerous violations of the requirements for asbestos abatement and removal, including workers not wearing respiratory protective equipment. Another violation of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation was the firm's failure to give new and young workers health and safety orientation and training specific to the worksite. Overall, the firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their own and other workers' health and safety, a repeated violation of section 115(2)(e) of the Workers Compensation Act.

Ace Roofing Ltd. | \$2,500 | Surrey | December 5, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed three of this firm's workers on the wet roof of a two-storey house performing re-roofing tasks. All three workers were wearing fall protection harnesses but were not connected to a lifeline. No other form of fall protection was in place. The workers were exposed to a risk of falling 6 to 7.6 m (20 to 25 ft.). The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required; this was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Administrative penalties are monetary fines imposed on employers for health and safety violations of the Workers Compensation Act and/or the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. The penalties listed in this section are grouped by industry, in alphabetical order, starting with "Construction." They show the date the penalty was imposed and the location where the violation occurred (not necessarily the business location). The registered business name is given, as well as any "doing business as" (DBA) name.

The penalty amount is based on the nature of the violation, the employer's compliance history, and the employer's assessable payroll. Once a penalty is imposed, the employer has 90 days to appeal to the Review Division of WorkSafeBC. The Review Division may maintain, reduce, or withdraw the penalty; it may increase the penalty as well. Employers may then file an appeal within 30 days of the Review Division's decision to the Workers' Compensation Appeal Tribunal, an independent appeal body.

The amounts shown here indicate the penalties imposed prior to appeal, and may not reflect the final penalty amount.

For more information on when penalties are considered and how the penalty amount is calculated, visit our website at worksafebc.com, then search for "Administrative penalties."

Akal Siding & Soffit Ltd. | \$1,000 | Abbotsford | November 25, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed this firm's worker in the basket of a boom lift performing siding work. The worker was not wearing personal fall protection gear and was exposed to a risk of falling about 3.5 m (12 ft.). The firm's failure to ensure that a personal fall arrest system was used on an elevating work platform was a repeated violation.

Allaire Construction Inc. | \$19,697.50 | Kelowna | November 3, 2014

WorkSafeBC found multiple violations of safety requirements when it inspected a residential construction worksite where this firm was the prime contractor. The violations included workers carrying out tasks 4 to 6 m (14 to 20 ft.) above grade without a fall protection system in place and work platforms that lacked the required guardrails. These violations showed that as the prime contractor at a multiple-employer workplace, the firm failed to do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system to ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

AM-2 Ventures Ltd., CT-2 Holdings Ltd. & RT-2 Holdings Ltd. / Timbro Contracting (A Partnership) | \$39,982.70 | Dawson Creek | November 14, 2014

During the installation of a sewer line 5 m (16 ft.) below grade, two of this firm's workers had to enter a vertically cut excavation to get into an incorrectly installed trench box. The workers were exposed to the risk of being seriously injured or killed if the excavation had collapsed either while they were approaching the trench box or while they were in it. The firm failed to ensure that the excavation and trench box met the sloping and shoring requirements of section 20.81(1) of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

AM-2 Ventures Ltd., CT-2 Holdings Ltd. & RT-2 Holdings Ltd. / Timbro Contracting (A Partnership) | \$39,982.72 | Hope | November 14, 2014

This firm had dug a 2.5 m (8 ft.) deep excavation to install underground utilities for a subdivision. The excavation collapsed, dislodging a natural gas line. WorkSafeBC's investigation found an incorrectly installed trench box in the excavation that lacked safe entry and exit points. In addition, excavated material had not been kept back a minimum distance of 0.6 m (2 ft.) from the edge of the excavation. These were repeated and high-risk violations of the requirements for excavations.

Asbestos Response Management Inc. | \$2,500 | Langley | October 23, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's worksite, which consisted of five houses and a fourplex, all pre-1990, that were being prepared for demolition. Officers found drywall debris and other potentially asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) on the ground and in piles of refuse around the site. A representative of the firm stated that a hazardous materials survey had not been conducted as required prior to demolition work. The officers issued a stop-work order for the site. WorkSafeBC hired a third party to assess the buildings for hazardous materials. The third-party survey identified a number of ACMs. The firm violated the hazardous materials requirements of section 20.112 of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated violation.

B Prince Roofing Ltd. | \$9,750 | Coquitlam | October 1, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed this firm's worker spray-painting chimney flashing on a narrow section of the steep roof of a two-storey house. The worker was not wearing personal fall protection equipment, and no other form of fall protection was in place. He was exposed to a risk of falling 5 m (16 ft.). Ten months later at another worksite, one of this firm's workers was seen re-roofing a two-level house. He was wearing personal fall protection equipment but was not attached to a lifeline, and no other form of fall protection was in place. This worker was exposed to a risk of falling 4 m (14 ft.). A concrete staircase with metal railing, a concrete retaining wall and walkway, and a paved driveway below increased the worker's risk of serious injury or death in the event of a fall. In both instances the firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used in places where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more might occur. These were repeated and high-risk violations.

Baldev Singh / M.G. Roofing & Siding | \$2,500 | Vancouver | November 27, 2014

On a rainy day, WorkSafeBC observed two of this firm's workers on the steep roof of a two-storey house under construction. Neither worker was using a personal fall protection system and no other fall protection system was in place. Tripping hazards on the wet roof increased their risk of falling 8.5 m (28 ft.) to uneven ground, fences, and stacks of construction materials. The firm's failure to ensure that fall protection was used as required was a repeated and high-risk violation.

BCS Contractors Ltd. | \$1,000 | Surrey | November 4, 2014

This firm was performing asbestos abatement and removal activities at a site where a pre-1990 house and duplex were to be demolished. WorkSafeBC observed a variety of debris contaminated by asbestos-containing materials inside the house and in a shed in

Penalties (continued)

the backyard. Officers also observed inadequate decontamination facilities; a work area that was not marked off with yellow tape as required; and workers entering the removal zone without personal protective equipment. These deficiencies exposed workers to asbestos fibres, increasing their risk of serious illness and death. The firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their own and others' health and safety, a repeated violation.

