

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200900517	PENFOLDS ROOFING INC.	Not Appealed		2010-08-24	\$145,046.98	721051	West Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working on a roof between 4.5 m (15 ft.) and 6 m (19 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
200900446	DIVECO MARINE LTD	Not Appealed		2010-06-03	\$100,000.00	764015	Klemtu/Bella Bella	This firm's worker was fatally injured while diving to recover dead fish from a fish farm pen. As he ascended rapidly to the surface from a depth of 31.5 m (103 ft.), he experienced an air embolism, then lost consciousness and drowned. A WorkSafeBC investigation found that this firm did not have adequate safety procedures for diving operations. It failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety.	1*
200900581	DAVEY TREE EXPERT CO OF CANADA LIMITED	Under Review		2010-05-31	\$89,808.02	764062	North Vancouver	This firm failed on numerous occasions to adequately train, instruct, and supervise its workers to fall trees safely. In one incident, the firm's worker was in the process of cutting down a tree. Part of the tree trunk split off and struck the worker, who suffered serious injuries, including the loss of an eye. The worker's supervisor did not ensure that the worker used safe falling methods.	
200800337	0205568 B.C. LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-05-31	\$83,570.62	721028	New Westminster	This firm's worker was fatally injured at a construction site while setting up the temporary framework (falsework) for a concrete pour. The firm failed to ensure that the falsework was braced and used according to the manufacturer's instructions. As a result, the falsework collapsed, and several sheets of plywood that had been stacked on top of it fell and struck the worker. The firm failed to ensure that the falsework was capable of withstanding the weight of the plywood. The firm also failed to provide its workers with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision to ensure their safety for installing falsework.	1
200900367	MARINE HARVEST CANADA INC	Not Appealed		2010-06-03	\$75,000.00	702001	Klemtu	A worker was fatally injured while diving to recover dead fish from a pen at this firm's fish farm. As he ascended rapidly to the surface from a depth of 31.5 m (103 ft.), he experienced an air embolism, then lost consciousness and drowned. As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, this firm failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at the workplace, and it failed to establish and maintain a system to ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	1*
200900019	TECK METALS LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-06-10	\$75,000.00	810804	Richmond	This employer's worker was transferring an industrial solution from one large tank to another. Each tank contained a rotating shaft and an impeller with four blades that was neither turned off nor locked out. The hose the worker was using to perform the transfer became entangled in one tank's impeller and began to wrap around the shaft, pulling the worker's hand in between the hose and the shaft. Four of the worker's fingers were severed. The employer failed to ensure that the energy-isolating device was locked out and that the rotating parts were guarded. It also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000588	VANCOUVER ORGANIZING COMMITTEE FOR THE 2010 OLYMPIC AND ...	Not Appealed		2010-09-20	\$75,000.00	721028	West Vancouver	Workers at this firm's worksite climbed onto work platforms up to 14.5 m (48 ft.) above grade using the vertical poles of a scaffold. Suitable ladders were not provided. As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, the firm failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at the workplace, and it failed to establish and maintain a system at the workplace that would ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated violation.	
200900420	PETER KIEWIT INFRASTRUCTURE CO.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-11-25	\$75,000.00	721028	Richmond	Workers did not have access to a certified first aid attendant when a propane explosion occurred at a remote construction camp. As the prime contractor at a multiple-employer worksite, this firm failed to ensure that the required first aid services were available and coordinated. This was a repeated violation.	
201000439	WESTERN FOREST PRODUCTS INC.	Under Review		2010-10-29	\$75,000.00	703008	Gold River	Two of this firm's workers were falling trees within a two tree-length radius of one another. One of the fallers cut down a tree that struck the other faller, inflicting fatal injuries. The firm failed to ensure that its fallers worked the required two tree-length distance from each other, and it failed to provide its workers with adequate supervision and instruction.	1
201000607	INTERIOR ROADS LTD	Under Review		2010-11-16	\$73,305.41	723002	Bella Coola	A faller was fatally injured at this multiple-employer workplace when he was struck by a leaning alder tree that split vertically (barberchaired) while he was falling it. Violations occurred at this workplace relating to the falling activity, first aid requirements, and supervision and instruction. As the prime contractor, this firm failed to do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system or process to ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation with respect to the workplace.	1
201000648	CGGVERITAS SERVICES (CANADA) PARTNERSHIP	Not Appealed		2010-11-19	\$68,927.17	704009	East Of Tumbler Ridge	A faller was seriously injured at this multiple-employer workplace when he was struck by a tree. The spruce tree he had cut down fell onto another tree, which then broke and struck him. Violations occurred at this workplace related to supervising falling activity as well as inspecting and correcting substandard falling methods. As the prime contractor, this firm failed to do everything reasonably practicable to establish and maintain a system or process in the workplace to ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	
201000478	VIC VAN ISLE CONSTRUCTION LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-22	\$68,714.73	764028	Revelstoke	Failure to comply with sections of the regulation related to concrete formwork and falsework.	
200900011	R 171 ENTERPRISES LTD	RD Varied	\$38,035.59	2010-06-14	\$54,336.56	712027	Kelowna	This firm's worker suffered several amputated fingers while operating a mechanical punch press. The firm failed to ensure that the punch press had the required safeguarding to prevent worker's hands from contacting hazardous moving parts. It also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200800472	688682 BC LTD 688689 BC LTD 688685 BC LTD &1100719 ALBERTA INC	RD Confirmed	\$54,160.34	2010-07-21	\$54,160.34	721028	Kelowna	As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, this firm failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at the workplace, and it failed to establish and maintain a system at the workplace that would ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. It failed to provide the workplace supervisor with the information and training required to oversee subcontractors. As a result of the firm's failure to locate underground utilities, an excavator damaged an electrical cable.	
200900716	CANADA SCAFFOLD SUPPLY CO LTD	Under Review		2010-11-09	\$49,824.62	721047	Burnaby	This firm's worker suffered serious injuries after falling about 4 m - 14 ft. when a platform of the scaffold he was standing on gave way. One of the platform hooks had failed. The firm failed to adequately inspect and maintain the scaffold to ensure that it was safe to use. In addition, the scaffold was not assembled according to safe work procedures to ensure that all its components were properly secured. The firm failed to ensure the health and safety of all the workers at the site where its work was being done. These were all repeated violations.	
200900622	COAST BUILDING SUPPLIES LTD	Under Review		2010-07-21	\$45,936.92	742010	Port Coquitlam	Two of this firm's workers were unloading drywall on a balcony over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900242	FOLEY'S CANDIES LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-23	\$44,505.10	711006	Richmond	A worker's hand was seriously injured when it got caught in the drive mechanism of a chocolate depositing machine. This firm failed to ensure that the machine was effectively locked out to make it safe for maintenance work. The firm also failed to provide workers with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision.	
200900656	MANSONVILLE PLASTICS (B C) LTD	Review Suspended		2010-01-12	\$44,179.16	713013	Surrey	This firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order within a reasonable time. After it took discriminatory action against a worker, the firm failed to provide remedies as ordered by WorkSafeBC.	
200800703	LNB CONSTRUCTIO N INC.	Under Review		2010-12-29	\$42,236.80	721031	Logan Lake	This firm's foreman entered an unsafe excavation between 1.5 and 3.5 m (5 and 12 ft.) deep to repair a water line. The excavation's sides had not been adequately sloped or shored, and there was no safe means of entering or exiting the excavation.	
200900535	SEALUM INDUSTRIES LTD	WCAT Appeal (RD Confirmed)	\$41,632.84	2010-03-19	\$41,632.84	712011	Delta	This firm failed to ensure that its machines and equipment were fitted with adequate safeguards, thereby repeatedly exposing its workers to a high risk of injury. As a result, a worker's hand and was seriously crushed after coming into contact with a machine's hazardous point of operation. The firm also failed to provide workers with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision.	
201000027	DC ROOFING INC	Under Review		2010-06-09	\$41,238.25	721051	Vancouver	This firm's worker was working on a steep roof about 10.5 m (35 ft.) above grade. He was wearing a harness but was not tied off to a lifeline or anchor. At a different worksite about two months after this violation, five of the firm's workers were observed without fall protection at heights from 3 to 9 m (10 to 30 ft.) above grade. These were repeated high-risk violations of the fall protection requirements.	
201000329	SEALUM INDUSTRIES LTD	Under Review		2010-07-30	\$38,718.64	712011	Delta	This firm's workers were exposed to tobacco smoke in the workplace. The firm also failed to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to control exposure to tobacco smoke.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000335	538738 BRITISH COLUMBIA LTD & 605684 BRITISH COLUMBIA LTD ET AL	Under Review		2010-10-28	\$35,326.52	714032	Vanderhoof	A young worker at this firm's mill was trying to clear wood chips stuck between the moving parts at one end of a running conveyor. The worker suffered a broken arm when it got caught between the conveyor belt and its rotating drum. The worker, who was by himself, was stuck for about two hours, lying face down on the ground buried under wood chips, before another worker discovered him. The firm failed to guard the conveyor's drum to prevent workers from getting caught in its pinch points. It also failed to implement a written procedure for checking on workers assigned to work alone or in isolation.	
