

In 2009, 211 penalties were imposed against 190 employers, totaling \$4,465,313.40. Individual penalties ranged from \$1,000 to \$250,000. Following is a list of the penalties, including employer name, dollar value, the nature of the violation, and the status of any appeal. There are two levels of appeal for WorkSafeBC penalties. The Status and Adjusted columns indicate if a penalty was appealed or is being appealed (and at what level), is within the appeal period, and the result of any appeal as of date this report was released. Where there is an amount listed in the Adjusted Penalty Amount column, that amount represents the current penalty amount as at the date of publication.

Operating City	Employer/Description of Violation	Imposed Penalty Amount	Status	Adjusted Penalty Amount
Ft. Nelson	<p>CANADIAN NATURAL RESOURCES LIMITED Fatality. A young worker was killed when he fell from a drilling rig's monkey board (work platform) shortly after the rig became engulfed in flames as a result of an uncontrolled release of gas from the wellbore. This firm failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers and all other workers where its work was being done. In particular, the firm failed to analyze the risks arising from work activities and to implement safe work procedures as required by the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. These reckless violations resulted in a worker's death.</p>	\$250,000.00	Under review	
Richmond	<p>SNC-LAVALIN CONSTRUCTORS (PACIFIC) INC & RIZZANI DE ECCHER INC Fatality. A worker, operating a carry-deck crane, was crushed between the crane and a bridge side wall. This employer failed to adequately instruct, direct, and supervise workers, and failed to carry out effective, regular workplace inspections to ensure safe work practices.</p>	\$225,000.00	Under review	
Kamloops	<p>RETIREMENT CONCEPTS DEVELOPMENTS LTD. This firm, as the owner/prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, failed to establish and maintain a system that ensured compliance with the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.</p>	\$148,468.07	Not appealed	
Richmond	<p>MONTALCO CABINETS (1991) LTD One of this firm's workers suffered an amputated thumb after contacting an unguarded table saw blade. This was a repeated violation by the firm of the requirement to guard a table saw blade.</p>	\$105,638.65	Review Division varied – no further appeal	\$13,994.84
Coquitlam	<p>BURNIK VENTURES INC A worker leaned over the edge of an unguarded balcony, about 12 m (40 ft.) above grade, to discard scrap drywall. The worker was not wearing fall protection. This employer failed to provide a fall protection system for work where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.</p>	\$104,067.18	Not appealed	

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

Vancouver	<p>RICHMOND ELEVATOR MAINTENANCE LTD</p> <p>Fatality. A worker performing car-top service was fatally injured when he fell between an elevator car and the elevator shaft. This firm failed to provide elevator mechanics with adequate instruction, training, and supervision. It allowed workers to troubleshoot on fully energized equipment, and it failed to develop specific safe work procedures to protect workers from a high-risk hazard.</p>	\$97,500.00	Review Division varied, under appeal	\$75,000.00
Chetwynd	<p>NABORS CANADA ULC</p> <p>A worker was dismantling a drilling rig when he fell about 4 m (13 ft.) onto rig matting, sustaining a serious injury. This firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system as required by the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. It failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety.</p>	\$97,500.00	Within appeal period	
Whistler	<p>INTRAWEST ULC</p> <p>Fatalities. Two young workers were killed when their snowmobile veered off a ski run and into a gully. This employer had a comprehensive snowmobile training program. However, the snowmobile operator did not go through it. The employer failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers. It failed to ensure that the operator received adequate instruction in the safe use of the snowmobile and that the operator demonstrated to a qualified supervisor or instructor competency in operating it.</p>	\$93,750.00	Under review	
Williams Lake	<p>SIGURDSON BROS LOGGING CO LTD (BKR)1</p> <p>Two serious injuries occurred about five weeks apart in different sawmills operated by this employer. In the first incident, a worker was cleaning under a lumber stacker when he reached through an operating transfer deck chain for a piece of waste wood. His glove got caught in the chain sprocket, and his hand was drawn into the sprocket and amputated. In the second incident, a worker climbed onto the deck of a trimmer machine and approached an unguarded trim saw to straighten out boards being fed into the saw. As the worker tried to kick a board over the saw blade, his work boot was pulled into the trim saw and he fell onto the saw. The worker's right leg was amputated. His badly injured left leg was later amputated in hospital. This employer failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers and other workers at its workplace. It failed to remedy workplace conditions hazardous to worker health or safety and to provide its workers and other workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. It also failed to lock out and to guard the chain sprocket and circular saw.</p>	\$86,689.78	Not appealed	
Vancouver	<p>SNC-LAVALIN CONSTRUCTORS (PACIFIC) INC</p> <p>Fatality. A worker operating a carry-deck crane was fatally crushed between the crane and a bridge side wall. As the prime contractor, this employer failed to inspect the workplace, including the crane, and failed to implement a system or process to comply with the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.</p>	\$81,808.13	Under review	
Richmond	<p>CCI INDUSTRIES LTD</p> <p>This employer failed to ensure that equipment was locked out before performing maintenance work. It also failed to provide workers with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision with respect to lockout.</p>	\$79,957.57	Not appealed	

Nanaimo	VANCOUVER ISLAND HEALTH AUTHORITY Workers at two of the employer's acute care facilities were exposed to high risk of serious injury arising from the employer's repeated non-compliance with the regulations pertaining to workplace violence prevention and which also constituted a breach of the employer's general duty to ensure the health and safety of its workers.	\$75,000.00	Under review	
Ft. Nelson	NABORS CANADA ULC Fatality. A young worker was killed when he fell from a drilling rig's monkey board (work platform) after the rig became engulfed in flames as a result of an uncontrolled release of gas from the wellbore. This firm failed to ensure that the emergency escape system provided a quick and unimpeded exit. It also failed to make its workers aware of all known or reasonably foreseeable health or safety hazards.	\$75,000.00	Under review	
Houston	CANADIAN FOREST PRODUCTS LTD Workers were assigned to remove an accumulation of snow and debris from a waste conveyor. The conveyor was left running while this work was being performed. A worker sustained serious injury when his foot became caught in the conveyor. This employer failed to apply lockout procedures as required by Regulation, and failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety at the workplace.	\$75,000.00	Review Division Confirmed (within appeal period for WCAT)	\$75,000.00
Richmond	PTPC CORRUGATED COMPANY A worker's arm was crushed in a corrugator machine. This employer failed to de-energize parts not essential to the process. It also failed to provide workers with adequate instruction, training, and supervision.	\$75,000.00	Not appealed	
Chase	INTERNATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS LIMITED Fatality. A worker entered a hazardous area while attempting to clear a photocell on a canter line. The canter machine had been temporarily shut down, but it was not locked out as required by the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. The worker was killed when the machine was restarted while he was still in the hazardous area. This firm failed to provide adequate supervision and to follow the lock-out requirements. This was a repeated violation.	\$75,000.00	Under review	
Coquitlam	MAINSTREAM ASSOCIATION FOR PROACTIVE COMMUNITY LIVING A worker was exposed to violence in the workplace after this firm failed to conduct a proper risk assessment for the prevention of such violence. The firm also failed to take corrective actions immediately to prevent a recurrence of similar incidents.	\$74,534.17	Review Division cancelled	\$0.00
Richmond	VICEROY HOMES LIMITED Fatality. A young worker was fatally injured when a cart carrying 990 kg (2200 lb.) of wooden trusses tipped over onto him. This employer failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers. It failed to provide workers with adequate supervision and written safe work procedures.	\$70,425.54	Not appealed	