BCS Contractors Ltd. | \$1,000 | Surrey | November 3, 2014

This firm was performing asbestos abatement activities at a pre-1990 house due to be demolished. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed a number of violations of requirements for asbestos removal. Asbestos debris and dust were tracked out of the containment area into a "clean" area. Bags containing asbestos-contaminated waste were not labelled as required. Written procedures for waste removal were not followed. In addition, the firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their own and other workers' health and safety. These were all repeated violations.

BCS Contractors Ltd. | \$1,000 | Surrey | November 4, 2014

This firm was performing asbestos removal activities at a site where a pre-1990 house had been demolished. WorkSafeBC observed two large disposal bins on the property piled high with debris contaminated with asbestos-containing materials (ACMs). The bins had not been labelled as required to inform workers that they contained ACMs. Further, the debris had not been double-bagged in 6 mil plastic bags as required. These were both repeated violations.

BCS Contractors Ltd. | \$1,000 | Burnaby | November 4, 2014

This firm was performing asbestos abatement and removal activities at the site of a pre-1990 house prior to demolition. WorkSafeBC found that the firm had issued a clearance letter stating that all the hazardous material had been removed from the house when asbestos-containing materials were still present, including drywall joint compound and duct tape on heating pipes. The firm failed to use procedures acceptable to WorkSafeBC for control and handling of asbestos. This was a repeated violation.

Buckner's Excavating Ltd. | \$5,000 | Abbotsford | September 15, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed one of this firm's workers using an excavator to load brush and small trees from a cleared lot into the box of a container truck. The excavator's side windows were not fitted with the required guards to protect the operator from falling or intruding objects, and its rear window was missing completely, exposing the operator to a risk of serious injury or death. Another of the firm's workers was operating a second excavator on the site that also lacked the required protective structures. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-use order for both excavators. Two days later, the prevention officer returned to the worksite and again found one of the firm's workers using the excavator that was missing its rear window. The excavator had not been fitted with protective structures as required. The firm's failure to ensure that its mobile equipment had protective structures as required by section 16.21(1) of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation was a repeated violation.

Buckner's Excavating Ltd. | \$5,000 | Mission | October 2, 2014

This firm's worker was using an excavator to demolish a house when WorkSafeBC observed him. The worker could not produce the hazardous materials documentation required to be kept on site whenever demolition takes place. The prevention officer issued an order to stop work until the hazmat survey could be produced. The firm's failure to have a hazmat survey available at the worksite before beginning demolition activities was a repeated violation.

Derek Gene Oswald / Green Earth Systems | \$2,500 | Burnaby | November 28, 2014

WorkSafeBC visited a site where a single-storey pre-1990 house was being prepared for demolition and found three of this firm's





workers inside. Various asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) had been exposed but the firm had not had a qualified person assess the work activity as required. Nor had it ensured that procedures acceptable to WorkSafeBC would be used to control and handle the ACMs. The firm also failed to provide its workers with task-specific direction addressing both hazards and controls. These were repeated violations.

Derek Gene Oswald / Green Earth Systems | \$2,500 | Richmond | November 28, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected a pre-1990 house due for demolition. Its interior had largely been stripped, and piles of potentially asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) littered the interior and the exterior areas. WorkSafeBC hired a third party to assess the house for hazardous materials. The third-party survey confirmed the presence of various ACMs. WorkSafeBC's investigation found that the firm failed to conduct workplace exposure monitoring and assessment using acceptable occupational hygiene methods. It also failed to ensure that acceptable procedures would be used to control and handle ACMs. These were repeated violations.

Derek Gene Oswald / Green Earth Systems | \$3,250 | Vancouver | November 28, 2014

WorkSafeBC ordered this firm to stop supplying hazardous materials surveys and performing asbestos abatement work. The firm failed to comply with those orders at two worksites where pre-1990 houses were slated for demolition. The firm also failed to conduct acceptable workplace exposure monitoring and assessment, and to develop and implement exposure control plans for workers exposed to asbestos. As well, it failed to ensure that acceptable procedures were used to control and handle asbestos-containing materials, a high-risk violation. These violations, which were all repeated, demonstrate that the firm failed to ensure the health and safety of its own and other firms' workers in its workplace.

Digital Ice Canada Inc. | \$3,206.03 | Kelowna | November 14, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed two of this firm's workers installing shingles on the outside wall of a townhouse development. The workers were standing on work platforms atop a manufactured scaffold. The platforms lacked the required guardrails and no other form of fall protection was being used, exposing the workers to a risk of falling 4 m (14 ft.) to compact ground. The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required was a high-risk violation.

Ed Mattinson & Leon Messom / Teal Roofing and Construction | \$5,000 | Quesnel | November 25, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed four of this firm's workers working on the roof of a two-storey house, 5 m (17 ft.) above grade. One worker was wearing personal fall protection gear but was not connected to a lifeline. Two of the other workers were not wearing fall protection gear. No other form of fall protection was in place. The firm's failure to ensure that its workers used fall protection as required was a repeated and high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their safety. This was also a repeated violation.

Envoy Construction Services Ltd. | \$1,559.27 | Coquitlam | October 14, 2014

This firm was the prime contractor at a worksite where land-clearing activities and excavation were taking place. WorkSafeBC visited the site on November 15, 2013, and saw that no Notice of Project (NOP) had been submitted to WorkSafeBC as required prior to starting such work.

Fast Lane Traffic Services Ltd. | \$19,368.85 | Abbotsford | November 18, 2014

This firm was retained by the prime contractor of a highway-widening project to provide traffic control services. The firm's violations of the safety requirements for traffic control put its own and another firm's workers at high risk of serious injury or death. Specifically, it used a lane closure set-up inappropriate to the weather, visibility, and traffic conditions. As a result, a passing vehicle collided with the firm's lead truck and the non-worker driving that vehicle was killed. On January 29, 2014, WorkSafeBC ordered this firm to submit a Notice of Compliance with sections of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation and the Workers Compensation Act dealing with, respectively, providing effective traffic control and providing adequate instruction for and supervision of work activity in adverse weather conditions. The firm had until February 21 to comply with the orders. As of November 10, 2014, it had not done so.