200800571	RUSKIN CONSTRUCTION LTD	Under Review		2010-05-17	\$33,855.05	722001	Bob Quinn	This firm's workers were using an excavator to lower a 12-m (40-ft.) bridge section into place over a creek. The bridge section had not been properly restrained, and one of the ineffective restraining devices broke. As a result, the bridge section shifted and pinned a worker's leg against the excavator's track, inflicting serious injuries. The firm failed to inform and instruct workers on the use of an appropriate and safe restraint system to prevent the bridge from moving.	
201000132	BROADWAY ROOFING COMPANY LTD	Under Review		2010-07-27	\$33,560.38	721036	Vancouver	At least two of this firm's workers were working without any form of fall protection on the sloped roof of a two-house where they risked falls of up to about 7 m (24 ft.). This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000151	BROADWAY ROOFING COMPANY LTD	Under Review		2010-07-27	\$33,560.38	721036	Richmond	Two of this firm's workers were stripping shingles from the sloped roof of a house about 5.5 to 6 m (18 to 20 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200800492	GRIEG SEAFOOD B.C. LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-01-06	\$32,598.09	702001	Egmont	A worker slipped and fell into a fish-cleaning vat, seriously injuring an arm when it got caught in the vat's rotating auger. This employer failed to develop and enforce lockout procedures, to provide a suitable work platform, and to ensure that machinery and equipment is fitted with adequate safeguards. The employer also failed to provide workers with effective instruction, training, and supervision.	
201000022	SAMRA BROS. ROOFING LTD.	RD Confirmed	\$30,036.49	2010-06-17	\$30,036.49	721051	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were installing new shingles on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. They were not using adequate fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000358	P.E.T. PROCESSING INC	Not Appealed		2010-11-09	\$29,463.88	713024	Delta	This employer's worker was fatally injured while trying to retrieve a bag of plastic recyclables inadvertently tossed into the hopper of a waste materials baler. The baler's ram automatically started compressing when the worker climbed into the hopper. The employer had modified the baler. These modifications did not meet the safety requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation, making it easier for workers to access the hazardous ram chamber. The employer had not developed safe work procedures for the baler, including what to do in case material was inadvertently tossed into it. The employer failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety. Its workplace created serious hazards for workers, resulting in a fatal injury.	1

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200700650	SALVATION ARMY	Not Appealed		2010-01-13	\$28,946.32	766002	Mission	This firm failed to investigate a worker's suspicion that the mechanical room contained loose asbestos. A lab inspection confirmed that samples of the material contained asbestos. The firm failed to take the necessary corrective action without delay, and did not conduct a risk assessment on the material. The firm also failed to maintain an adequate health and safety program, and failed to provide its workers with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision to ensure the health and safety of workers.	
201000066	PROLINE ROOFING LTD	RD Confirmed	\$28,655.35	2010-05-25	\$28,655.35	721051	View Royal	Four of this firm's workers, including a supervisor, were working about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade on the roof of a house. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
200900395	TAMIHI LOGGING COMPANY LTD.	RD Varied	\$7,339.51	2010-02-08	\$27,121.96	703008	Harrison Hot Springs	This employer allowed loaded logging trucks to cross a logging bridge that needed repairs to make it safe for log hauling. The logging trucks exceeded by far the rated capacity of the bridge. The employer failed to ensure that the bridge was constructed and maintained as required by the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	
200900306	EMPIRE ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-15	\$24,793.86	721051	North Vancouver	This firm's worker was walking across the ridge of a sloped roof more than 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade without using any form of personal fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000538	GREAT WEST COAST ROOFING LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-14	\$23,958.14	721051	Richmond	One of this firm's workers was working on a sloped roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. At a later date, five of the firm's workers were working on a sloped roof up to about 7 m (24 ft.) above grade. They were wearing fall protection harnesses but were not connected to lifelines. These were repeated violations of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000037	PINNACLE PELLET WL INC.	RD Confirmed	\$22,984.28	2010-05-03	\$22,984.28	714019	Williams Lake	A truck driver was fatally injured when a loader backed into him while he was standing behind the truck. Although the driver was not this firm's worker, the incident happened in this firm's material storage building. The firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety and also failed to ensure the safety of other workers at its workplace.	1
201000477	B.Q.R. SYSTEMS LTD	Under Review		2010-09-08	\$22,622.40	721051	Port Coquitlam	Three of this firm's workers were removing shingles from a roof about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000820	P & D LOGGING LTD	Under Review		2010-12-07	\$21,984.43	703008	North Of Grand Forks	This employer allowed several of its logging truck drivers to transport logs across a bridge whose rated capacity had been significantly reduced after a professional engineer identified structural deficiencies. This was a violation of the requirement to inform workers of all known safety hazards.	
200900317	VINCENT EDMOND HARRIOTT	Under Review		2010-07-08	\$20,579.77	721024	Burnaby	Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade on the third-level decks of a multi-unit residence under construction. One deck had incomplete guardrails, while another had no guardrails. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200800479	TESSCO INC.	Under Review		2010-06-08	\$19,457.57	721028	Kelowna	Several of this firm's young workers were working at heights over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety. Hoses, electrical cords, and waste material with exposed nails also presented tripping hazards throughout the worksite.	
200900695	TRUONG'S ENTERPRISES LIMITED	RD Confirmed	\$18,641.22	2010-04-20	\$18,641.22	701016	Langley	This firm's worker sustained a skull fracture after falling about 1.5 to 2 m (5 to 6 ft.) from a mobile work platform. The platform was not equipped with a fall protection system. This was a violation of the requirement to install guards or guardrails around areas accessed by workers that are 1.2 m (4 ft.) or more above grade.	
201000239	REGAN ROOFING LTD	RD Confirmed	\$18,307.63	2010-06-03	\$18,307.63	721051	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working up to 7 m (24 ft.) above grade on the roof of a house without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900506	PRIME FRAMING AND FORMING LTD.	Under Review		2010-07-20	\$18,012.34	721024	Kamloops	This firm's owner and one of its workers were standing near a roof edge over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900024	TESSCO INC.	Under Review		2010-06-08	\$17,688.70	721028	Kelowna	As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, this firm failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at the workplace, and it failed to establish and maintain a system at the workplace that would ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. The firm also failed to ensure that a contractor complied with the fall protection requirements.	
200800497	SAMRA BROS. ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-01-04	\$16,877.31	721051	Richmond	Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a 5:12 sloped 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 regulation.	
201000061	EUGENE ALBERT BECK	Not Appealed		2010-07-07	\$15,011.86	721049	Burnaby	Two of this firm's workers were working near the unguarded edge of a work platform about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900611	ZENITH ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-08-18	\$15,000.00	721051	North Vancouver	This firm's worker was installing roofing material on a sloped roof between about 3.5 and 4.8 m (11 and 16 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000128	DOMINION ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-14	\$15,000.00	721051	Burnaby	This firm's owner and three of its workers were working more than 3.5 m (12 ft.) above grade on the roof of a house. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000164	DOMINION ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-14	\$15,000.00	721051	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working on a roof about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200800449	BILFINGER BERGER (CANADA) INC.	RD Varied	\$10,500.00	2010-02-12	\$15,000.00	722001	Pitt Meadows	This firm repeatedly failed to provide workers with effective instruction, training, and supervision. It also repeatedly failed to provide effective fall protection for work at heights well above 3 m (10 ft.).	
200900607	BRITISH COLUMBIA FERRY SERVICES INC	Under Review		2010-04-27	\$15,000.00	732014	Port McNeill	This firm failed to ensure that asbestos-containing material aboard one of its vessels was properly identified by signs, labels, or other effective means.	
201000579	BCRS ROAD SAFE INC	Review Rejected		2010-10-01	\$14,912.18	723009	Delta	This firm's owner failed to cooperate with a WorkSafeBC officer who was attempting to inspect the firm's job site. This was a violation of the requirement to cooperate with WorkSafeBC officers carrying out their duties under the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	
200900670	HALTON RECYCLING LTD	RD Confirmed	\$14,008.14	2010-02-05	\$14,008.14	731004	West Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were not wearing the safety footwear required for their work. In addition, one of the workers was not wearing the high visibility apparel required for work on a street with a speed limit over 30 kilometres an hour. These were repeated violations.	
200800633	TRI-R DEVELOPMENT GROUP INC.	RD Varied	\$5,222.12	2010-02-15	\$13,888.25	721027	Chilliwack	During the construction of two separate apartment complexes, this employer repeatedly failed to ensure guardrails were installed on balconies and elevated work areas accessible to workers.	
200900311	DAN-EX CONTRACTING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-05-04	\$13,578.65	721031	North Vancouver	Two workers were in an excavation that was about 2.5 m (8 ft.) deep. Their employer failed to ensure that the excavation sides were adequately sloped or supported as required. This was a repeated violation of the excavation requirements.	
201000257	CAN-TECH ROOFING LTD	RD Cancelled	\$0.00	2010-06-08	\$13,318.45	721051	Abbotsford	Two of this firm's workers were installing shingles on a sloped roof about 3.5 m (11 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000445	ARNOLD & SONS ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-08-24	\$13,145.66	721051	Coquitlam	This firm's worker was working on a sloped roof about 3.5 to 4 m (12 to 14 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
200900211	BRINK FOREST PRODUCTS LTD	WCAT Appeal (RD Confirmed)	\$13,083.82	2010-01-26	\$13,083.82	714032	Prince George	This firm's joint health and safety committee did not meet regularly. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to maintain a joint health and safety committee in a workplace with 20 or more workers. This employer also failed to ensure that machinery and equipment had adequate safeguards to protect workers.	