Port Coquitlam	CALIBRE HEALTH SERVICES INC. An inmate wielding a homemade knife took a worker hostage. This employer failed to comply with numerous sections of the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation, creating a high risk of serious injury, serious illness, or death. Its violations include failing to establish and maintain a joint health and safety committee, failing to conduct a risk assessment, and failing to take immediate corrective action to prevent a reoccurrence of hostage-taking incidents.	\$70,348.16	Under review
Abbotsford	RHA ENTERPRISES LTD. Fatalities. A 15-passenger van carrying 16 farm workers plus the driver collided with two transport trucks, rolled, and landed on its roof on the highway median. Three workers were killed and 14 others injured. The vehicle was not equipped with the required number of seatbelts, was not maintained according to the manufacturer's recommendations, and carried two more passengers than it was designed for. In addition, the van's driver did not hold the appropriate licence.	\$69,800.60	Not appealed
Vancouver	BC PAVILION CORPORATION This firm failed to ensure that a 347-volt electrical distribution panel (relay) was completely disconnected and locked out before starting work on it. It also failed to provide adequate instruction, training, and supervision.	\$68,970.57	Not appealed
Delta	DELTA CEDAR PRODUCTS LTD ETAL A worker was seriously injured when he accessed a hazardous point of operation at the outfeed of a machine. This employer failed to ensure the health and safety of the worker it assigned to carry out work on an inadequately safeguarded machine.	\$68,749.54	Not appealed
Richmond	QUE PASA MEXICAN FOODS LTD. A worker's arm was amputated after being caught in the drive unit of a drum fryer. This employer failed to provide the worker with written safe work procedures in accordance with the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated violation.	\$67,718.53	Not appealed
Prince George	YELLOWHEAD ROAD & BRIDGE (FORT GEORGE)LTD A worker suffered serious electrical burns when this employer failed to maintain the minimum clearance between workers and high-voltage equipment and conductors. This was a high-risk violation. In addition, when the minimum clearance could not be maintained because of work circumstances or the inadvertent movement of people or equipment, the employer failed to obtain from the power system's owner an assurance in writing on a form acceptable to the Board.	\$64,904.11	Under review
Revelstoke	SHEAR WALL CONTRACTING LTD This firm's project superintendent obstructed two WorkSafeBC officers who were trying to inspect a work site where they observed high-risk violations, including the lack of fall protection.	\$61,398.50	Within appeal period
Vancouver	PENFOLDS ROOFING INC. A worker was exposed to the risk of serious injury or death from falling off a roof. This firm failed to maintain a fall protection system and to install toeholds on a steep-sloped roof. This was a repeated high-risk violation.	\$59,229.05	Under review

Chilliwack	JAKES CONSTRUCTION LTD. This firm conducted blasting operations around 60-kV and 230-kV overhead power lines without first getting written assurance from the power system's owner.	\$59,028.73	Under review	
Abbotsford	JAKES CONSTRUCTION LTD. During the demolition of a commercial building, this employer ruptured an active natural gas line. It also disturbed asbestos-containing materials without ensuring that its workers were adequately protected.	\$59,028.73	Under review	
Richmond	LAFARGE CANADA INC This firm repeatedly failed to protect workers from exposure to corrosive products (clinker and Portland cement), to safeguard equipment, to ensure worker health and safety, and to coordinate the work of contractors.	\$55,531.32	Not appealed	
Port Coquitlam	CONCORD CONCRETE PUMPS INC This employer has continued over a 10-month period to violate numerous sections of the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. These violations were committed knowingly and/or recklessly.	\$53,540.15	Under review	
Quesnel	UNITED CONCRETE & GRAVEL LTD A worker suffered serious injuries after a fall of about 6 m (20 ft.). This firm failed to comply with the fall protection requirements.	\$50,937.65	Review Division varied – no further appeal	\$28,929.53
Port Hardy	KELTIC SEAFOODS LIMITED A worker suffered amputations to several fingers after contacting an energized auger conveyor. The auger's fixed guard was not properly secured against being removed without tools. This firm failed to provide the worker with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision.	\$49,104.50	Review Division varied – under WCAT Appeal	\$34,373.15
Surrey	METRO WASTE PAPER RECOVERY INC This employer impeded or dissuaded a worker from reporting an injury and establishing a claim for compensation with WorkSafeBC.	\$48,743.25	Not appealed	
Delta	CANADIAN VINYLTEK WINDOW CORPORATION This firm failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers by not providing adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision. It failed repeatedly to conduct workplace inspections and accident investigations, to ensure monthly meetings of the joint health and safety committee, to provide first aid attendants and adequate first aid facilities, and to safeguard saws adequately.	\$48,301.11	Within appeal period	
Squamish	NATT ROOFING LTD Four of this employer's workers, including the employer's principal, were not attached to a roof with lifelines or lanyards. The employer failed to ensure that a fall protection system is used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more might occur. In addition, it did not have a written fall protection plan for work done where workers are not protected by permanent guardrails and where a fall of 7.5 m (25 ft.) or more might occur. This employer received four previous administrative penalties for the same violations over the course of three years.	\$43,743.30	Within appeal period	

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

Cranbrook	TRI-CITY CONTRACTING LTD This firm's workers were exposed to a hazardous substance. Despite knowing that floor tiles contained chrysotile asbestos, the firm allowed its workers to remove the tiles without the appropriate precautions.	\$38,569.34	Review Division varied – under WCAT appeal	\$28,456.42
Kamloops	TRI-CITY CONTRACTING LTD This prime contractor failed to take reasonable steps to ensure the coordination of safety activities and to establish and maintain a system to ensure compliance.	\$38,569.34	Under review	
Abbotsford	MARV'S EXCAVATING LTD This firm failed to ensure that an excavation over 1.2 m (4 ft.) deep was adequately sloped, shored, or supported according to the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation or a professional engineer's instructions before allowing workers to enter it. This was a repeated violation.	\$38,063.16	Not appealed	
Richmond	PREMIER ENVELOPE (B C) LTD The tip of a worker's finger was amputated while she was working on a guillotine-style paper cutter. This employer failed to provide adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision to workers who operated paper-cutting presses. The employer also failed to adequately safeguard a guillotine paper slicer and die cutter.	\$37,634.77	Under review	
Oak Bay	ROMA BUILDERS LTD This firm, which had already received a penalty for a similar violation, failed to develop and implement a fall protection system.	\$34,696.48	Under review	
Vancouver	PMC BUILDERS & DEV LTD A worker was welding from a scaffold platform that stood on a plywood platform. The plywood platform in turn stood on a roof deck. The worker was exposed to a fall hazard of about 7.5 m (25 ft.). He was not wearing fall protection equipment even though it was available on site, and there were no guardrails. This was a repeated fall protection violation.	\$34,271.75	Review rejected	
Delta	WEST COAST GRANITE MANUFACTURING INC A granite slab weighing about 486 kg (1,080 lb.) released from a scissor clamp that a worker was using to move the slab. The slab pinned the worker against adjacent stacked slabs. The workstation had an unsafe design, and the work method was unsafe. This firm failed to ensure the health and safety of all workers at its worksite, failed to maintain an occupational health and safety program, and failed to stack materials securely.	\$33,425.94	Not appealed	
Lytton	GRAND CONSTRUCTION LTD At this firm's worksite, numerous ends of rebar were sticking out from various concrete foundations. Most of these exposed ends were not guarded, bent over, or removed, thereby exposing workers to a risk of impalement injury. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to ensure that exposed ends of reinforcing steel hazardous to workers are guarded or removed.	\$33,115.06	Under review	