Fraser Valley Roofing Ltd. | \$2,500 | Chilliwack | November 25, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed four of this firm's workers on the second-floor balcony and the steep portico roof of a two-storey house under construction. None of the workers were using a personal fall protection system and no other form of fall protection was in place. Further, one of the workers on the portico accessed it via a boom-supported elevating work platform that also lacked the required fall protection. The workers were exposed to a risk of falling anywhere from 3.4 to 13.7 m (11.5 to 45 ft.). The lack of fall protection was a repeated and high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their health and safety, a repeated violation.

Penalties (continued)

Fraser Valley Roofing Ltd. | \$2,500 | Chilliwack | November 25, 2014

Seven of this firm's workers were on the roof of a bungalow performing re-roofing activities. Only one of them was using a personal fall protection system. With no other form of fall protection in place, the other six workers were exposed to a risk of falling 2.75 to 6 m (9 to 20 ft.). The firm failed to ensure that fall protection was used as required, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Glass House Ventures Inc. / Glass House Environmental | \$12,059.48 | Surrey | November 26, 2014

This firm conducted a hazardous materials survey of an industrial complex that was about to be demolished and issued a clearance letter stating that no hazardous materials were present, when in fact asbestos-containing materials were still present. A demolition contractor then began tearing down the structure. The firm failed to monitor and assess workplace exposure to hazardous substances using methods acceptable to WorkSafeBC, a repeated violation.

Guest Excavating Co. Ltd. | \$1,000 | Surrey | October 23, 2014

This firm allowed its worker to use an excavator to demolish a pre-1990 house and remove asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) contrary to the asbestos abatement procedures outlined in the firm's Notice of Project. As a result, the worksite and the excavator were both contaminated with ACMs. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order for the site and a stop-use order for the excavator. The firm failed to comply with all requirements of part 115 of the Workers Compensation Act. In particular it failed to provide the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure the health and safety of its own and other workers at the workplace.

Gut R Dun Exteriors Inc. | \$2,500 | Kelowna | November 3, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed one of this firm's workers walk down a steep roof and climb onto a scaffold platform at the roof's edge. The scaffold area the worker stepped onto was not equipped with guardrails. The worker was not using a personal fall protection system and was exposed to a risk of falling about 6 m (20 ft.) to grade. Another of the firm's workers climbed a ladder to get onto another scaffold platform. The scaffold section he stepped onto was also not equipped with guardrails, and this worker too lacked a personal fall protection system. He was exposed to a risk of falling about 5.5 m (18 ft.). The firm's failure to ensure that fall protection systems were used as required was a high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their health and safety.

H & G Roofing & Sheet Metal Ltd. | \$10,900.60 | Harrison Hot Springs | October 15, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed three of this firm's workers re-roofing a two-storey house. The workers were not using personal fall protection gear, and no control zone was in place. They were exposed to a risk of falling 4.5 m (15 ft.). The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Hans Demolition & Excavating Ltd. | \$8,510.81 | Burnaby | October 28, 2014

This firm allowed its worker to demolish a pre-1990 house using an excavator. A hazardous materials survey was not on site as required. WorkSafeBC had a sample of flooring material from the demolition debris tested and found that its backing contained 65 percent chrysotile asbestos. The firm violated section 112 of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation by failing to have a hazmat survey available at a demolition site. This was a repeated violation.

J & J Framing Ltd. | \$7,333.55 | Mission | October 16, 2014

Eight of this firm's workers were conducting framing activities on the second floor of each of two adjacent houses. Guardrails had not been installed, and no other fall protection system was in place. The workers were exposed to a risk of falling almost 4 m (13 ft.). In addition, access to the second floor of one house was by way of a stairway that lacked a handrail, and at the other house, by way of a stepladder and a half-flight of stairs that also lacked a handrail. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more might occur. It failed to provide a stairway including at least framing, treads, and a handrail to the second level of the houses. These were repeated and high-risk violations. Finally, it failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their health and safety, a repeated violation.

J & J Framing Ltd. | \$7,333.55 | Mission | October 16, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed two of this firm's workers on the roof of a two-storey house under construction. One worker was not wearing personal fall protection gear. He was exposed to a risk of falling 3.5 m (11.5 ft.). The other worker was wearing fall protection gear, but his lifeline was attached only to a 2x4 with a loose knot. He was exposed to a risk of falling 6 m (20 ft.). No other form of fall protection was in place. Construction debris strewn on hard-packed dirt and gravel below increased the workers' risk of serious injury or death in the event of a fall. The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Jakes Construction Ltd. | \$65,595.03 | Langley | November 18, 2014

This firm was the prime contractor for a highway-widening project. The firm's violations of the safety requirements for traffic control put

its own and another firm's workers at high risk of serious injury or death. Specifically, it used a lane closure set-up inappropriate to the weather, visibility, and traffic conditions. As a result, a passing vehicle collided with the firm's lead truck and the non-worker driving that vehicle was killed. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the instruction and supervision needed to ensure their own and other workers' health and safety. These were repeated and high-risk violations.

Jaswinder Rihal / Double S.R. Construction | \$7,500 | Surrey | October 29, 2014

Two of this firm's workers were sheathing trusses on the roof of a three-storey townhouse, standing on an end truss that was laid flat. One worker took a step on the truss and it broke, causing him to stumble. His co-worker reached to grab him and fell 9 m (30 ft.) to the ground, sustaining serious injuries. Neither worker was wearing personal fall protection gear. No other form of fall protection was in place. The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Jesse Slingsby / Rockin Roofing | \$2,500 | Maple Ridge | October 24, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed a representative of this firm and one of its workers on the steep roof of a two-storey house under construction, installing shingles. The firm's representative was wearing personal fall protection gear but was not connected to an anchor point. The worker was not wearing fall protection gear. No other form of fall protection was in place. Both were exposed to a risk of falling 6 m (19 ft.). Gravel, construction debris, and drainage conduit below increased their risk of serious injury or death in the event of a fall. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Kenneth Edward Dovich / Dovich & Sons Roofing & Siding | \$2,500 | Mission | November 26, 2014

In May 2014, WorkSafeBC ordered this firm to submit Notices of Compliance with requirements to ensure the use of fall protection and to properly instruct, train, and supervise workers. As of June 19, 2014, the firm had not complied. The firm is being penalized for its failure to comply with WorkSafeBC orders, a violation of section 115(1)(b) of the Workers Compensation Act.