201000104	WHONNOCK ROOFING LTD	RD Varied	\$6,430.00	2010-06-07	\$12,860.00	721051	Pitt Meadows	Eight of this firm's workers were working up to 10 m (34 ft.) above grade on the roof of a three-storey house. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety. The firm also failed to ensure the stability of a ladder used to access the roof.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000719	WESCO CABINETS LTD	Under Review		2010-11-17	\$12,760.55	714042	Richmond	This firm exposed its workers to serious hazards in its woodworking shop by failing to provide them with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision. Its violations include failing to provide lockout procedures and personal locks as well as failing to safeguard table saws and edge banners. The firm did not provide emergency washing facilities or an adequate level of first aid at its worksite. It failed to fit test workers who wear respirators, to ensure that noise-exposed workers receive annual hearing tests, and to implement an effective protective equipment program. The firm also failed to conduct incident investigations, regular safety meetings, and regular workplace inspections.	
200800173	GOLDBAND SHAKE & SHINGLE LTD	Under Review		2010-10-19	\$12,571.30	714023	Port Hardy	A worker at this firm's mill suffered an amputated finger when his hand contacted the running blade of a trim saw. In previous incidents at this mill, two other workers also suffered amputated fingers when their hands contacted running saw blades, and a third worker suffered a near-amputation of a foot when it was drawn into a saw blade. The firm repeatedly failed to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
200800334	HARSCO CANADA LIMITED	Review Withdrawn		2010-05-31	\$12,238.65	764031	New Westminster	This firm failed to supply temporary framework (falsework) equipment that was in good working condition. The falsework collapsed at the construction site where it was installed by another firm's worker. The worker was fatally injured as a result.	1
201000014	ACCURATE ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-11-10	\$12,212.17	721051	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working on a 12:12 sloped roof between about 4 m (13 ft.) and 6.5 m (22 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200800447	ALL STAR EXCAVATING & DEMOLITION LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-19	\$11,991.70	721005	New Westminster	This employer failed to ensure that inspection results showing the locations of hazardous substances were available at the worksite. Less than three years before this recent violation, the employer received another penalty for a similar violation.	
200800468	LUMBERS MACMILLAN & SONS CONTRACTING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-07-06	\$11,797.26	721028	Campbell River	Three of this firm's workers were working without any form of fall protection on a roof over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements, including the requirement to provide a fall protection plan. In addition, several of the firm's workers were in an excavation whose sides were not sloped or supported as required.	
200900173	CUSTOM METAL PRODUCTS INC	RD Varied	\$9,712.78	2010-02-05	\$11,426.80	712028	Coombs	This employer failed to safeguard a power press to prevent workers from contacting the point of operation. Less than three years before this recent violation, the employer received another penalty for a similar safeguarding violation.	
201000156	BERTO CONTRACTORS LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-30	\$11,229.40	721031	Surrey	This firm's workers were working in an excavation about 2 m (6 ft.) deep. The excavation's sides had not been sloped or shored as specified by an engineer or as required by the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated violation.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000240	MADGE CONTRACTING LTD	RD Confirmed	\$10,988.88	2010-05-12	\$10,988.88	721051	Kelowna	A worker slipped on a snow-covered roof and fell more than 9 m (30 ft.) to the ground, suffering serious injuries. This firm failed to ensure the worker's health and safety. It failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It failed to provide a written fall protection plan for work done where workers, not protected by permanent guardrails, could fall more than 7.5 m (25 ft.). And it failed to ensure the use of toe-holds as required on steep roofs.	
200700803	A & T PROJECT DEVELOPMENT S INC	Not Appealed		2010-01-06	\$10,824.18	721027	Kamloops	A worker entered a hazardous excavation that was about 3 to 3.5 m (10 to 12 ft.) deep. The sides of any excavation that is over 1.2 m (4 ft.) deep must be properly sloped or shored. This firm failed to ensure that a far deeper excavation was adequately sloped and safe to enter. As the prime contractor, the firm failed to coordinate subcontractor safety activities on a multiple-employer worksite.	
201000345	ATWAL'S ENTERPRISES LTD	Not Appealed		2010-07-02	\$10,533.25	721036	Abbotsford	Four of this firm's workers were working without any form of fall protection on a roof between about 5.5 and 7.5 m (18 and 25 ft.) above grade. The firm's owner was on the ground at the time and could see the workers. There was also no written fall protection plan for this workplace. These were repeated violations of the fall protection requirements	
201000441	ICON HOMES LTD	Not Appealed		2010-07-08	\$10,045.45	721027	Quesnel	This employer's worker was in an excavation about 3.5 m (11 ft.) deep. After the worker got out, the side of the trench where the worker had been standing caved in. The employer failed to ensure that the excavation sides were adequately sloped or supported as required.	
201000003	B & G POWER SYSTEMS LTD	Not Appealed		2010-01-15	\$9,852.14	767003	Coquitlam	A worker positioned a boom within the limits of approach of a live high-voltage electrical power line, causing an electrical arc between the boom and the line. A worker on the ground suffered serious burns as a result. This employer failed to prevent the boom from coming within the minimum distance of the energized high-voltage line. Further, it failed to keep inspection and maintenance records for the boom truck and failed to inspect the boom truck at least once every 12 months. This employer also failed to provide workers with the adequate instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure the health and safety of those workers in carrying out their work and to ensure the health and safety of other workers at the workplace.	
201000008	BERGEVIN ELECTRICAL CONTRACTING NELSON LTD	RD Varied	\$7,850.12	2010-04-19	\$9,812.65	721019	Nelson	This firm's owner suffered serious burns from an electrical flash while working on an energized electrical panel. This was a high-risk violation of the requirement to completely disconnect and lock out electrical equipment before working on it.	
201000187	ACTION ROOFING LTD	WCAT Appeal (RD Confirmed)	\$9,746.30	2010-06-23	\$9,746.30	721051	Maple Ridge	Two of this firm's workers were installing roofing material on a roof deck about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000251	0800312 B.C. LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-05-06	\$9,581.48	721051	North Delta	Five of this firm's workers were working on a steep-sloped roof up to about 7 m (23 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety. The firm also repeatedly failed to secure extension ladders that workers were using to access the roof.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200800592	CAN-TECH ROOFING LTD	RD Confirmed	\$9,430.48	2010-03-04	\$9,430.48	721051	Chilliwack	Three of this firm's workers were working on a roof with a 6:12 slope at heights between 3 and 5.5 metres (10 and 18 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. The firm repeatedly failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur.	
201000422	603212 B.C. LTD	Not Appealed		2010-10-12	\$9,398.43	764028	Campbell River	This firm failed to provide a first aid attendant with a valid certificate at its steel fabrication facility. It also failed to prepare several incident investigation reports, to provide a new worker with an orientation, to ensure that hand grinders have the required guards, and to provide annual hearing tests. The firm's failure to prepare incident investigation reports as well as its failure to ensure that there was someone on site with a valid first aid certificate were repeated violations of the Workers Compensation Act.	
201000215	SEABEE CONSTRUCTION & ENGINEERING LTD	RD Cancelled	\$0.00	2010-06-30	\$9,302.68	721027	Coquitlam	This firm repeatedly refused to cooperate with WorkSafeBC officers who were attempting to inspect the firm's workplace.	
200900036	MEGA CRANES LTD	Under Review		2010-07-05	\$9,143.06	721014	Richmond	This firm supplied a tower crane that had several deficiencies, including improperly secured access ladders. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to ensure that the crane was set up according to the manufacturer's instructions.	
201000525	TONY LE	Not Appealed		2010-10-14	\$8,847.33	721042	Vancouver	After being ordered to do so, this employer failed to submit a compliance report detailing the steps taken to comply with orders issued for safety violations.	
200900696	FOUNTAIN TIRE (DAWSON CREEK) LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-05	\$8,721.43	764006	Dawson Creek	A young worker suffered severe crushing injuries when the front-end loader he was working under dropped onto him. The loader had not been securely blocked against inadvertent movement. This firm failed to provide the worker with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision to ensure his health and safety.	
201000616	CHISHOLM ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-11-01	\$8,711.25	721051	Vancouver	Three of this firm's workers, including a supervisor, were working near the unguarded edge of a sloped roof about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade. They were wearing fall protection harnesses but were not attached to lifelines. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements, including the requirement for a site-specific fall protection plan.	
200900688	SELECT ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-01-28	\$8,706.26	721051	Vancouver	A worker without any form of fall protection fell about 3.5 m (12 ft.) from a roof onto a wooden I-beam truss. He was seriously injured. This firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	
200800631	CAN-DIVE CONSTRUCTION LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-22	\$8,626.73	764015	Hudson's Hope	This firm failed to meet several of the safety requirements for a planned diving operation to locate log-boom anchors at a depth of about 55 to 76 m (180 to 250 ft.) on the bottom of a reservoir. For example, it failed to ensure that a decompression chamber met the manufacturer's specifications and other applicable standards. It did not ensure that dive helmets and related equipment were inspected and maintained as required. The firm also failed to ensure that the air supplied for diving operations was tested at least once a year.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000221	BURKE PURDON ENTERPRISES LTD	RD Confirmed	\$8,474.14	2010-04-13	\$8,474.14	732044	Fort Saint James	This employer repeatedly failed to ensure that the bullboard behind a logging truck's cab was permanently marked with the required information or fully identified in an engineer's or manufacturer's letter that is kept in the truck.	