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

New Westminster	SURLANG ROOFING LTD Three of this firm's workers were working on a 7:12 sloped roof that was about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. The workers were not wearing fall protection. This was a repeated violation.	\$32,149.90	Review Division confirmed – no further appeal	
Merritt	651432 BC LTD This firm's supervisor entered an excavation that was 2 m (7 ft.) deep and had sides that were not adequately sloped, shored, or protected by other effective means. This was a repeated violation of the sloping and shoring requirements set out in the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	\$31,655.42	Within appeal period	
Masset	GRAND CONSTRUCTION LTD A worker was installing plywood flooring on the second floor of a building. The guardrails had been removed. The worker, not protected by another means of fall protection, was exposed to a potential fall of 3.5 m (12 ft.) to the concrete floor below. This was repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$30,498.16	Under review	
Burnaby	NATT ROOFING LTD This firm failed to protect its workers from the hazard of falling from roofs over 3 m (10 ft.) high. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$29,505.84	Not appealed	
Coquitlam	AQUAPROOF RESTORATION SERVICES INC A worker was standing without fall protection on top of a balcony handrail to access a scaffold about 4.5 m (15 ft.) above grade.	\$28,910.26	Review withdrawn	
Surrey	F & G DELIVERY LIMITED Fatality. This employer's delivery truck driver was fatally injured when his truck rolled over him at a delivery stop. The vehicle's parking brake had not been used for some time. As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, the employer failed to ensure the coordination of health and safety activities and failed to establish and maintain a system or process to ensure compliance with the regulations. The employer also failed to ensure the health and safety of other workers at the workplace.	\$28,880.00	Review Division cancelled	\$0.00
Prince George	P.G. SORT YARD LTD This firm failed to comply with the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation regarding lockout, safeguarding, and a safe means of crossing transfer decks. This was a repeated violation.	\$28,852.52	Not appealed	
Surrey	JAS CONSTRUCTION LTD. Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection near the unguarded edge of a building. The distance from the edge of the third floor to the ground was about 6 m (20 ft.). This was a repeated fall protection violation.	\$28,738.06	Not appealed	
North Vancouver	ADVANCED SYSTEMS ROOFING AND WATERPROOFING LTD. Several of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a roof about 10 m (35 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	\$27,717.24	Within appeal period	

Delta	WESTSHORE SPECIALTIES LTD A worker was seriously injured when he accessed an inadequately safeguarded hazardous point of operation at the outfeed of a machine. This employer failed to ensure the health and safety of this worker, who was assigned by another employer to carry out that other employer's work using an inadequately safeguarded machine. This employer owned the machine, which was located at a worksite also owned by this employer.	\$27,287.70	Not appealed
Dawson Creek	DAKOTA CONTRACTING LTD Fatality. This employer failed to adequately supervise a worker in the safe performance of duties, to ensure that equipment was repaired in accordance with manufacturer's instructions, and to shut down all mobile equipment before maintenance.	\$25,943.48	Not appealed
Surrey	ARKTOS DEVELOPMENTS LTD Fatality. A worker received fatal crushing injuries when a forklift boom he was working under suddenly collapsed. This employer failed to ensure the worker's health and safety. It failed to ensure that only trained and qualified workers were allowed to operate forklifts. It also failed to ensure that workers were adequately supervised and to ensure that a qualified mechanic inspected and maintained the forklift to ensure safe operation.	\$25,810.38	Not appealed
Coquitlam	POLSTAR CONSTRUCTION LTD. This firm failed to ensure that workers used a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.	\$25,805.94	Under review
Abbotsford	TIMBRO CONTRACTING LTD. Workers were working in a trench about 2 to 2.2 m (6.5 to 7.2 ft.) deep with no protective structures or shoring. This firm failed to ensure that a trench over 1.2 m (4 ft.) deep was adequately sloped, shored, or supported according to a professional engineer's instructions.	\$25,457.94	Under review – late filing
Burnaby	GREAT WEST PAPER BOX CO LTD This employer failed to ensure that its workers followed proper lockout procedures when doing maintenance on printing and box-making machinery. It failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety as well as the health and safety of other workers at the workplace. It also failed to undertake timely corrective action to prevent a recurrence of a similar incident after a worker sustained serious injury when cleaning machinery that had not been locked out.	\$24,365.56	Under review
West Vancouver	DC ROOFING INC One of this firm's directors and one of its workers were walking across the roof of a house, at heights over 7.5 m (25 ft.), without any fall protection. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work done where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also failed to ensure its scaffold platform had a minimum width of 50 cm (20 in.).	\$22,819.65	Under review

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

Burnaby	MASSULLO HOLDINGS LTD. Fatality. One of this firm's workers was fatally injured when a forklift tipped over onto him. The forklift, stuck in soft ground beside a sloped road, tipped over when the worker and one of the firm's owners tried to tow it onto the roadway. The firm failed to ensure that the worker was adequately trained in forklift operations, and it knowingly allowed the forklift to be used in an unsafe manner.	\$20,832.04	Review Division penalty – WCAT confirmed RD decision	\$20,832.04
Prince George	FORTWOOD HOMES LTD This firm allowed work to be done in an excavation that was over 1.2 m (4 ft.) deep and whose sides were not adequately supported or sloped, or safeguarded in any other way. This was a high-risk violation.	\$19,761.90	Under review	
Courtenay	BRYTAR CONTRACTING INC This is a repeated penalty for this firm's failure to use scaffold components according to the manufacturer's specifications or according to a professional engineer's written instructions that include the rated load, erection procedures, and compliance with the applicable standard. The firm also failed make the required data available at the workplace.	\$19,202.88	Review Division confirmed, under appeal	
Langley	FRASER VALLEY ROOFING LTD. This firm failed to ensure the safety of it workers when working 3 m (10 ft.) or more above grade. It failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system, failed to develop the required written fall protection plan, and failed to provide workers with adequate instruction, training, and supervision. This was a repeated violation.	\$18,907.84	Not appealed	
Surrey	JAS CONSTRUCTION LTD Fatality. One of this firm's workers sustained fatal head injuries after falling about 9 m (29 ft.) from the roof of a three-storey townhouse. The worker was wearing a fall protection harness, but it was not secured to an anchor system. There was no site-specific fall protection plan. The firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety.	\$18,679.74	Not appealed	
Coquitlam	MAYDAY CLEANING SERVICES INC. This firm has repeatedly failed to comply with orders. The orders have required an informal occupational health and safety program, a joint health and safety committee, the recording of all reported or treated injuries and exposures to contaminants covered by the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation, and the investigation of incidents that resulted in worker injuries requiring medical treatment.	\$18,510.13	Review Division varied, under appeal	\$16,385.21
Surrey	S & A EXCAVATING LTD This employer dug a bulk excavation in a lot beside a house. The excavation partially collapsed, exposing a foundation wall and leaving the sidewalk near the house suspended more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. If the sidewalk had collapsed, a gas line could have ruptured or a live hydro line could have been exposed. The employer failed to carry out the excavation according to a professional engineer's written instructions. It also failed to ensure the health and safety of workers and to provide workers with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision.	\$17,998.80	Within appeal period	