Kooner & Sran Construction Co. Ltd. | \$5,000 | Richmond | November 4, 2014

Two of this firm's workers were applying sheathing to the second-storey exterior wall and trusses of a building. One worker was standing on the narrow top plate of the wall, about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. The other worker was working from a 2x4 cleat attached to the sheathed portion of the steep roof. He was about 4 m (13 ft.) above grade. No fall protection system was in use, which was a repeated and high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety, a repeated violation.

Lambertus Johannes Zonderland / Bart Zonderland's Framing | \$2,500 | Mission | October 29, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed this firm's worker on the steep roof of a two-and-a-half-storey house under construction, performing framing tasks. The worker was not using personal fall protection gear, and no other form of fall protection was in place, exposing him to a risk of falling 6.5 m (22 ft.). The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required, a repeated and high-risk violation. Another framer on the site, a young worker, had not received a health and safety orientation as required before starting work, a repeated violation of section 3.23(1) of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation (the Regulation). In addition, although they were using nail guns, neither worker was wearing safety eyewear as required by section 8.14(1) of the Regulation when handling materials that pose a risk of injury to the eyes. This was also a repeated violation.

Mattu Roofing Ltd. | \$3,972.70 | Langley | October 27, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed three of this firm's workers on the steep roof of a two-storey house, applying new shingles. The workers were wearing personal fall protection gear but were not attached to lifelines. No other form of fall protection was in place. The workers were exposed to a risk of falling about 5.5 m (18 ft.). The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required, a repeated and high-risk violation, and failed in general to ensure the health and safety of its workers.

Multi-Form Gutters Ltd. | \$2,500 | Abbotsford | November 18, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed three of this firm's workers on the roof of a seven-storey building under construction. One worker was wearing a safety harness attached to an improperly installed self-retracting lifeline. A rope was also attached to his harness and was being held by a new and young worker whose own safety harness was not attached to an anchor point. The third worker was not wearing any personal fall protection gear. No other form of fall protection was in place on the roof. All three workers were exposed to a risk of falling 18 m (60 ft.) to grade. The firm's failure to ensure that fall protection systems were used as required was a high-risk violation.

Perfect Roofing & Power Washing Ltd. | \$2,500 | Langley | October 28, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed three of this firm's workers applying roofing paper on the steep roof of a three-storey house under construction. The workers were not using personal fall protection gear, and no other form of fall protection was in place. The workers were exposed to a risk of falling 5.5 to 9 m (18 to 30 ft.). The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Penalties (continued)

P.R.G. Construction Ltd. | \$5,000 | White Rock | October 28, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed excavation-related violations on a construction site where this firm's workers were installing formwork for a new house. An excavation deeper than 1.2 m (4 ft.) was not sloped or shored as required by section 20.81(1) of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. Further, no fall protection system was in place as required around the edge of the excavation. Two workers standing near the edge handing lumber down to three workers in the excavation were exposed to a risk of falling 3.5 m (12 ft.). All five workers were exposed to the risk of serious injury or death should the excavation have collapsed. These were repeated and high-risk violations.

Raymond Gary Bond / Solace Decorating | \$2,500 | White Rock | November 10, 2014

At a site where a three-storey house was under construction, WorkSafeBC observed this firm's worker on the flat roof leaning over the roof edge to sand it. The worker was wearing personal fall protection gear, but his lifeline was connected to an insufficient anchor point (an aluminum plumbing vent stack) that would not have withstood the arrest force if he had fallen. No other fall protection system was in place, so that the worker was exposed to a risk of falling 8.3 m (27 ft.). The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required was a repeated and high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its worker with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure his health and safety, a repeated violation.

Ryder Roofing Ltd. | \$26,876.62 | Kelowna | November 27, 2014

This firm's worker was on the roof of a two-storey apartment building performing re-roofing tasks. He was wearing a fall protection harness but was not connected to a lifeline. No other form of fall protection was in place, so he was exposed to a risk of falling nearly 5 m (16 ft.). The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Ryder Roofing Ltd. | \$26,876.62 | Kelowna | November 27, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed two of this firm's workers on the steep roof of a house, installing roofing felt. Neither worker was using a personal fall protection system. No other form of fall protection was in place. The workers were exposed to a risk of falling about 8.3 m (27 ft.). At another site, two of the firm's workers were on the flat roof of a four-storey building, also without any form of fall protection. These workers were exposed to a risk of falling 12 m (40 ft.). The firm contravened fall protection requirements — a high-risk violation and failed to ensure the health and safety of its own and other firms' workers. It also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their health and safety. These were repeated violations.

Sahara Roofing Ltd. | \$2,500 | Surrey | September 23, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed three of this firm's workers applying shingles to the steep roof of a three-storey townhouse complex under construction. All three workers were wearing fall protection harnesses but only one was attached to a lifeline. No other form of fall protection was in place, exposing the two workers not attached to lifelines to a risk of falling 6 m (19 ft.). The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall over 3 m (10 ft.) could occur, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Sahara Roofing Ltd. | \$5,000 | Surrey | September 30, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected a worksite where a two-storey house was under construction and observed three of this firm's workers working on the steep roof. Workers gained access to the roof by climbing out of a second-storey window. The workers were not using any personal fall protection gear, nor was any other form of fall protection in place, exposing them to a risk of falling as much as 7.3 m (24 ft.). Roofing materials and air hoses on the roof as well as the way the workers were accessing the roof increased the likelihood of slipping or tripping. In the event of a fall, hard-packed dirt at grade, strewn with construction materials and debris, posed a risk of serious injury or death. The firm acted with reckless disregard in failing to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Employers' Advisers

Assisting Employers with Workers' Compensation Issues

The Employers' Advisers Office provides independent advice, assistance, and representation on all matters related to compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and WorkSafeBC's regulations and policies. To further assist employers, we provide educational seminars.