201000241	SATNAM CONSTRUCTION LTD	Not Appealed		2010-05-28	\$8,436.55	721024	Richmond	Three of this firm's workers were working on a wet roof about 7 m (24 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000523	MCPHERSON CONSTRUCTION LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-11-22	\$8,420.15	721027	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working between about 4 and 6 m (14 and 19 ft.) above grade, assembling the first floor walls of a house under construction, without using any form of fall protection. The firm failed to ensure that guardrails were installed where practicable to protect workers from fall hazards. It also failed to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety. These were repeated violations.	
201000297	THEODORE HERMUS	Under Review		2010-07-22	\$7,937.58	721051	North Vancouver (Deep Cove)	This firm's worker was installing roofing paper on a roof about 4 m (14 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000159	DOSANJH CONSTRUCTION LTD	Not Appealed		2010-07-15	\$7,660.65	721024	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were not using any form of fall protection while framing a porch roof about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000492	NORTHWOOD ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-09-27	\$7,639.65	721051	South Surrey	Four of this firm's young workers were working on a sloped roof at least 3 m (10 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900569	FIVE RIVERS STUCCO LTD.	RD Confirmed	\$7,534.25	2010-02-12	\$7,534.25	721042	Vancouver	Four workers were working about 3 m (12 ft.) above grade on a single pole wood frame scaffold that had no guardrails. The scaffold platform consisted of a single plank that was only 25 cm (10 in.) wide when the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation requires a minimum width of 50 cm (20 in.). This firm repeatedly endangered workers by violating the safety requirements for work platforms and guardrails at a construction site.	
200900519	NJ ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-08-23	\$7,500.00	721051	Surrey	This firm's supervisor and two of its workers were working on a roof with a slope of 7:12. The supervisor was about 7 m (23 ft.) above grade while the workers were about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade. The workers were wearing fall protection harnesses, but the harnesses were not connected to lifelines or anchor points. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000100	STEWART ARNOLD NEWSTEAD	Not Appealed		2010-08-13	\$7,500.00	721051	Quesnel	This firm's owner and two of its workers were replacing shingles on a roof about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade. They were not using adequate fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000102	STEWART ARNOLD NEWSTEAD	Not Appealed		2010-08-13	\$7,500.00	721051	Quesnel	This firm's owner and two of its workers refused to come down from the roof of a house as directed by a WorkSafeBC officer. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to cooperate with WorkSafeBC officers who were trying to inspect the workplace.	
201000286	H. PARAS ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-11-05	\$7,500.00	721051	Richmond	Three of this firm's workers, including the principal, were working on a roof between about 3.5 and 5 m (12 and 16 ft.). They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000388	LEE ANDREW HUFFMAN	Not Appealed		2010-07-12	\$7,500.00	721051	Abbotsford	This firm's worker suffered serious injuries when he fell about 5 m (17 ft.) from a pitched roof to the ground. He was not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
200900524	RAI ROOFING LTD	Under Review		2010-11-29	\$7,500.00	721051	Coquitlam	This firm's principal and five of its workers were working on a sloped roof between 5.5 and 7 m (18 and 24 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000150	RAI ROOFING LTD	Under Review		2010-11-29	\$7,500.00	721051	Vancouver	This firm's principal and four of its workers were installing roofing material on a sloped roof 3.5 m (12 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000298	H. PARAS ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-11-05	\$7,500.00	721051	Richmond	Four of this firm's workers were working on a sloped roof between about 3.5 and 7 m (12 and 24 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. A ladder at the firm's construction site did not extend the required length above the roof edge to ensure safety. The ladder was also not secured as required to ensure stability. The firm failed to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety. These were all repeated violations. In addition, two of the firm's workers were not wearing any personal protective equipment when creating clouds of silica dust by cutting concrete roofing tiles with circular saws.	
201000125	SPC HOLDINGS AND CONSTRUCTIO N LTD	RD Confirmed	\$7,391.53	2010-03-22	\$7,391.53	721051	North Vancouver	Three of this firm's workers, including a supervisor, were on a 5:12 sloped roof about 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of personal fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	
201000645	WILLIAMS ROOFING & DRAINAGE LTD.	Under Review		2010-11-25	\$7,305.28	721036	Vancouver	Three of this firm's workers, including the site supervisor, were working near the edge of a roof about 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000012	0758148 BC LTD	RD Cancelled	\$0.00	2010-01-28	\$7,261.95	764006	Fort Saint John	This firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order within a reasonable time. After it took discriminatory action against a worker for raising safety concerns, the firm failed to provide the remedies ordered by WorkSafeBC.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200800192	M.R. ADAMA ENTERPRISES LTD (BKR)	Not Appealed		2010-05-31	\$6,862.40	703012	Port McNeill	This firm's worker was fatally injured when he was struck by a tree. High winds blew the tree down from the steep slope above him. The worker was part of a crew conducting blasting operations in hazardous terrain. The firm failed to ensure the health and safety of the workers at the worksite.	1
200900643	REPP INDUSTRIES LTD	Not Appealed		2010-03-02	\$6,769.82	721051	Abbotsford	Three of this firm's workers, including a supervisor, were re-roofing a house. They were not using any form of fall protection. One of the workers was seriously injured when he fell off the sloped roof to the ground about 5 m (16 ft.) below. The firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also failed to ensure that its workers were adequately trained and supervised.	
201000205	BIG SKY NORTH HOLDINGS LTD.	Under Review		2010-11-15	\$6,597.65	721049	Williams Lake	Two of this firm's workers were installing gutters on a house while standing on a work platform more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900680	BASSI ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-03-10	\$6,500.00	721036	Ladner	Three of this firm's workers, including its supervisor, were working on a 12:12 sloped roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade without any fall protection. On a separate inspection, this firm's president and a worker were on a sloped roof about 5 m (17 ft.) above grade while not using any form of personal fall protection. These were repeated violations of the fall protection regulations.	
201000063	A-1 QUALITY STUCCO LIMITED	Not Appealed		2010-04-08	\$6,468.08	721042	Burnaby	This employer failed to ensure that its wood frame scaffolds were designed and installed according to the required standard. After a first inspection, the employer was instructed to make the necessary improvements to the scaffolds. However, a second inspection revealed that the employer's workers continued to use the unsafe scaffolding, risking falls from 3 m (10 ft.) or more above grade.	
201000769	JOE'S CONTRACTING INC	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-08	\$6,257.80	721051	Vancouver	This firm's principal and two of its workers were installing plywood on a sloped roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000383	A I CONTRACTING LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-06	\$6,207.27	703008	Williams Lake	This firm failed to ensure that the barrier behind the cab of its logging truck was permanently marked with the manufacturer's name and address, the barrier's model or serial number, and its rated capacity in terms of cargo weight. This was a repeated violation of the requirements for logging truck barriers.	
201000192	MCLAREN DISTRIBUTORS LTD	RD Varied	\$4,300.29	2010-05-07	\$6,143.28	741013	Nelson	This firm's worker was standing close to the unguarded edge of a roof about 3.5 m (11 ft.) above grade without using any form of personal fall protection. This was a violation of the fall protection requirements. The firm also failed to submit a notice of compliance detailing the steps that were being taken to comply with orders issued for previous violations.	
201000195	SID ALUMINUM BUILDING PRODUCTS LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-21	\$6,063.75	721049	Surrey	This firm's worker was installing siding onto a building from a boom-supported lift. The worker was not wearing a fall protection harness tied off to the lift, even though a harness was available on site. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to wear a personal fall arrest system secured to an anchorage point while working from a self-elevating platform.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200900679	GLOBE FOUNDRY LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-01	\$6,012.19	712013	Burnaby	This employer failed to comply with multiple WorkSafeBC orders within a reasonable time. Its violations include the following. The employer failed to assess the potential for overexposure to hazardous substances. It did not provide workers with written procedures for the selection, use, and maintenance of respirators. The spray booth at its workplace was not being used according to the regulations. The exhaust ventilation system in one of its buildings did not effectively control air contaminants. The employer failed to provide eyewash and shower facilities as required. It failed to prepare a workplace inventory of asbestos-containing material. It also did not maintain a health and safety program based on regular monthly meetings for discussing health and safety.	
200800705	FORBES INDUSTRIAL CONTRACTORS LTD	RD Cancelled	\$0.00	2010-01-12	\$5,998.05	722001	Fort Saint John	This employer failed to supervise workers in the safe performance of their work. The employer and its supervisor failed to take appropriate action to correct an unsafe condition. It also failed to ensure that workers wear seat belts on mobile equipment with rollover protective structures.	
200800502	THE WILDLIFE PARK SOCIETY OF B C	Not Appealed		2010-03-30	\$5,997.29	761032	Kamloops	This employer failed to establish a written respiratory protection program for workers who must wear respiratory equipment to protect them from airborne viruses and chemicals. It also failed to comply with orders within a reasonable time.	
201000631	SHANE MCCANN CONTRACTING LTD	Review Rejected		2010-09-28	\$5,913.05	721027	Quesnel	Three of this firm's workers were working about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade on a house under construction. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
200900315	21ST CENTURY ROOFERS LTD	Review Withdrawn		2010-01-05	\$5,826.45	721036	North Vancouver	Three 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 of the fall protection regulation.	