Esquimalt	SMYTHE ROOFING LTD. Four of this firm's workers were working without fall protection close to the edge of a roof about 4 m (13 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$17,803.60	Not Appealed
Campbell River	OKIM HOLDINGS LTD This firm failed repeatedly to 1) provide a quick and unobstructed emergency exit, 2) conduct a violence risk assessment, 3) conduct an assessment of the risk to workers of musculoskeletal injury, 4) ventilate a designated smoking room with a non-recirculating exhaust ventilation system to meet the requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation, 5) repair the building envelope to prevent moisture infiltration and mould growth, and 6) investigate the cause of a fire.	\$15,836.18	Review Division varied – no further appeal
Kamloops	WRABEL BROTHERS CONSTRUCTION LTD Three of this firm's workers were working without any fall protection at the leading edge of a flat roof about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade. This is a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$15,666.02	Not appealed
Colwood	KENNETH ROYSTON POSKITT This employer failed to ensure the use of adequate fall protection equipment and to provide adequate supervision. These were repeated violations.	\$15,286.35	Under review
North Vancouver	SHAKE N' TILE STEEL ROOFING CORP Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a roof about 7 m (25 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	\$14,825.98	Within appeal period
New Westminster	EMPIRE ROOFING LTD Three workers were working with no means of fall protection on a frost-covered, sloped roof at heights between 3 and 4.5 m (11 and 15 ft.) above grade.	\$14,607.01	Not appealed
Ladner	LADNER HOMES LTD Two workers were doing roofing work about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. The workers were not using fall protection and none was available on site. This firm's supervisor was on site at the time. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$14,598.36	Under review
Colwood	SKYTECH ENTERPRISES INC. This firm repeatedly failed to ensure that its workers wear fall protection where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur.	\$13,280.65	Review rejected
Vancouver	SONEPAR CANADA INC This employer failed to ensure that materials were placed, stacked, or stored on racking in a stable and secure manner. This violation resulted in a worker's serious injury. The employer failed to ensure that the racking could withstand any stresses likely to be imposed upon it. Further, the employer failed to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety in carrying out the work of placing, stacking, and storing materials in a stable and secure manner.	\$11,760.92	Not appealed

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

Coquitlam	PERM ROOF 1 LTD. Two workers, one of them on his first day on the job, were working without fall protection on a roof about 10 m (32 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated high-risk violation.	\$11,560.55	Not appealed
Surrey	FRASERVIEW TERRACE LTD A worker sustained serious back injuries when he fell through an unmarked, unsecured floor opening 4.5 m (15 ft.) to the concrete floor below. This firm violated the applicable sections of both the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	\$11,326.42	Not appealed
Maple Ridge	WHONNOCK ROOFING LTD Two of this firm's workers were working without adequate fall protection on a roof about 3.5 to 5 m (12 to 17 ft.) above grade. One of the workers was the firm's principal. This was a repeated violation.	\$11,271.39	Under review
Kamloops	ARTISTIC SIGN SERVICE LTD This firm repeatedly failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also repeatedly failed to provide workers with the instruction and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety.	\$11,156.28	Not appealed
Surrey	NOVO HOMES INC This employer failed to ensure that a fall protection system was being used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur.	\$10,939.93	Not appealed
Vancouver	CAPITOL ROOFING CO LTD This firm failed to provide an adequate fall protection plan. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements. The firm also failed to provide workers with proper instruction, training, and supervision.	\$10,187.83	Review withdrawn
Vancouver	ACCURATE ROOFING LTD Two of this firm's workers were working on a roof without using fall protection. One was working 3.5 m (11 ft., 6 in.) above grade on a 4:12 slope, while the other was working at 4 m (14 ft.) above grade on an 8:12 slope. This was a repeated violation.	\$10,160.13	Not appealed
Port Coquitlam	MARINE ROOFING (1996) LTD This firm repeatedly violated the fall protection requirements.	\$9,769.98	Not appealed
Vancouver	METAL & WOOD PRODUCTS(1958) LTD This employer failed to safeguard or lock out a punch press and to provide written lockout procedures, which resulted in a serious injury to a worker's hands when the worker adjusted a rubber stripper on the press. The employer also failed to supervise and train its workers.	\$9,523.23	Not appealed
Abbotsford	RITE-WAY ROOFING LTD This firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. Two of this firm's workers were working without any form of fall protection about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation.	\$9,331.65	Not appealed

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

Abbotsford	RITE-WAY ROOFING LTD A worker fell about 8 m (27 ft.) from a steep-sloped roof, sustaining injuries. This firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.	\$9,331.65	Not appealed	
Chetwynd	B A C K VENTURES LTD Four of this firm's workers were not wearing seat belts while operating off-highway logging trucks. The road they were travelling on was slippery, steep, and covered in snow.	\$9,283.88	Review Division cancelled	\$0.00
Burnaby	SHANE EDMOND HEBERT This firm repeatedly violated the fall protection requirements.	\$9,096.69	Not appealed	
Port Alberni	DAVE LESLIE ROZZANO One of this firm's workers was working within the limits of approach of a 25-kV overhead power line. The worker had not been informed about the electrical hazard before being permitted to work close to the energized line.	\$8,545.41	Not appealed	
Saanich	DAVID GRONOW ROOFING LTD Three of this employer's workers, including a supervisor, were working on the roof of a house over 3 m (10 ft.) high. They were not connected to their fall protection equipment. The employer previously received a warning letter about fall protection.	\$8,452.88	Not appealed	
New Westminster	MEGA CRANES LTD This firm failed to comply with the requirement to conduct an accident investigation.	\$8,152.88	Review Division varied – under WCAT appeal	\$7,593.47
New Westminster	TOMA CONSTRUCTION INC This firm failed to ensure that there were guardrails at numerous locations throughout its worksite. It also failed to ensure effective housekeeping on site. These were repeated violations.	\$8,070.90	Under Review	
Courtenay	SMITH 'N' GORDON DRYWALL CORP. Three workers were wearing running shoes while installing drywall, risking crushing injuries if the drywall had fallen onto their feet. This firm repeatedly failed to ensure that workers wear protective footwear, such as steel-toed boots.	\$7,911.15	Review Division confirmed – no further appeal	
Pitt Meadows	597109 BC LTD This firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order. It had taken prohibited discriminatory action against a worker, contrary to the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> . The firm was ordered to pay the worker's lost wages, but it did not do so by the required date.	\$7,887.70	Not appealed	
Campbell River	C.R. WEST COAST ROOFING LTD Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a roof about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.	\$7,611.93	Under review	