Please visit our website for more information about upcoming seminar dates: www.labour.gov.bc.ca/eao. All services are provided without cost to employers. Contact us toll-free: 1 800 925-2233



Did you know?

Falls are a leading cause of workplace injury.

WORK SAFE BC

Sangha Framing Ltd. | \$2,500 | Surrey | September 23, 2014

Three of this firm's workers were sheathing the steep roof of a wood-frame house on a rainy day. Two of them were on the roof itself and one was within the trusses. None of the workers were using personal fall protection equipment and no other form of fall protection was in place. They were exposed to a risk of falling 6 m (20 ft.) to framed walls and construction materials and debris at grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required, a repeated and high-risk violation. It also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their health and safety, a repeated violation.

Shayne Dayrle Unger (Bkr) / Unger Roofing | \$2,500 | Langford | August 22, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed a representative of this firm, and one of its workers, stripping shingles from the steep roof of a house. The firm's representative was not wearing personal fall protection gear. Its worker was wearing a safety harness but was not attached to a lifeline. No other form of fall protection was in place. Both were exposed to a risk of falling 5 m (16 ft.) to a paved driveway below. The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur was a repeated and high-risk violation of section 11.2(1)(a) of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.

Sraon Framing Ltd. | \$2,000 | Surrey | November 14, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed three of this firm's workers performing framing and wall-sheathing tasks at a two-storey house under construction. The second level lacked guardrails, exposing any workers on the second floor to a fall of more than 3 m (10 ft.). The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required was a repeated and high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their health and safety, a repeated violation.

Sraon Framing Ltd. | \$5,000 | Delta | November 14, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed this firm's worker standing at the gable end of a two-storey house under construction performing framing activities. He was within 2 m (6.5 ft.) of the roof edge and was wearing personal fall protection gear but was not connected to an anchor. No other form of fall protection was in place. The worker was exposed to a risk of falling 6 m (20 ft.) to uneven, compact soil strewn with construction materials. The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required was a repeated and high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its worker with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure his health and safety, a repeated violation.

Standard Plumbing & Heating Ltd. | \$22,749.24 | Surrey | November 5, 2014

This firm was the prime contractor for a three-storey townhouse development under construction. Two workers for a subcontractor were sheathing trusses when one of them fell 9 m (30 ft.) to the ground, sustaining serious injuries. No fall protection system was in place, nor was a written fall protection plan. As the prime contractor on the site, the firm failed to establish and maintain a system to ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation, a repeated violation.

Swiftsure Drywall Interiors Ltd. | \$43,601.17 | Saanich | September 10, 2014

This firm was providing drywalling services at a worksite where a multi-storey residential building was being constructed. Two of its workers (one a young worker) stood on an unguarded third-storey balcony without fall protection, throwing debris into a steel disposal bin at ground level. The young worker fell 7 m (22.6 ft.) to the ground, sustaining serious injuries. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used whenever a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Tatla Developments Ltd. | \$2,500 | White Rock | October 9, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected a construction site where this firm was the prime contractor and found multiple violations of safety requirements. For example, an air compressor operating in a wet environment had exposed copper wires and was powered by a 220-volt receptacle without a ground fault circuit interrupter (GFCI). Workers were exposed to silica dust (a carcinogen) because the firm had not provided a silica exposure control plan. Orientation records could not be found for two workers exposed to a fall hazard of 12 m (40 ft.). The worker who was supposed to act as the qualified coordinator for the worksite and deal with health and safety issues was also expected to work on construction tasks, which drew his attention away from the safety of the worksite. The firm repeatedly failed to ensure that the activities of employers, workers, and other persons at its workplace relating to occupational health and safety were coordinated. It also repeatedly failed to do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system for ensuring compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.

Thind Properties Ltd. | \$12,070.71 | Vancouver | November 26, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected a site where this firm was the prime contractor for the construction of a 12-storey tower and found multiple violations of safety requirements. For example, guardrails were not adequately constructed or secured; openings in the floor were unguarded and unmarked; and a worker cutting cinder blocks with a wet saw was not wearing eye or hearing protection. The firm failed to do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system for ensuring compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated violation.

Penalties (continued)

Tri-City Environmental Corp. | \$2,500 | Vancouver | November 25, 2014

This firm conducted a hazardous materials survey of a house in Vancouver that was about to be demolished. WorkSafeBC's inspection of the property and review of the hazmat survey found that the firm failed to collect adequate samples from various areas likely to contain asbestos, and in some cases had not collected any samples from such areas. The firm also failed to completely remove some asbestos-containing materials (e.g., duct tape residue and vinyl flooring debris). These were repeated violations of the requirement to ensure that any hazardous materials found on a worksite are safely contained or removed before demolition begins.

Triex Contracting Ltd. | \$16,423.24 | Langley | November 4, 2014

This firm's worker was falling trees with the help of an excavator when he was seriously injured by a tree that struck and pinned him. WorkSafeBC issued four orders to the firm in August and September 2013 for violating requirements to prepare a safe escape route, use appropriate rigging techniques, identify and communicate hazards to workers, and develop written safe work procedures. The firm did not comply with the orders until May 2014. The firm is being penalized for its failure to comply with WorkSafeBC orders within a reasonable time.