201000376	S.M. ROOFING B.C. LTD	RD Confirmed	\$5,729.48	2010-07-08	\$5,729.48	721051	West Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were stripping a roof about 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection even though fall protection equipment was available on site. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000496	ONTOP ROOFING LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-02	\$5,415.05	721051	Maple Ridge	This firm's worker was working on an unguarded roof about 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade. He was wearing a fall protection harness but was not connected to a lifeline. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000411	CEI INDUSTRIES LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-23	\$5,373.50	721051	Campbell River	This firm allowed work to continue on a building constructed of structural steel that was within the limits of approach of live high-voltage power lines. This was a violation of the requirement to maintain the minimum applicable distance between workers and live high-voltage equipment and conductors.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200800653	REVELSTOKE BUILDERS SUPPLY (1978) LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-14	\$5,322.12	741014	Revelstoke	This firm has failed to comply within a reasonable time with multiple WorkSafeBC orders issued under the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation and the Workers Compensation Act. It failed to assess the risk of musculoskeletal injuries (MSIs) from using desks not designed as computer workstations. It failed to assess the risk of injury from violence for cash-handling activities. It also failed to ensure that storage racking was properly designed and safely used. Finally, it failed to submit a report explaining what it had done to comply with the orders it received relating to these violations.	
201000448	BEN JONATHAN HANSFORD	Not Appealed		2010-09-09	\$5,215.30	721051	Surrey	This firm's owner and four of its workers were working on a sloped roof about 7.5 m (25 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000193	NANAK CONSTRUCTION & FRAMING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-12	\$5,136.60	721024	Maple Ridge	This employer's worker was working on a house under construction about 9 m (30 ft.) above grade without using any form of personal fall protection. The employer was on site at the time. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000281	PEACE ENTERPRISES LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-06-17	\$5,102.84	721027	Fort Saint John	As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, this firm failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at the workplace, and it failed to establish and maintain a system at the workplace that would ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	
200800524	BASSI ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-03-10	\$5,000.00	721036	Richmond	This firm's president and one of its workers were on a 5:12 sloped roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade while not using any form of personal fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations	
200800605	PLANIT INDUSTRIES & RESEARCH LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-16	\$5,000.00	713025	Langley	This firm has violated an order to stop all work at its facility for the manufacturing of plastics. It allowed hazardous chemicals to be handled and mixed as part of the manufacturing process. WorkSafeBC issued the order to stop work after determining that multiple safety violations at the facility posed an immediate danger to workers. The firms violations include the following. Written safe work procedures on eliminating or minimizing the risk of exposure to hazardous chemicals were not available. A worker handled hazardous chemicals without adequate skin and hand protection. Chemical spills had not been adequately cleaned up. Containers of hazardous chemicals did not have the required labels. Containers not meant to hold hazardous chemicals were also being used. An exhaust system for removing air contaminants was ineffective because it had been partially dismantled.	
200900523	BL ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-01-11	\$5,000.00	721051	Coquitlam	This firm's principal and one of its workers were working without fall protection on a sloped roof about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200900659	PLANIT INDUSTRIES & RESEARCH LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-16	\$5,000.00	713025	Langley	This firm has violated an order to stop all work at its facility for the manufacturing of plastics. It allowed hazardous chemicals to be handled and mixed as part of the manufacturing process. WorkSafeBC issued the order to stop work after determining that multiple safety violations at the facility posed an immediate danger to workers. The firms violations include the following. Written safe work procedures on eliminating or minimizing the risk of exposure to hazardous chemicals were not available. A worker handled hazardous chemicals without adequate skin and hand protection. Chemical spills had not been adequately cleaned up. Containers of hazardous chemicals did not have the required labels. Containers not meant to hold hazardous chemicals were also being used. An exhaust system for removing air contaminants was ineffective because it had been partially dismantled.	
201000209	ARTHUR MOORE	Not Appealed		2010-05-27	\$5,000.00	721001	Surrey	This firm failed to cooperate with WorkSafeBC officers and to provide them with information as requested. It has also failed to comply with WorkSafeBC orders.	
201000652	ALL WORLD ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-11-05	\$5,000.00	721036	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. They were wearing fall protection harnesses but were not attached to lifelines. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
200800663	DAVID MOORMAN	WCAT Appeal (RD Confirmed)	\$5,000.00	2010-02-05	\$5,000.00	721027	Prince George	This firm's owner was working without any form of fall protection at a height of about 4 m (14 ft.) to install roof trusses. He failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	
201000163	LEE ANDREW HUFFMAN	RD Varied	\$3,500.00	2010-03-29	\$5,000.00	721051	Port Coquitlam	This firm's worker was on a 7:12 sloped roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. The unsupervised worker was not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety at the workplace.	
201000305	JASPAL SINGH CHANNA	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-31	\$5,000.00	721024	North Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were framing the eaves of a sloped roof without using any form of fall protection. One of the workers was working near the roof's edge about 6.5 m (21 ft.) above grade, while the other was working from an unguarded deck about 4.5 m (15 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000456	MDM ROOFING LTD	Review Rejected		2010-08-25	\$5,000.00	721051	Burnaby	One of this firm's principals and three of its workers were removing roofing material from a sloped roof at least 4 m (14 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000724	TEJINDER S KALER	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-08	\$5,000.00	721051	Burnaby	Two of this firm's workers were installing roofing material on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000859	L&M ROOFING LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-20	\$5,000.00	721051	Richmond	Three of this firm's workers were landing roofing material on a roof about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000483	NEW WORLD ROOFING LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-11-23	\$4,979.50	721051	West Vancouver	Four of this firm's workers, including a supervisor, were working on a roof about 6.5 m (22 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000695	SIDHU CONCRETE PUMPING LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-01	\$4,974.23	721011	North Vancouver	This firm failed to ensure that a concrete pump truck was set up as required. One of the truck's outriggers was not set up on level, stable ground, and the boards placed under the outriggers to stabilize the pump truck were too small. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to follow the manufacturer's specifications for setting up outriggers.	
200900501	SHAAN CONSTRUCTION LTD	Under Review		2010-08-27	\$4,823.10	721024	Abbotsford	Three of this firm's workers were working on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. Two days later, two of the firm's workers were again found working at heights about 6 to 7.5 m (20 to 25 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. These were both high-risk violations of the fall protection requirements.	
201000501	JOANDON CONSTRUCTION INC.	Under Review		2010-09-16	\$4,756.75	721027	Nanaimo	This firm's workers were working on a roof over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. In addition, a ladder used at the worksite had been set up inside a dumpster in violation of the safety requirements. This firm failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers. These were repeated violations.	
201000108	MACBETH BROS. ROOFING LTD	Review Withdrawn		2010-06-28	\$4,700.05	721051	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working without any form of fall protection on a roof up to about 8 m (27 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements, including the requirement for a fall protection plan.	
201000412	DUNSMUIR APARTMENTS LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-11-02	\$4,500.00	761033	Esquimalt	This firm began repairing the water-damaged floor of an apartment building without first identifying asbestos-containing materials that would be disturbed or removed by the repairs. It also failed to ensure that its workers were adequately protected from the potential exposure to asbestos fibres when removing the asbestos-containing material and that an inventory of all asbestos-containing materials in the building was prepared and kept current.	
201000155	DIAL-A-ROOF LTD	Not Appealed		2010-07-14	\$4,469.30	721051	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection between about 6 and 7.5 m (20 and 25 ft.) above grade on the roof of an apartment building. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection regulations.	
201000546	DELPHINA ENTERPRISES LTD	Not Appealed		2010-09-24	\$4,200.48	721051	Richmond	Three of this firm's workers were working on a sloped roof between 4 and 6 m (14 and 20 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. An extension ladder at the firm's worksite did not meet the safety and stability requirements. The firm also failed to provide workers with the information, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety. These were all repeated violations.	
201000303	ONKAR FRAMING & CONSTRUCTION LTD.	Under Review		2010-10-28	\$4,154.53	721024	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were standing about 2.5 m (8 ft.) above grade on the top of interior walls under construction. This was a repeated violation of the requirement for work platforms to be at least 50 cm (20 in.) wide. In another repeated violation this firm also failed to provide a first aid attendant with a valid certificate at its construction site.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000153	TREVOR KEITH QUINNELL	Not Appealed		2010-07-14	\$3,929.23	712034	Vancouver	Three of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on a roof about 6.5 m (21 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection regulations.	
201000103	GREAT WEST COAST ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-08-23	\$3,806.45	721036	Richmond	Three of this firm's workers, including a supervisor, were installing shingles on a wet and slippery roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000375	ONLY BEST FRAMING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-07-09	\$3,687.83	721024	North Vancouver	This firm's worker was working without fall protection on a roof about 4 m (14 ft.) above grade even though fall protection equipment was available on site. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000595	A1-BTI ROOFING LTD.	Review Rejected		2010-09-29	\$3,675.53	721051	Abbotsford	Three of this firm's workers were working on a sloped roof over 9 m (30 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements, including the requirement for a fall protection plan.	