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

Powell River	<p>SHANE AGIUS At least three of this employer's workers were not attached to a roof with lifelines or lanyards. The employer failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It received two previous administrative penalties for the same violation over the course of three years.</p>	\$7,500.00	Within appeal period
Richmond	<p>FLECK CONTRACTING LTD This firm repeatedly failed to plan work and to instruct its supervisor and workers in the safe removal of asbestos-containing materials.</p>	\$7,124.65	Not appealed
Comox	<p>NELSON STANLEY HANSON This firm failed to ensure that workers used a fall protection system when exposed to the hazards of a fall greater than 3 m (10 ft.). This was a repeated violation.</p>	\$7,101.32	Not appealed
Surrey	<p>COASTAL STEEL SYSTEMS INC Fatality. This employer's worker fell off a roof and then through insulation to a concrete floor 5 m (17 ft.) below. He died in hospital from his head injuries. The employer failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system for work where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also failed to provide its workers, including the deceased worker, with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision to ensure their health and safety.</p>	\$6,987.40	Not appealed
Fort Saint John	<p>G K MECHANICAL LTD This firm's workers were working in an excavation 2 to 3 m (6.5 to 10 ft.) deep with no protective structures or shoring. The firm failed to ensure that an excavation over 1.2 m (4 ft.) deep was adequately sloped, shored, or supported according to a professional engineer's instructions.</p>	\$6,657.98	Not appealed
North Vancouver	<p>AFFORDABLE ROOFING LTD One of this firm's workers fell about 3.5 m (12 ft.) from a roof while working without fall protection. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.</p>	\$6,292.45	Not appealed
Burnaby	<p>B.Q.R. SYSTEMS LTD Six of this firm's workers were working without adequate fall protection on an 8:12 sloped roof about 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work done where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.</p>	\$6,205.20	Not appealed
Salmon Arm	<p>0746903 BC LTD This firm repeatedly failed to comply with orders requiring a less formal health and safety program, a first aid record, a risk assessment on workplace violence, and the identification of hazards for workers working alone.</p>	\$6,120.80	Not appealed

Cumberland	DEVON RICHARD KNAPFL A worker was about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade on the 6:12 pitch roof of a house under construction. The worker wore a fall protection harness but was not connected to a lifeline. Four workers, including the employer, were later working on the roof without fall protection. The roof's peak was over 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade, but no written fall protection plan was available on site. The employer failed to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety as well as the health and safety of other workers at the workplace. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$6,067.76	Review Division confirmed – no further appeal	
Sechelt	MORTLOCK ENTERPRISES LTD. This employer prevented or dissuaded a worker from reporting injuries and filing compensation claims with WorkSafeBC.	\$6,042.73	Not appealed	
Surrey	RYCHTER P CONSTRUCTION LTD One of this firm's workers was working without fall protection on the top plate of the wall of a house under construction. The worker was about 7 m (24 ft.) above ground. In addition, the balconies, which were about 3 m (10 ft.) above grade, had no guards or guardrails. These were repeated violations of the fall protection requirements.	\$5,980.30	Not appealed	
Campbell River	OKIM HOLDINGS LTD This firm failed repeatedly to ensure that a friable asbestos-containing material was safely removed, enclosed, or encapsulated to prevent the release of airborne asbestos fibres. Specifically, the employer failed to remove a ceiling that contained chrysotile asbestos at levels above 1 percent. Despite knowing about the hazard, the employer permitted workers to use the area directly below the ceiling.	\$5,899.85	Review Division varied – no further appeal	\$5,396.74
Burnaby	A SUPER ROOFING INC Without a fall protection system in place, this firm's workers were on a roof about 8 to 10 m (26 to 32 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements and the requirement for a written fall protection plan where a fall of 7.5 m (25 ft.) or more could occur.	\$5,773.70	Under review	
Surrey	APEX ELECTRIC LTD This firm's workers were not wearing hard hats and safety footwear as required. The firm failed to ensure that its workers were wearing the appropriate personal protective equipment. These were repeated violations.	\$5,305.85	Not appealed	
Port Alberni	HARBOUR QUAY HOMES INC. A worker for a subcontractor was working within the limits of approach of a 25-kV overhead power line. As the prime contractor for a multiple-employer worksite, this firm repeatedly failed to ensure that the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others were properly coordinated. The firm failed to do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system to ensure compliance with the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	\$5,054.35	Not appealed	
Vancouver	COAST TO COAST ROOFING & RUBBISH REMOVAL LTD. This employer repeatedly violated the fall protection requirements. It also failed to provide proper instruction, training, and supervision.	\$5,000.00	Not appealed	

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

Prince Rupert	ISLAND ROOFING INC. Three of this firm's workers were working on a 4:12 sloped roof that was about 5 m (17 ft.) above grade. The workers were not wearing fall protection. This was a repeated violation.	\$5,000.00	Not appealed
Surrey	NJ ROOFING LTD This firm repeatedly violated the fall protection requirements.	\$5,000.00	Not appealed
Esquimalt	OLDE TOWNE ROOFING LTD Four workers were working near the edge of a roof that varied from 3.5 to 5 m (12 to 16 ft.) above grade. The workers were not wearing fall protection. This firm repeatedly failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system and to provide adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision.	\$5,000.00	Not appealed
Vancouver	NORTH STAR FRAMING LTD A worker without fall protection was standing over 5.5 m (19 ft.) above grade on the edge of a two-storey house under construction. This was a repeated violation. The employer also failed to provide the worker with a work platform.	\$5,000.00	Not appealed
North Vancouver	0800312 B.C. LTD. Three of this firm's workers were working without adequate fall protection on an 8:12 sloped roof about 7.5 (25 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.	\$5,000.00	Not appealed
Campbell River	MARK WAYNE SCHULTZ A worker was working without fall protection on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated high-risk violation by this employer.	\$4,941.11	Not appealed
North Vancouver	ATWAL'S ENTERPRISES LTD Two workers were on a roof at a height of about 13.5 m (45 ft.) and were not attached to their lifelines. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$4,685.30	Not appealed
North Vancouver	EUROPEAN CUSTOM STONE INC. This employer failed to submit a compliance report after being ordered to do so.	\$4,630.05	Within appeal period
Surrey	PRO CONSTRUCTION LTD. This firm repeatedly violated the guardrail and fall protection regulations after receiving a warning letter.	\$4,612.53	Not appealed
North Vancouver	HONG WAY CONSTRUCTION LTD This firm repeatedly violated the fall protection regulations. One of the firm's workers was observed without fall protection where a fall of about 5 m (16 ft.) might have occurred.	\$4,456.05	Not appealed
Burnaby	SUPER STRONG ROOFING LTD Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection where a fall of 6 m (20 ft.) or more might have occurred. The firm repeatedly violated the fall protection requirements, exposing workers to a high risk of serious injury through falls.	\$4,439.75	Not appealed