Troj & Odis Construction Ltd. | \$13,995.80 | Surrey | November 25, 2014

This firm was building a strip mall with a cantilevered roof overhang. WorkSafeBC observed three of the firm's workers performing framing tasks near the edge of the overhang. Another worker was underneath the overhang, standing on a scaffold without guardrails. None of the workers were using personal fall protection systems. All four were exposed to a risk of falling as much as 6 m (19 ft.). The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Waraich Roofing Ltd. | \$5,000 | Surrey | September 25, 2014

Two of this firm's workers were shingling the steep roof of a two-storey house under construction. They were wearing safety harnesses but were not connected to safety ropes, lanyards, or anchor points, nor was any other form of fall protection in place. They were exposed to a risk of falling about 6 m (20 ft.). The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required was a repeated and high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety, a violation of section 115(2)(e) of the Workers Compensation Act.

WDIC Contracting Ltd. | \$1,146.78 | Chilliwack | November 25, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed two of this firm's workers near the edge of the roof of a two-storey house under construction. Neither worker was using a personal fall protection system; no other form of fall protection was in place. The workers were exposed to a risk of falling more than 6 m (20 ft.) to uneven ground strewn with construction debris. The firm failed to instruct its workers in fall protection systems and procedures, a repeated violation.

Yuan Xiao Tian | \$2,500 | Surrey | October 30, 2014

WorkSafeBC observed two of this firm's workers on the extremely steep roof of a house performing re-roofing tasks. Neither worker was wearing personal fall protection gear, nor was any other form of fall protection in place. They were exposed to a risk of falling 4 to 5.5 m (14 to 18 ft.). The firm's failure to ensure that a fall protection system was used as required was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Manufacturing

B.A. Dawson Blacktop Ltd. | \$47,603.69 | Kamloops | October 2, 2014

At a cement and asphalt plant operated by this firm, a worker entered a silo to take measurements for a planned welding job. Another worker, unaware that someone was in the silo, started to prepare a batch of cement. Overhead gates in the silo opened and a large volume of sand engulfed the first worker. The worker, who was found unresponsive and was rescued, could easily have died. The firm's failure to provide a lockout procedure and to ensure that machinery was locked out before its worker entered the silo was a high-risk violation.

Brink Forest Products Ltd. | \$68,773.47 | Prince George | September 22, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's finger joint manufacturing operation and found combustible dust accumulations from 0.6 to 30 cm (1/4 to 12 in.) on a variety of surfaces in two of its buildings. Some of the dust was in contact with potential ignition sources. Up to 40 workers in the two buildings would have been exposed to a risk of serious injury or death in the event of a fire or explosion resulting from the dust. Prevention officers issued an order to stop work until the dust accumulations could be removed. The firm's failure to control and remove hazardous accumulations of combustible dust as required by section 5.81 of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Carrier Lumber Ltd. | \$14,999.29 | Prince George | October 3, 2014

WorkSafeBC officers inspected this firm's sawmill and planer mill and observed accumulations of combustible dust more than 0.3 cm (1/8 in.) deep, some up to 20 cm (8 in.) deep, on roof rafters, wall purlins, and other surfaces in the blower pit structure, an open-air structure located outside the planer mill. The accumulations covered more than 5 percent of the structure's overall surface area, and some were in direct contact with ignition sources, such as a gear reducer and electrical junction box. Officers determined that the firm failed to regularly inspect the blower pit area at intervals that would prevent the development of hazardous accumulations of combustible dust. The firm's failure to control and remove such accumulations was a repeated violation.

Carrier Lumber Ltd. | \$73,814.33 | Prince George | October 3, 2014

In an explosion and fire at this firm's sawmill on July 22, 2013, one worker was burned by hot metal shrapnel and two other workers narrowly missed being burned or killed by the resulting fireball. WorkSafeBC's investigation found that to increase production, the firm had modified a planer to run at speeds well above those recommended by the manufacturer and had begun operating the planer 24 hours a day, 5 days a week. As a result, friction fires on the planer were common, and smouldering material conveyed through the dust collection system had caused several fires in the months before this incident. The firm failed to operate equipment according to the manufacturer's instructions and to remedy workplace conditions hazardous to the health and safety of its workers. It also failed to establish health and safety policies and programs in accordance with the regulations, and to adequately instruct workers required to fight fires in the safe performance of their duties. These were all high-risk violations.

Lantic Inc. | \$97,500 | Vancouver | October 16, 2014

At this firm's sugar refinery, a boiler tube burst inside the firebox of a boiler lined with friable asbestos (asbestos that easily becomes airborne), causing a slurry of water and debris to spill into the powerhouse. A worker informed a superintendent of the firm that the water was likely contaminated with asbestos but the superintendent did not investigate the spill as required. Multiple workers were likely exposed to airborne asbestos fibres as a result of being permitted to enter the space to sample, clean, repair, and inspect without being told of or protected from the hazard. Required personal protective equipment was not used, and cleanup procedures were inadequate to contain the asbestos fibres. The firm failed to correct reported unsafe conditions in its workplace. It allowed work to take place that disturbed asbestos-containing material without taking the necessary precautions to protect workers. These were high-risk violations. The firm knowingly or with wilful disregard contravened its duty to ensure the health and safety of its own and other workers present in its workplace.

Lucky 6 Industrial Co. Ltd. | \$2,598.93 | Chilliwack | October 10, 2014

This firm's worker was lubricating a machine that moulds plastic pill bottles while the machine was cycling. He got caught between its moving die plates and sustained serious upper-body injuries. WorkSafeBC's investigation found that switches on safety gates that guard the machine had been bypassed to allow the machine to operate even when the gates were open. The firm's failure to develop lockout procedures, as required whenever machinery is not effectively safeguarded, was a high-risk violation. As well, the worker was not adequately trained in safe operation of machinery or in lockout requirements. The firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their safety.

Mako Wood Furniture Inc. | \$9,427.92 | Surrey | November 7, 2014

In October 2013, WorkSafeBC ordered this firm to remedy conditions related to overloading racks and recirculating air from an air-cleaning device. In June 2014, WorkSafeBC ordered the firm to adjust its combustible dust ventilation system to meet engineering specifications. As of October 2014, the firm had not complied with any of these orders. The firm is being penalized because it failed to comply within a reasonable amount of time.