200900308	ARONA FRAMING & CONSTRUCTION INC	Not Appealed		2010-01-19	\$3,621.15	721024	North Vancouver	One of this firm's workers was standing without any form of fall protection on the top plate of a house frame about 6.5 m (22 ft.) above grade. The firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	
200800361	ISLAND VIEW CONSTRUCTION LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-14	\$3,512.32	721027	Colwood	This firm's worker was installing siding from an unguarded work platform about 6 m (20 ft.) above uneven, rocky ground. In addition, the worker was not using any personal fall protection, even though such equipment was available on site. This firm failed to meet the fall protection requirements, exposing its worker to a high risk of falling.	
200900502	PER WITSO, (BKRK) KRISTIAN PER WITSO (BKR)& DONALD GEORGE WITSO	Not Appealed		2010-01-04	\$3,431.18	721051	Prince George	This firm's owner, a supervisor, and another worker were working on the sloped roof of a new residential building about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade without a fall protection system in place. This was a repeated violation.	
201000481	C.B.S. CONSTRUCTION LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-11-23	\$3,403.45	721024	Burnaby	Two of this firm's workers were installing trusses on a house under construction, about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade, without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000002	JOHN KENNETH SUTTON	Not Appealed		2010-05-31	\$3,250.00	721051	Near Chase	A worker suffered fatal injuries when he fell about 6 m (20 ft.) to the ground from the edge of an unguarded roof. He was not using any form of fall protection. This firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It failed to provide the worker with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure his safety.	1

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200800328	W. A. ALLEN CUSTOM CONTRACTING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-21	\$3,250.00	721027	Parksville	As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, this firm failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at the workplace, and it failed to establish and maintain a system at the workplace that would ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. The firm also failed to establish and maintain an adequate first aid regime. These were repeated violations.	
200900470	W. A. ALLEN CUSTOM CONTRACTING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-21	\$3,250.00	721027	Qualicum Beach	This employer failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers. One of its workers was working without fall protection on a roof about 6.5 m (22 ft.) above grade. Another worker was not wearing safety headgear and footwear while exposed to such risks as falling objects and puncture injuries. The employer also failed to provide first aid attendants and adequate first aid equipment. These were repeated violations.	
201000258	SHAAN CONSTRUCTION LTD	Under Review		2010-08-27	\$3,231.75	721024	Surrey	Two of this firm's workers were working 6 m (20 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900629	GREAT WEST COAST ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-08-23	\$3,105.66	721036	Surrey	Four of this firm's workers were working about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade on the roof of a house. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900518	BIRDI CONSTRUCTION LTD	Under Review		2010-07-08	\$3,073.68	721024	Aldergrove	This firm's supervisor was working without any form of fall protection from a house under construction about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade. Later that same day, the firm's supervisor was again found working without any form of fall protection on an improperly constructed wood frame scaffold about 4 m (14 ft.) above grade. These were repeated violations of the fall protection requirements.	
201000207	NEW WORLD FRAMING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-05-07	\$3,008.23	721024	Surrey	This firm's workers were working at heights more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000098	JOLIET ENTERPRISES LTD	Under Review		2010-11-30	\$2,781.28	761024	Kamloops	Before starting renovation work on its hotel, this firm did not ensure that an inventory of all asbestos-containing materials was prepared and kept current. It failed to ensure that those hazardous materials were properly identified by signs, labels, or other effective means. It also failed to protect workers from hazardous airborne asbestos dust by allowing asbestos-contaminated drywall to be removed from several hotel rooms and by failing to implement an exposure control plan. The firm then refused to comply with a WorkSafeBC order requiring it to submit a written compliance report detailing the steps it was taking to address the safety violations at its worksite.	
201000249	BIRDI CONSTRUCTION LTD	Under Review		2010-07-08	\$2,758.65	721024	Abbotsford	This firm's owner was sheathing a wet sloped roof 5 m (17 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900683	SAME DAY FRAMING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-01-21	\$2,740.75	721024	Surrey	This employer's workers were working on the second floor of a house under construction. However, a job built ladder was the only means available for climbing up to the work area. The employer failed to provide the required stairway for safe access to the second floor. This was a repeated violation.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000650	FALCON FRAMING CO. LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-11-03	\$2,665.00	721024	Vancouver	This firm's worker was installing roof trusses while standing on top of a wall under construction about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000792	TANU SIDING LTD	Under Review		2010-11-30	\$2,664.30	721049	Abbotsford	Two of this firm's workers were installing exterior siding while standing on a steep roof. They were not using any form of fall protection, and risked falling about 3 to 6 m (11 to 20 ft.) to grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000219	RWB INDUSTRIES LTD	Not Appealed		2010-06-14	\$2,647.96	721027	Surrey	A worker was working without fall protection more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade on the roof of a building under construction. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900536	221633 B C LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-23	\$2,625.72	764050	New Westminster	This firm has failed to comply within a reasonable time with multiple WorkSafeBC orders issued under the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation and the Workers Compensation Act. One of its workers was seriously injured after being struck by heavy mobile equipment (used in road construction) that was being placed in a shipping container. The equipment, suspended from hoisting chains attached to the forks of a class 7 rough-terrain forklift, shifted while being moved. The firm failed to provide workers with adequate information, supervision, training, and instruction.	
201000175	NU-TOUCH STUCCO LTD	Not Appealed		2010-06-04	\$2,591.75	721042	Vancouver	This firm's president and one of its workers were standing about 3 m (9 ft.) above grade on a single-plank scaffold that was less than 50 cm (20 in.) wide. This was a repeated violation of the requirement for scaffold platforms to be at least 50 cm (20 in.) wide.	
200900613	P BENIPAL FRAMING & CONSTRUCTION LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-02-17	\$2,573.83	721024	Surrey	Two workers were working about 6 m (19 ft.) above grade without adequate fall protection. This firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations. The firm also failed to properly secure a set of trusses so that it did not pose a risk of injury.	
201000558	PERMANENT ROOFING LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-11-22	\$2,552.45	721051	Richmond	Two of this firm's workers were working on a sloped roof up to about 7 m (24 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000642	LE NEHYO CONTRACTING LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-11-19	\$2,547.30	704009	East Of Tumbler Ridge	This firm's worker was seriously injured when he was struck by a tree. The spruce tree he had cut down fell onto another tree, which then broke and struck him. The firm did not ensure that the worker performed his work safely according to the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation and the BC Faller Training Standard. It did not ensure that the intended direction of the falling tree was free of obstructions and that a safe escape route was prepared in advance. The firm failed to ensure the health and safety of its worker.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200900322	HELEN JANE MACHAM	Not Appealed		2010-01-04	\$2,500.00	721027	Chilliwack	Fatality. The lift arms of a skid-steer loader lowered unexpectedly, pinning a worker between the crossbar of the lift arms and the engine compartment. The worker suffered fatal injuries. This employer failed to provide workers with adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision for operating mobile equipment safely. The employer also failed to ensure that the loader was safe to operate.	1
200800329	FISH BOAT 1 PREVENTION DIVISION	Not Appealed		2010-01-19	\$2,500.00	702008	Qualicum Beach	This employer's president obstructed a WorkSafeBC safety officer from inspecting its fishing vessel.	
200800395	KAREN CORTNER	Not Appealed		2010-01-27	\$2,500.00	721051	Westbank	A young worker who was not tied off to his lifeline fell about 5 m (17 ft.) from a 7:12 pitch roof to the ground below and broke his foot. While he was being treated at the clinic, another of this firm's young workers fell about 3 m (10 ft.) from a garage roof but was not injured. The firm failed to ensure that workers used a fall protection system for work 3 m (10 ft.) or more above grade. It also failed to provide adequate information, instruction, training, and supervision.	
200800402	MATHIEU LANGELIER	Not Appealed		2010-01-25	\$2,500.00	721051	Kelowna	A young worker suffered a fractured elbow and a concussion when he fell from a steep-sloped roof about 10.5 m (35 ft.) above grade. There were no guardrails, and the worker was not wearing fall protection. This firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur, and it failed to provide the young worker with adequate supervision, training, and instruction. It also failed to provide first aid equipment, supplies, and services.	
200800549	BS SANGHERA ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-01-13	\$2,500.00	721051	Vancouver	Workers were exposed to a high risk of injury while working without any form of fall protection on a steep-sloped roof over 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. This employer failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system for work done where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur.	
200800567	0786688 BC LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-08	\$2,500.00	721027	Prince George	This employer has failed to comply with two WorkSafeBC orders within a reasonable time. It failed to submit a notice of project for its construction site and failed to provide adequate first aid equipment, supplies, and attendants for the site.	
200800590	D JOHN SNOWDON & CANDICE SNOWDON	Not Appealed		2010-02-17	\$2,500.00	764014	Chilliwack	Two of this firm's workers were on a roof more than 10 m (33 ft.) above grade, cleaning the gutters. They were not using any form of fall protection. The firm failed to provide a fall protection system for work done where workers are not protected by permanent guardrails and where a fall of 7.5 m (25 ft.) or more could occur. It also failed to submit a written report outlining the steps it was taking to comply with the fall protection requirements.	