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

Abbotsford	TREVOR BROWN & CAROL BROWN Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade on the roof of a house. The firm has a history of fall protection violations and has previously received a warning letter.	\$4,439.53	Not appealed	
Burnaby	SELECT ROOFING LTD Five of this firm's workers were working without fall protection about 8.5 m (28 ft.) above grade. They were not aware of the fall protection requirements, and their supervisor was not on site. This was a repeated violation.	\$4,353.13	Not appealed	
Abbotsford	GARRY DOHMS Three of this firm's workers were working on a low-sloped roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade without the benefit of guardrails or personal fall protection. The firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system for work where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It failed to ensure a safe workplace.	\$4,144.55	Not appealed	
Langley	EMERALD SPRINGS FARM CORP A young worker was severely injured when an excavation collapsed. This firm failed to ensure that an excavation that was over 1.2 m (4 ft.) deep was adequately sloped, shored, or supported according to a professional engineer's instructions.	\$4,121.48	Review Division cancelled	\$0.00
Vancouver	ALL RIGHT TRUCKING-99 LTD Before demolition work began, this employer failed to make available at the worksite a copy of an inspection report on asbestos-containing materials and removal results. The employer is aware of this regulatory requirement because it had already received orders for failing to do this once before. Further, the employer was aware the violation was occurring when it took another firm's word that a hazardous materials inspection had been conducted. This employer did not ask for a copy of the inspection report from that other firm.	\$4,006.58	Not appealed	
Coquitlam	DAVID MATTHEW SCHOLTEN This employer failed to comply with orders on fall protection, despite numerous opportunities to submit a notice of compliance.	\$3,875.96	Not appealed	
Squamish	99 NORTH PITCHED & FLAT ROOFING INC Five of this firm's workers, including a supervisor, were working without any form of fall protection over 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation.	\$3,828.50	Not appealed	
Fort St. John	1222192 ALBERTA LTD As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, this employer failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of the employers, workers, and others at the worksite. The employer failed to take adequate precautions to prevent injury or illness.	\$3,749.98	Within appeal period	
West Vancouver	DAVID MATTHEW SCHOLTEN This firm repeatedly failed to comply with the regulations regarding protecting workers from falls of 3 m (10 ft.) or more. It failed to ensure proper instruction, training, equipment, and supervision related to fall protection.	\$3,591.40	Not appealed	

Abbotsford	LANDTEC GROUND EXPERTS LTD Two of this firm's workers were in an excavation about 3 to 3.5 m (9 to 11 ft.) deep. The excavation was unshored and unsloped, and a professional engineer had not inspected it. The firm's president obstructed WorkSafeBC's investigation by refusing to speak to the WorkSafeBC officer and by leaving the site while being questioned. When he returned, he denied that the workers on site belonged to his firm.	\$3,500.00	Not appealed
North Vancouver	AMANPREET SANDHU One of this firm's workers was working without fall protection on a roof about 8 m (27 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulation.	\$3,402.30	Not appealed
Richmond	MEGA EMPIRE INTERNATIONAL ENTERPRISE LTD Workers were performing dry grinding/cutting of granite countertops without effective respiratory protection. These workers were exposed to high levels of airborne crystalline silica dust, which is directly associated with the disease silicosis. This employer also exposed its workers to a high risk of injury through numerous electrical hazards and a lack of guarding on grinding/cutting equipment.	\$3,250.00	Not appealed
Burnaby	BRIAN DAVID DOWNIE Two workers were working close to the unguarded edge of a sloped roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. No fall protection system was being used.	\$3,250.00	Not appealed
Brisco	RIVER BUTTE MANAGEMENT LTD This firm failed to maintain a formaldehyde detector (linked to an exhaust ventilation system) to ensure that exposures fall below the 8 hour limit of 0.3 ppm. This was a repeated violation. The firm also allowed workers to smoke in undesignated areas, and did not maintain the designated smoking room.	\$3,209.92	Not appealed
Vancouver	ALLA CABINET (2002) LTD This employer failed to ensure that workers replaced guards over table saw blades after completing woodworking operations for which the use of guards was impracticable. This was a repeated violation.	\$3,157.45	Not appealed
Coquitlam	B.Q.R. SYSTEMS LTD Workers were working without fall protection at a height over 7.5 m (25 ft.). This was a repeated violation. This employer failed to adequately train and supervise workers and failed to ensure the use of fall protection equipment.	\$2,949.13	Not appealed
White Rock	MIN ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES LTD. During the demolition of multiple houses, this firm failed to adequately remove, contain, and dispose of asbestos-containing vermiculite and other friable asbestos-containing materials. Unprotected workers were exposed to airborne asbestos fibres.	\$2,894.28	Not appealed
Burnaby	HARJAP SIDHU Four of this employer's workers, including the principle, were working on the second floor of a house under construction with a large opening that had no guardrails. The employer failed to ensure the use of guardrails or other means of fall restraint. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,852.03	Within appeal period

Surrey	FRASERVIEW TERRACE LTD This firm did not ensure that a registered professional engineer certified an excavation as "safe to enter" before allowing workers to work in it. The excavation was about 4 m (14 ft.) deep, and there was a spoil pile beside the excavation that was about 2 m (6 ft.) high. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Coquitlam	DARREN SMAILL One of this firm's workers was working without fall protection on a roof 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Comox	SKIDMORE/TINKERBELL II This firm has repeatedly failed to comply with orders.	\$2,500.00	Under review
Burnaby	DOMINION ROOFING LTD Three workers were installing asphalt shingles near a building's roof edge, about 6 to 8 m (20 to 26 ft.) above grade. The sloped (5:12) roof, which was unguarded, was wet from rain. The workers were not using any kind of fall protection system. In addition, the ladder used to access the roof was unsecured and did not extend sufficiently above the roof edge. This firm has a history of fall protection violations. The fall protection violation in this case was high risk.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Surrey	FERGUSON PROPERTIES LTD. As the prime contractor, this firm failed repeatedly to do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system or process to ensure compliance with the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	\$2,500.00	Under review
Richmond	PARAS ROOFING LTD This firm's principal and two workers were working without fall protection on steep-sloped roofs about 7 m (24 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Surrey	FERGUSON PROPERTIES LTD. As the prime contractor, this firm failed repeatedly to do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system or process to ensure compliance with the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	\$2,500.00	Under review
Surrey	PERRY ALEXANDER RINK This firm's worksite did not have adequate work platforms. They were only 25 cm (10.5 in.) wide when the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation requires a width of 50 cm (20 in.) around the interior condominium wall forms being used to place concrete. A worker without fall protection was also placing concrete while walking along a narrow whaler of the forms about 0.5 m (2 ft.) above the work platforms. The work platforms were 3 m (10 ft.) above grade.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed

Chilliwack	<p>VALLEY RIDGE HOLDINGS LTD</p> <p>This firm's multiple and repeated violations of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation included the following. Workers without fall protection were framing 5.5 to 5.8 m (18 to 19 ft.) above grade. Other workers without fall protection were exposed to a fall hazard of 6 m (20 ft.). Workers without safety eyewear used pneumatic power nailers and power skill saws. A worker was in an extended aerial lift without a personal fall arrest system. Stairways were missing rails. The prime contractor demonstrated an ongoing failure to coordinate occupational health and safety at a multiple-employer workplace. All these violations together presented a high risk of serious injury or death to workers.</p>	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Richmond	<p>JASPAL SINGH CHANNA</p> <p>Four workers were working on the sloped roof of a single-family house under construction. They were working at heights of between 5.5 to 7.3 m (18 to 24 ft.) above grade. No guardrails were in place, nor were the workers wearing fall protection. This was a repeated violation by this employer of the fall protection requirements.</p>	\$2,500.00	Under review
Burnaby	<p>TOM HAYES SCOTT</p> <p>This employer failed to submit a compliance report after being repeatedly instructed to do so.</p>	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Coquitlam	<p>GURPREET S CHOONGH & KAMALJIT S SANDHU</p> <p>This firm's co-owner violated the fall protection requirements. This was a repeated violation.</p>	\$2,500.00	Under review – late filing
Burnaby	<p>TAJ ROOFING LTD.</p> <p>Three of this firm's workers were working on a 6:12 sloped roof that was about 6.5 m (22 ft.) above grade. The workers were not using fall protection. This was a repeated violation.</p>	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Burnaby	<p>BL ROOFING LTD</p> <p>This firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. Two of the firm's workers were working with no means of fall protection about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.</p>	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Richmond	<p>EXPERT ROOFING LTD</p> <p>This firm's president and a worker were working near the unguarded edge of a sloped roof, about 6.7 metres (22 feet) above grade, without a fall protection system. The firm repeatedly failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system as required by the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.</p>	\$2,500.00	Within appeal period
Port Moody	<p>NEW CANADIAN ROOFING LTD.</p> <p>One of this firm's workers was working without fall protection on a roof about 5.5 to 7.5 m (18 to 25 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work done where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.</p>	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Richmond	<p>PARAS ROOFING LTD</p> <p>This firm's principal and two workers were installing slate tile roofing 3 to 7 m (10 to 23 ft.) above grade without adequate fall protection. This was a repeated violation.</p>	\$2,500.00	Not appealed

Westbank	FOUR CORNER ROOFING LTD A worker broke both his heels when he fell about 3 m (11 ft.) from a steep-sloped roof. This firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used, and it failed to instruct, train, and supervise its workers.	\$2,500.00	Within appeal period
Burnaby	FIVE RIVERS STUCCO LTD. This firm exposed its workers to the risk of falling from heights 3 m (10 ft.) or more above grade when it failed to comply with the requirements for designing and installing safe work platforms. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary for installing and using a safe work platform.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Prince George	MANJIT SINGH MANHAS This firm's principal and another worker, both without fall protection equipment, were working on the roof of a house over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. Fall protection equipment was on site but not being used. These were repeated violations of the fall protection requirements. The concrete slab and patio furniture on the grade below increased the risk of serious injury or death.	\$2,500.00	Review Division confirmed, under WCAT appeal
Richmond	S & J FRAMING LTD. This firm's owner was standing without fall protection on a single truss about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade and 0.5 m (2 ft.) from the edge. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$2,500.00	Review rejected
Vancouver	DOMINION ROOFING LTD This firm's owner was working without fall protection on a roof with a slope of 4:12 or less, about 7 m (22 ft.) above grade, and was seriously injured after falling from the roof. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Vancouver	DOMINION ROOFING LTD Three of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a roof with a 6:12 slope at about 5, 5.5, and 6 m (16, 18, and 20 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Surrey	0726784 B.C. LTD. Fatality. A subcontractor's worker suffered fatal injuries in a fall of 8.5 m (28 ft.). An investigation determined that the prime contractor of the multiple-employer workplace failed to ensure that the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at the workplace were coordinated.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
West Vancouver	TIBOR GYIMESI This employer operated an unsafe and uncertified mobile crane, exposing workers to the risk of injury.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Vancouver	SD2 FRAMING INC This firm's owner was working without any form of fall protection on a work platform 3 m (10.5 ft.) above grade. Also, window openings on the main and second floors were not equipped with guardrails. This exposed workers to fall hazards of between 3 and 3.5 m (10 and 12 ft.). The firm has a history of repeated violations of the fall protection requirements.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed

Richmond	HI TECH ROOFING LTD Four of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a roof about 5 m (17 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work done where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed	
Westbank	BILDAL CONSTRUCT INC A worker was working without fall protection and without adequate instruction at heights over 5 m (16 ft.) above grade, contrary to the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed	
Granisle	GRANISLE ENTERTAINMENT CO. LTD This firm violated the fall protection requirements for work done over 4 m (14 ft.) above grade.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed	
Saanich	SOUTH ISLAND HOMES LTD Two workers were re-roofing without fall protection about 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation. This firm had two previous orders for fall protection violations.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed	
Victoria	EQUITEX REALTY LTD. This employer, a property management company, failed to prepare and maintain an inventory of asbestos-containing materials, potentially exposing workers to asbestos in one of the buildings it manages.	\$2,500.00	Review Division varied – no further appeal	\$1,000.00
Langford	CUSTOM PRO EXTERIORS LTD This firm's supervisor was working without fall protection at heights over 3 m (10 ft.). This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations. The firm had already been issued a warning letter.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed	
Surrey	FERGUSON PROPERTIES LTD. As the prime contractor, this firm failed repeatedly to do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system or process to ensure compliance with the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	\$2,500.00	Under review	
Surrey	AUTHENTIC ROOFING INC. Two workers were working 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade on a roof with a slope of 4:12, with no fall protection system in place. This was a repeated fall protection violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed	
Abbotsford	PAUL ESPOSITO DEVELOPMENTS LTD This firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work done where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It failed to ensure that it had the equipment, supplies, facilities, first aid attendants, and services for promptly giving first aid in case of an injury. It also failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at the workplace. It did not do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system or process that would ensure compliance with Part 3 of the <i>Workers Compensation Act</i> and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed	
Kamloops	DUANE MERVYN GENGE & LOIS ANN GENGE One of this firm's workers was working without any form of fall protection on a 5:12 pitch roof, about 9 m (16 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed	