Mutual Materials Company of Canada Inc. | \$26,333.02 | Abbotsford | September 19, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's warehouse and observed two forklift operators who were not wearing seat belts while their forklifts were moving. The firm failed to ensure that its workers wore seat belts while operating forklifts as required under section 16.33(1) of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Pacific Salmon Industries Inc. / Scanner Enterprises | \$15,063.20 | Surrey | November 18, 2014

After an ammonia leak at this firm's fish-packing plant, WorkSafeBC found that the plant lacked an emergency ventilation system for accidental release of ammonia. Officers also found that the existing ammonia ventilation system was not designed, installed, and maintained using established engineering principles, exposing workers to a risk of serious injury or death if an ammonia leak occurred. These were repeated and high-risk violations. The firm is being penalized for failing to comply in a reasonable time with orders to repair and modify its ammonia ventilation systems.

Penalties (continued)

Princeton Post & Rail Ltd. | \$10,349.93 | Princeton | November 5, 2014

This firm's young worker received serious hand injuries while operating a doweller machine at the firm's fence-post manufacturing plant. WorkSafeBC found that the machine had a safeguard to prevent workers from accessing hazardous points of operation, but that it had been removed. This was a repeated and high-risk violation of the safeguarding requirements and the prohibition against circumventing safeguarding. The controls for starting and stopping the doweller machine were not within easy reach of the operator, a violation of the powered equipment requirements. Finally, the injured worker had not been given health and safety orientation and training specific to the workplace prior to starting work. The firm failed to provide the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure its worker's health and safety.

Tolko Industries Ltd. / Lavington Planer | \$97,500 | Lavington | October 9, 2014

This firm's young worker, part of a night-shift cleanup crew at a sawmill, was cleaning next to a moving conveyor belt. He became entangled in the belt and sustained fatal injuries. WorkSafeBC's investigation found that the machine was missing part of its guarding. The firm failed to ensure that the conveyor belt was safeguarded as required. The failure to replace the missing guard also violated the requirement that employers remedy any workplace condition hazardous to workers' safety. Further, because the machinery lacked proper safeguarding, the firm's failure to lock it out before maintenance work was done violated lockout requirements. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their safety. These were all high-risk violations.

Urban Metals Ltd. | \$1,000 | Port Coquitlam | October 8, 2014

Welding stations at this firm's worksite did not have local exhaust ventilation to minimize worker exposure to harmful airborne contaminants. In September 2013, WorkSafeBC ordered the firm to install local exhaust ventilation, but as of July 10, 2014, the firm had failed to comply.

Primary Resources

Avina Fresh Produce Ltd. | \$45,100.87 | Abbotsford | October 28, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's mushroom farm and found that the firm was using picking platforms without guardrails or proper locking mechanisms. Allowing workers to use platforms without guardrails when working at heights over 1 m (4 ft.) above grade was a high-risk violation of section 4.55 of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation (the Regulation). The firm also violated section 4.3(2)(b) of the Regulation, by failing to repair and inspect its platforms as specified by a professional engineer — even months after WorkSafeBC ordered the firm to do so.

Christina Mushrooms Ltd. | \$2,268.96 | Abbotsford | November 14, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected one of this firm's mushroom farms in September 2013 and found that its mushroom picking ladder systems were unsafe. Examples of deficiencies included broken guardrails, frayed cable, and missing locking mechanisms. WorkSafeBC ordered the firm to repair and inspect its picking equipment as specified by a professional engineer. As of May 2014, the firm had not complied.

H.Q. Mushroom Farm Ltd. | \$8,380.80 | Abbotsford | November 25, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's mushroom farm and found picking platforms without guardrails or proper locking mechanisms. Workers were exposed to a risk of falling to the concrete floor and sustaining serious or fatal injuries. The firm violated section 4.3(2)(b) of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation by failing to repair and inspect its platforms as specified by a professional engineer.

Preet Farm Contractors Ltd. | \$17,249.46 | Delta | October 7, 2014

This firm failed to maintain in safe operating condition the farm vehicle it used to transport workers. WorkSafeBC inspected the vehicle, which was being used to transport 12 workers, and found that its floor and frame were compromised by large amounts of rust. The inspection also found the vehicle to be in disrepair generally. This put the safety of the firm's workers and others at risk. The firm's failure to meet the maintenance requirements for vehicles used to transport workers was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Preet Farm Contractors Ltd. | \$35,154.59 | Surrey | October 7, 2014

This firm transported 28 workers as passengers in a vehicle designed for 14 passengers (plus driver), putting the safety of its workers and others in nearby vehicles at extreme risk. The firm knowingly and with reckless disregard contravened the requirements in the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation for transportation of workers. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Samuel William Cromarty / Lucky Logger | \$5,221 | Hope | October 28, 2014

At a logging site in heavy fog, this firm's worker, the hook tender, moved out of the safe zone near the timberline. He was likely trying to get a closer look at a turn (a load of logs hooked to the grapple yarder) that was stuck on an obstruction. Suddenly the turn either upended or swung around the obstruction, striking the worker. The firm failed to ensure that its worker was positioned so as to avoid exposure to moving logs, as required by section 26.39 of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a high-risk violation.

Vernon Albert Reimer & Debra Reimer / Rat River Logging | \$2,500 | Prince George | November 24, 2014

This firm was the prime contractor carrying out logging activities on a cutblock. The firm failed to promptly fall or assess numerous danger trees that posed a possible hazard to users of a road through the block, exposing its own and other workers to a risk of serious injury or death. The failure to fall or assess the dangerous trees was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Service Sector

Doug Stevens Ltd. | \$21,943.18 | West Kelowna | November 21, 2014

This firm directed its worker to use a piece of lifting equipment that WorkSafeBC had ordered out of service to lift a part out of a bulldozer. The worker refused the unsafe work and was dismissed from his job. A supervisor then used the piece of equipment to complete the lift. Besides contravening the stop-use order wilfully or with reckless disregard, the firm failed to investigate the report of unsafe work. It also failed to maintain a workplace health and safety program as required, and failed in general to ensure the health and safety of its workers and any other workers present at its workplace.