200800596	SHOA ORGANIZATION S SERVICES LTD	Not Appealed		2010-03-23	\$2,500.00	721027	Nanaimo	As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, this firm failed to coordinate the activities of employers, workers, and others to ensure health and safety. As a result, high-risk violations occurred. Workers were in an excavation more than 1.2 m (4 ft.) deep that was not supported, sloped, or benched. The written instructions for the excavation work were not available on site as required. In addition, workers were working without fall protection at heights more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200800637	TORY ALLEN CHARLTON	Not Appealed		2010-03-30	\$2,500.00	721051	Terrace	Four of this firm's workers were on the roof of a house more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200800641	GREGORY ROBERT BURDETT (BKR)	Not Appealed		2010-03-01	\$2,500.00	721051	Tappen	A young worker injured his leg when he fell about 6.5 m (22 ft.) from a ladder while cutting roofing material. This firm repeatedly failed to maintain a record of safety meetings, to provide first aid equipment and attendants, and to provide adequate training and supervision.	
200800654	A.L.K CONSTRUCTION LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-01-14	\$2,500.00	721027	Merritt	As a prime contractor, this firm failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at a multiple-employer worksite. It failed to take the necessary steps to comply with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. Its violations include failing to ensure the use of fall protection for work at heights over 3 m (10 ft.) and failing to ensure that workers wore safety headgear and safety footwear. It also failed to ensure that open web trusses were erected with adequate bracing.	
200800662	SHOA ORGANIZATION SERVICES LTD	Not Appealed		2010-03-23	\$2,500.00	721027	Nanaimo	As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, this firm failed to coordinate the activities of employers, workers, and others to ensure health and safety. It also failed to ensure regular workplace inspections to prevent unsafe conditions from developing. Tripping hazards, exposed nails, job-built ladders that did not meet the safety requirements, and missing guardrails and handrails were a few of the unsafe conditions. In addition, workers were working without fall protection at heights more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade.	
200800676	CALIBRE VENTURES INC	Not Appealed		2010-03-19	\$2,500.00	721027	Chilliwack	As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer worksite, this firm failed to ensure the health and safety of its workers and subcontractors. Its violations include the following. A worker who was not using any fall protection was at risk of a fall of about 4 m (14 ft.) from a house under construction. Workers without safety eyewear were using pneumatic nail guns that lacked nose guards. The construction site was littered with debris, posing tripping hazards. Guardrails and handrails were missing where required. In addition, after a worker required medical treatment for an injury, the firm failed to immediately undertake an accident investigation.	
200900014	0748983 BC LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-08-11	\$2,500.00	721024	Westbank	A young worker for this firm fell about 7 m (22.5 ft.) and suffered multiple fractures when a guardrail on a third-storey balcony failed. The firm failed to ensure that its workers were protected with a fall protection system when guardrails were removed to accommodate work.	
200900093	CANADIAN CUSTOM HOMES CENTRE LTD	Not Appealed		2010-03-12	\$2,500.00	721027	Coquitlam	This firm repeatedly failed to coordinate the work of renovating a building. As a result, workers were exposed to asbestos fibres that were likely over the exposure limit. Such high-risk exposure can lead to asbestos-related diseases, many of which are fatal.	
200900286	WAYNE GRAY	WCAT Appeal (RD Confirmed)		2010-02-03	\$2,500.00	721024	West Vancouver	One of this firm's young workers was walking up the standing truss of a 4:12 sloped roof about 4 m (14 ft.) above grade. The worker was not using any form of personal fall protection. The firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200900303	BS SANGHERA ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-23	\$2,500.00	721051	Vancouver	This firm repeatedly failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also repeatedly failed to ensure worker safety through proper instruction, training, and supervision.	
200900310	MDM ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-23	\$2,500.00	721051	North Vancouver	A worker climbed over the ridge of a 6:12 sloped roof more than 4 m (14 ft.) above grade. He was not wearing any form of personal fall protection. This firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations	
200900325	WAYNE A GRAY	Not Appealed		2010-02-05	\$2,500.00	721051	North Vancouver	A worker was removing roofing material from a 5:12 sloped roof over 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. She was not using any form of personal fall protection. This firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	
200900391	GOLD SEAL VENTURES LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-01-05	\$2,500.00	721051	Victoria	This firm failed to ensure that a fall protection system was used where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also failed to provide workers with adequate supervision and adequate fall protection training and instruction.	
200900490	ROBERT JOSEPH GAGNON	Not Appealed		2010-01-25	\$2,500.00	721051	Maple Ridge	Five workers, including the employer, were on the sloped roof of a house under construction, about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. The workers wore full body harnesses but were not connected to any anchors. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations. The employer also failed to provide workers with adequate information, training, and supervision.	
200900620	ARTHUR MOORE	Not Appealed		2010-04-12	\$2,500.00	721001	Delta	The written hazardous materials assessment prepared by this employer for the demolition of a house contained numerous deficiencies. The employer subsequently failed to comply with multiple WorkSafeBC requests for additional documentation to support the results in that assessment.	
200900623	BS SANGHERA ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-02-23	\$2,500.00	721051	Richmond	This firm repeatedly failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. It also repeatedly failed to ensure worker safety through proper instruction, training, and supervision.	
200900664	JR ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-06-29	\$2,500.00	721051	North Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working without fall protection on an unguarded roof about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
200900669	CUSTOM CRAFT CABINETS LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-01-28	\$2,500.00	714034	Burnaby	This employer failed to comply with multiple WorkSafeBC orders within a reasonable time. Its violations include the following. The employer failed to provide Material Safety Data Sheets for controlled products and failed to provide written lockout procedures for machinery and equipment. A ladder without the required guardrails was being used to access a mezzanine about 3.5 m (12 ft.) above grade. Workers were wearing running shoes instead of the required safety footwear. An emergency exit was blocked and would not have provided a quick escape route.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200900713	0701115 BC LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-07	\$2,500.00	721028	Surrey	As the prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, this firm failed to coordinate the health and safety activities of employers, workers, and others at the workplace, and it failed to establish and maintain a system at the workplace that would ensure compliance with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. It also failed to ensure that there were enough first aid attendants available on site and that its workers were wearing high visibility apparel while working around mobile equipment. These were repeated violations.	
201000011	KELLY ALEXANDER HASCARL	Not Appealed		2010-02-17	\$2,500.00	732044	Nakusp	This employer failed to comply with two orders. The first order required the employer to ensure that its self-loading log transporter was equipped with a bullboard behind its cab to protect its driver from loads that might shift. The second order required the employer to submit a written report outlining the steps that it was taking to comply with the first order.	
201000045	NEW-AGE ROOFING CO LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-05-12	\$2,500.00	721051	Kamloops	Six of this firm's workers, including a supervisor, were working on a steep-sloped roof up to about 15 m (50 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. The firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated high-risk violation.	
201000047	MANN ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-03-30	\$2,500.00	721051	Surrey	This firm's owner and one of its workers were working about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade on the 16:12 sloped roof of a two-storey house. They were not using any form of personal fall protection even though the required equipment was available on site. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000130	CANADO BUILDING & MANAGEMENT LTD	Not Appealed		2010-03-09	\$2,500.00	721028	Vancouver	This employer erected a garbage chute near an overhead high-voltage power line, failing to maintain at least the minimum distance required between the energized line and the chute. The employer also failed to obtain written authorization from the power system's owner. The employer's owner, workers, and subcontractors were exposed to the danger of working close to the live power line. This was a high-risk violation	
201000131	ANDREW JACKSON HARRIS	Not Appealed		2010-03-11	\$2,500.00	721051	North Vancouver	This firm's owner and one of its workers were on a roof more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of personal fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection regulations.	
201000146	GOLD STAR ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-07-12	\$2,500.00	721051	Richmond	This firm's owner and one of its workers were waterproofing a sloped roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection regulations.	
201000157	NORRIS RODNEY LAITINEN & TALENA ELLEN JENSEN	Not Appealed		2010-04-16	\$2,500.00	721036	Merritt	This firm's two owners and three of its workers were working on a roof about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000184	RICCARDO JOHN DIVILIO	Not Appealed		2010-04-09	\$2,500.00	721024	Maple Ridge	Three of this firm's workers were working about 5 m (17 ft.) above grade while not using any form of personal fall protection. The firm's owner was working directly below these workers. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000190	BAHIA ROOFING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-04-09	\$2,500.00	721051	Maple Ridge	This firm's owner and four of its workers were working on a sloped roof between 2.7 and 4.6 m (9 and 15 ft.) above grade without any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety at the workplace.	
201000242	L&M ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-06-01	\$2,500.00	721051	Richmond	This firm's worker was working on a roof 8.5 m (28 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements. The firm also failed to provide workers with a safe means of accessing the roof and failed to provide a written fall protection plan for the worksite.	
201000262	GEORGE U FEHR	Not Appealed		2010-05-12	\$2,500.00	721027	Vanderhoof	This firm's owner and two of its workers were working at least 3 m (11 ft.) above grade on the roof of a house under construction. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000339	ALL KIND ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-09-08	\$2,500.00	721051	Abbotsford	Three of this firm's workers were installing roofing shingles on a roof about 5.5 to 6 m (18 to 20 ft.) above grade without using fall protection. The firm failed to provide a fall protection plan and supervision as required by the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. These were repeated violations.	