Abbotsford	COASTAL EDGE TIMBER COMPANY LTD This employer failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers and other workers at the workplace where its work was being done. The employer's contractor struck and severed a 25-kV overhead power line. The employer had failed to provide the contractor with information on safe work procedures in and around high-voltage power lines. In addition, the employer did not ensure that a certified utility arborist was on site, nor did it take out an assurance of no-reclose, which resulted in the line continuously trying to re-energize itself after a tree struck and severed the line.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Burnaby	DEWAY FABRICATION & BUILDERS LTD. A worker contacted a high-voltage power line while trimming trees, exposing himself, another worker, and a non-worker on the ground to the risk of serious injury.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Delta	G.R. ROOFING LTD. Two of this firm's workers were working without any form of fall protection on a 4:12 sloped roof about 5 m (17 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Richmond	J.P.D. ROOFING LTD. Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a roof over 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated failure to comply with the fall protection requirements.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Squamish	BL ROOFING LTD Four of this employer's workers were working without fall protection on a steep-sloped roof 6 to 7.5 m (20 to 25 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Kamloops	MICHAEL J. GALLANT This firm repeatedly failed to use a means of fall protection for work at elevations over 3 m (10 ft.).	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Surrey	SADHU SIRA Two workers were working without an effective fall protection system on a steep roof about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Surrey	WESTWAY ROOFING LTD This firm failed to comply yet again with the fall protection requirements after receiving a previous administrative penalty.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Delta	6778305 CANADA INC. This firm failed to adequately safeguard a machine, which resulted in a worker's serious injury. It failed to adequately instruct and supervise the worker.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Burnaby	NANAK CONSTRUCTION & FRAMING LTD Two workers, one of them a young worker, were working without fall protection on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. They were about 0.3 m (1 ft.) from the roof's edge, and the ground below them was littered with lumber and debris. This firm failed to ensure that workers use a fall protection system when a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also failed to provide a temporary stairway to a floor before undertaking any work on that floor.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed

Vancouver	ADVANCED STUCCO LTD. This employer violated the safe scaffolding requirements and exposed its workers to falls of up to 3.5 m (12 ft.). This violation posed a high risk of serious injury or death. This was the employer's second violation of the scaffolding and fall protection requirements.	\$2,500.00	Within appeal period
New Westminster	0806245 BC LTD. This firm repeatedly failed to comply with the requirement to provide a fall protection system for work where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers and knowingly provided a WorkSafeBC officer with false information.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
New Westminster	MOONLIGHT ROOFING LTD This firm's principal and one of the firm's workers were on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. They were wearing fall protection harnesses but were not connected to lifelines. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Anmore	H. PARAS ROOFING LTD. Workers were working without fall protection on a steep-sloped roof, contrary to the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This firm failed to provide the workers with adequate instruction, training, and supervision. These were repeated violations.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Port Moody	BESTWEST ROOFING INC. This firm failed to protect workers from the hazard of falling from elevations of 3 m (10 ft.) or more. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Within appeal period
Anmore	H. PARAS ROOFING LTD. Workers were working without fall protection and a written fall protection plan on a steep-sloped roof, contrary to the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Richmond	NEW MILLENIUM TIRE CENTRE LTD. Fatality. A worker was sent to service the tires on a crane truck. He removed the front passenger-side tire and replaced it with a new one. He then attached an inflation hose to the valve stem. The worker started the compressor and then left the tire to inflate. A few minutes later, the worker returned to the tire and knelt down in front of it to remove the inflation hose and check the pressure with a handheld gauge. The tire then exploded off the rim and struck the worker, inflicting fatal injuries. The worker had been using the tools the employer had supplied. The employer, who had instructed the worker to service tires in this way, failed to provide him with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure his health and safety and the health and safety of other workers at the workplace. The employer also failed to supply a remote chuck with a sufficient length of hose and an inline hand-operated valve with a gauge so that the worker would have been safely outside the wheel components' trajectory.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Richmond	H & D ROOFING LTD. A worker was working without any fall protection about 8.5 m (28 ft.) above grade on a 7:12 pitch roof. The firm's owner could clearly see the worker, and there was no fall protection plan on site. This was a repeated failure to ensure the use of a fall protection system, to implement a fall protection plan, and to provide adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed

Coquitlam	JASON PALMETER Four workers were working without adequate fall protection on a roof over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. This firm was ordered to produce a notice of compliance for a previous violation but has failed to comply within a reasonable time.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Coquitlam	ASMAN ROOFING LTD. Workers were working over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade on the unguarded roof of a two-storey house under construction. They were wearing personal fall protection harnesses but were not connected to safety lines. One of the harnesses was very loose fitting and showed signs of extensive wear. The roof's peak was 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade, but the employer did not have a written fall protection plan for the worksite. These were repeated violations.	\$2,500.00	Review rejected
Vancouver	ALL WORLD ROOFING LTD Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work done where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Saanich	ROBERTO MAIGLER Three workers, including the owner, were working without fall protection on the roof of a three-storey house over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Westbank	DEAN ROGER CHARTRAND Without any fall protection, two of this employer's workers were working over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade on the roof of a two-storey house. The employer failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a high-risk violation.	\$2,500.00	Within appeal period
Nelson	CHAHAT ENTERPRISES LTD One of this firm's workers was working without fall protection on a ladder jack scaffold about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	\$2,500.00	Within appeal period
Mission	LEE ANDREW HUFFMAN Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work done where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Richmond	A TO Z ROOFING LTD. This firm violated the fall protection regulations four times within ten months.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Richmond	NEW CITY FRAMING LTD This firm repeatedly violated the fall protection regulations.	\$2,500.00	Within appeal period

WorkSafeBC 2009 Penalty Report

Belcarra	JUAN ALBERTO PEREZ GONZALEZ Two workers were working without fall protection about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade on a steep-sloped roof, contrary to the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. The supervisor was on site at the time. This firm failed to provide its workers with adequate instruction, training, and supervision. These were repeated violations.	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Burnaby	ROYAL STUCCO LIMITED One of this firm's workers was using a narrow wooden plank without guardrails as a scaffold platform. The worker was not using a fall protection system even though he was at risk of falling 6 m (20 ft.). The firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also failed to ensure that its scaffold platform had a minimum width of 50 cm (20 in.).	\$2,500.00	Not appealed
Powell River	SHANE AGIUS This firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used for work done where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation.	\$2,000.00	Not appealed
Vancouver	DONOVAN MANAGEMENT LTD Two workers were stepping off an elevating work platform onto a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. These workers joined a third worker in stripping formwork within 4 m (13 ft.) of the roof edge. No fall protection system was in place. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	\$1,066.41	Not appealed
North Vancouver	AZTECH ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING SERVICES LTD This consulting firm specializing in pre-demolition asbestos identification and assessment services failed to exercise reasonable care in conducting a hazardous material survey.	\$1,000.00	Not appealed
Surrey	FRASERVIEW TERRACE LTD This firm repeatedly failed to comply with the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. It failed to address first aid requirements, despite being instructed and having received numerous orders.	\$1,000.00	Not appealed
North Vancouver	DESAKOTA DEVELOPMENTS LTD This employer failed to submit a compliance report after being ordered to do so.	\$1,000.00	Not appealed
West Vancouver	H. PARAS ROOFING LTD. This firm repeatedly failed to develop and implement a fall protection plan for work at heights over 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade.	\$1,000.00	Not appealed
Total		\$4,465,313.40	