Til-Van Holdings Ltd. / Frontier Restaurant Motel & 24 Hour Self Serve | \$2,578.88 | Revelstoke | November 17, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's restaurant and found machinery that was not fitted with adequate safeguards, exposing workers to the risk of serious injury if they inadvertently contacted moving parts. The firm also did not have lockout procedures for cleaning and maintenance of machinery, exposing workers to a risk of receiving an electric shock or being caught in equipment if it activated. WorkSafeBC first ordered the firm to remedy these failings in January 2013. WorkSafeBC performed five separate follow-up inspections throughout 2013 and issued the firm a warning letter, but as of September 2014 the firm still had not complied. The firm failed to comply with the outstanding orders within a reasonable time.

Trade

Jace Holdings Ltd. / Thrifty Foods | \$63,317.44 | Saanichton | November 24, 2014

A burger-molding machine in this firm's grocery store was producing malformed patties. A worker was directed to reach past a safeguard to correct the problem while the machine was running. The worker did so and sustained serious injuries. WorkSafeBC's investigation found that the firm's workers were not trained in safe operation of the machine or in lockout requirements for it. The firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision needed to ensure their safety. These were high-risk violations.

Transportation and Warehousing

BFI Canada Inc. | \$75,000 | Kelowna | September 5, 2014

This firm operates a waste material collection and sorting facility. To clear a jam, two of this firm's workers climbed on top of a conveyor belt when it had been powered down but not locked out. The belt started moving again while one worker was still on it. He sustained serious injuries. The firm failed to ensure the use and verification of lockout procedures as required by the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation, a high-risk violation. About a month later, WorkSafeBC inspected the facility, and found various deficiencies related to lockout and safeguarding requirements. For instance, the firm allowed its workers to use a baler machine from which safeguards to ensure workers could not access the hazardous point of operation had been removed. The firm's failure to ensure that the machine was fitted with adequate safeguards as required by section 12.2(b) of the Regulation was a repeated and high-risk

B.S.G. Trucking Inc. | \$1,000 | Surrey | October 15, 2014

An inspection found that the starter of this firm's dump truck could engage when the engine was coupled to the drive wheels (that is, while the truck was in gear). Starting equipment while it is in gear can cause it to move forward unexpectedly, posing a hazard to people

Penalties (continued)

nearby. WorkSafeBC ordered the firm to install a starter interlock switch to prevent this. Two months later the firm had not complied. The firm's failure to ensure that its mobile equipment could not be started when the engine was coupled to the wheels violated section 16.16 of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.

D.L. Bins Ltd. | \$24,353.18 | Cowichan Valley | November 27, 2014

This firm's worker was standing atop a trommel (a large drumlike revolving screen used to process compost) to clean it when it revolved, throwing the worker 3.4 m (11 ft.) to the ground. The worker sustained serious injuries. The firm failed to ensure that all parts of the trommel were secured against movement before its worker began the maintenance work. It failed to ensure that workers who carried out maintenance work on the equipment had ready access to personal locks so they could follow the required lockout procedure. Finally, it failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. These were high-risk violations.

Fairway Disposal & Demolition Ltd. | \$12,603.30 | Richmond | November 21, 2014

Hazardous substances were present, or potentially present, in this firm's waste stream, which put its workers at risk of exposure. The firm failed to have a qualified person conduct the required walkthrough survey of its worksite to assess the potential for workers' overexposure to hazardous substances and to write and help the firm implement an exposure control plan. In November 2011, WorkSafeBC ordered the firm to correct these health and safety violations, but by November 2012 the firm had not complied. This was a repeated violation.

Four Seasons Roofing and Disposal 2007 Ltd. | \$2,564.98 | Surrey | November 26, 2014

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's worksite, a pre-1990 house being prepared for demolition, and observed a waste disposal bin filled with potentially asbestos-containing materials. The hazardous materials survey of the site supplied by the firm was insufficient, so the officer issued a stop-work order and surrounded the site with yellow warning tape. Four weeks later, the officer visited the site again and found the tape torn down and a large pile of refuse behind the house. The officer recognized the refuse as the former contents of the disposal bin. The firm is being penalized for knowingly violating a WorkSafeBC order.

WWL Vehicle Services Canada Ltd. | \$194,832.51 | Delta | November 3, 2014

This firm's worker fell while climbing off a railcar used to ship automobiles and was seriously injured. In April 2013, WorkSafeBC ordered the firm to implement a practicable engineering solution for fall protection at its workplace, but as of April 2014, the firm had failed to comply.

Marketplace directory

















"Over 25 years of OH&S expertise"

www.kineticohs.com info@kineticohs.com

Moving Safety in the Right Direction

Specializing in:

•Asbestos, Lead & Mould Survey & Assessments

 Asbestos Air & Bulk Analysis
 Confined Space Assessments & Procedures • Worker Exposure Monitoring • Exposure Control Plan Development • Indoor Air Quality

Contact Us:

Harvey Wong, CRSP, ROHT 604-816-1290 Ramin Hamidnejad, CRSP 604-401-7174 Office 604-988-0099

Sure Hazmat and Testing

Our Services Include:

- · Asbestos Worker Training · Pre-Purchase Hazmat Assessment
- Pre-Renovation Hazmat Assessment
 Pre-Demolition Hazmat Assessment
 - Analytical Services: NIOSH 7400 & NIOSH 9002 Methods

For more information, contact: John Shaw C: 604-724-2341 T: 604-444-0204

E: surehazmat@shawbiz.ca www.surehazmat.com









Reduce the impact with the trusted leader in First Aid and Safety Training

Accidents in the workplace cost your company. You can reduce the impact by making your workplace safer, and ensuring that there is a qualified first aid attendant on your worksite. St. John Ambulance can help with first aid training and product solutions that work for you.

Register today at www.sja.ca or call 1.866.321.2651 Shop online: www.shopsafetyproducts.ca