201000341	WILLIAM G VAN OORT	Not Appealed		2010-07-13	\$2,500.00	721027	Agassiz	This firm's owner and one of its workers were working without fall protection on the roof of a townhouse about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade. In addition, four of the firm's workers were using nail guns without wearing safety eyewear even though safety glasses were available on site. These were repeated violations of the fall protection and safety eyewear requirements	
201000364	GREAT VAN ROOFING AND DRAINAGE LTD	Not Appealed		2010-08-18	\$2,500.00	721027	Burnaby	Four of this firm's workers were installing roofing material on a roof between about 3.5 and 4 m (11 and 13 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000374	GUS VAN LOENEN	Not Appealed		2010-10-01	\$2,500.00	721027	Coquitlam	This employer failed to comply with an order requiring it to submit a written compliance report detailing the steps it was taking to address safety issues observed at its worksite.	
201000377	PRINCE ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-10-18	\$2,500.00	721051	Vancouver	Four of this firm's workers, including the site supervisor, were working on a sloped roof between 4.5 m (15 ft.) and 6 m (20 ft.) above grade without using fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000381	TREVOR LEE GLADISH	Not Appealed		2010-07-15	\$2,500.00	721051	Naramata	Four of this firm's workers were not using any form of fall protection while working on a roof between 3 and 7.5 m (10 and 25 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000459	BHAGWANT DHALIWAL	Not Appealed		2010-10-20	\$2,500.00	721051	Coquitlam	This firm's principal was working on a sloped roof about 8 m (27 ft.) above grade without using any fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000468	NYSTAR DEVELOPMENT S CORPORATION	Not Appealed		2010-09-08	\$2,500.00	721028	Vancouver	Ten of this firm's workers were removing asbestos-containing materials from a demolition site without following the proper procedures and without using appropriate personal protective equipment. The firm failed to ensure that the asbestos-containing materials identified in the worksite's hazardous materials survey were safely contained and removed.	
201000484	NEW TECH FRAMING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-09-08	\$2,500.00	721024	Delta	This firm's president and one of its workers were working on a sloped roof about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000487	RG ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-09-07	\$2,500.00	721051	Burnaby	This firm's worker was working on a roof about 4 m (14 ft.) above grade. He was not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000490	TEJINDER S KALER	Not Appealed		2010-09-02	\$2,500.00	721051	Surrey	Three of this firm's workers were working on a sloped roof about 3.5 m (12 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000555	J & J FRAMING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-09-10	\$2,500.00	721024	Richmond	Three of this firm's workers were working on a house under construction without using fall protection. One of the workers was standing on narrow lumber top plates 3 m (10 ft.) above grade, while the other two workers were standing on narrow lumber top plates about 6 m (19 ft.) above grade. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000586	GUY MORRALL	Not Appealed		2010-09-08	\$2,500.00	721051	Richmond	This firm's principal failed to cooperate with a WorkSafeBC officer who was attempting to inspect the firm's job site. This was a violation of the requirement to cooperate with WorkSafeBC officers carrying out their duties under the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	
201000636	BRAR BROTHERS ROOFING LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-09-28	\$2,500.00	721051	Surrey	This firm's owner and one of its workers were installing roofing material on a sloped roof more than 6.5 m (22 ft.) above grade without using fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200800028	228100 B C LTD	RD Confirmed	\$2,500.00	2010-03-24	\$2,500.00	721031	Quesnel	This firm's worker was not wearing a seat belt while operating a bulldozer near the edge of an excavation. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to wear the seat belts on mobile equipment. In addition, the bulldozer's seat belt was difficult to access because it was jammed under the seat. This was also a repeated violation of the requirement to inspect mobile equipment for safety before operating it.	
200800160	JOHN O CURRY	RD Varied (Reduced to Warning)	\$0.00	2010-03-10	\$2,500.00	721051	Nanaimo	Two workers were working on a roof between 5 and 6 m (16 and 20 ft.) above grade. They were not using effective fall protection. This firm failed to ensure the use of a fall protection system where a fall of 3 m (10 ft.) or more could occur. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection regulations.	
200900064	BHUPINDER CHAHAL BC HAZMAT INSPECTIONS LTD.	RD Varied	\$1,750.00	2010-03-12	\$2,500.00	763006	Coquitlam	This firm repeatedly provided clearance certificates indicating that hazardous materials had been safely removed when it did not know who had removed the materials or how the work had been carried out. It did not conduct any sampling to confirm that the worksite was free of asbestos contamination before certifying that it was safe for workers to enter.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
200900336	MATTU ROOFING LTD	RD Confirmed	\$2,500.00	2010-04-20	\$2,500.00	721051	Vancouver	This firm's owner and three of its workers were stripping roofing material from a roof more than 4.5 m (15 ft.) above grade. There were no guardrails on the roof, and the workers were not using any personal fall protection equipment. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900443	JASON DAVID COLLETT	Under Review		2010-10-22	\$2,500.00	703002	Prince George	This firm allowed its workers to use unsafe methods for cutting down trees. For example, it allowed the use of sloping cuts, contrary to safe falling procedures. One of its workers was at risk of being struck by a tree when the area around the tree wasn't cleared as required. The firm also failed to provide a safe escape route by brushing out the areas around trees that were being felled. These were high-risk violations of the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	
200900631	DIAMOND ROOFING LTD.	Review Rejected		2010-08-20	\$2,500.00	721051	Surrey	This firm's owner and two of its workers were working on a roof about 5 m (16 ft.) or more above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900707	MICHELLE ELIZABETH GOHN	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-31	\$2,500.00	723009	Grand Forks	This firm's worker suffered multiple fractures after the trailer of a commercial vehicle struck and then dragged him 100 m (328 ft.) down a highway. A WorkSafeBC investigation found that the firm assigned the injured worker as well as another worker to traffic control duties without ensuring that they were adequately trained for a high-risk traffic control operation to guide traffic through a two-way road temporarily reduced to one lane. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to train traffic control persons in a manner acceptable to WorkSafeBC.	
201000015	655843 B C LTD	Under Review		2010-09-07	\$2,500.00	741013	Windermere	This firm repeatedly failed to implement a system of pre-payment for fuel at its rural gas station as required by the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation.	
201000020	HARCO SERVICES LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-01	\$2,500.00	714031	Maple Ridge	A young worker for this firm sustained serious injuries after using his foot to roll a log towards a front-end loader fitted with a bucket-and-grapple attachment. This was a common practice at the firm's worksite. The grapple closed around the worker's foot, crushing three toes, which were later surgically amputated. The employer did not have a system in place to ensure the health and safety of workers, and did not provide the new and young worker with health and safety orientation and training.	
201000169	DANIEL JOSEPH DAWSON CARDINAL	Review Rejected		2010-07-12	\$2,500.00	721051	Richmond	Two of this firm's workers were working near the edge of a sloped roof about 11 m (36 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection regulations.	
201000183	RMG SIDING & ROOFING LTD	Under Review		2010-11-22	\$2,500.00	721049	Trail	This firm's worker was working on a roof up to about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000265	DARRELL DEAN WARNER	Under Review		2010-06-01	\$2,500.00	721051	Campbell River	Six of this firm's workers, including a supervisor, were working on a roof more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000395	SKYLITE BUILDING MAINTENANCE LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-17	\$2,500.00	764014	Burnaby	This firm's workers were removing asbestos-containing materials from a building that was being demolished without following the proper procedures. The firm failed to implement a site-specific exposure control plan to ensure that the hazardous materials were safely contained and removed. For example, workers did not have access to a safe area for changing into protective clothing and for disposing of asbestos-contaminated clothing. The firm also failed to fit test workers to ensure that their respirators provided an effective seal against airborne asbestos fibres. It also failed to train and supervise its workers in safe asbestos removal procedures.	
201000447	AMARSINGH BUILDERS LTD.	Not Appealed		2010-11-18	\$2,500.00	721024	Surrey	This firm's principal and several of its workers were installing guardrails more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade on the third storey of a building under construction. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000466	DON S DEWAR	Under Review		2010-09-22	\$2,500.00	721024	Coquitlam	This firm's principal was working about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade on a house under construction without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000467	G & K EXCAVATION AND DEMOLITION SERVICES LTD	Under Review		2010-10-15	\$2,500.00	721031	Vancouver	This firm failed to ensure that asbestos-containing materials identified in the worksite's hazardous materials survey was safely removed from the worksite.	
201000513	BILLKANG INVESTMENT LTD	Under Review		2010-08-12	\$2,500.00	721027	Surrey	This firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order to stop work by allowing workers to remove asbestos-containing material from the workplace subject to the stop work order.	
201000553	DON DOERKSEN	Under Review		2010-11-04	\$2,500.00	764006	Mission	This employer failed to comply with an order requiring it to submit a written compliance report detailing the steps it was taking to address safety issues observed at its worksite.	
201000600	SUNTAN-STONE CONSTRUCTION LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-10	\$2,500.00	721027	West Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were working more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade on the roof of a house under construction. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000611	BRYAN-YAYAATULAYC EXCAVATING LTD	Not Appealed		2010-11-16	\$2,500.00	721031	Hagensborg	This firm's worker was fatally injured when he was struck by a leaning alder tree that split vertically (barberchaired) while he was falling it. The firm did not ensure that the worker was capable of safely performing his work according to the BC Faller Training Standard. The worker used incorrect falling techniques, which increased the risk of the tree splitting. There were no written safe work procedures for falling and bucking, for establishing minimum distances between workers, or for using mechanical assistance to fall the trees. Another worker was not clear of the area within a two tree-length radius of the tree that split. The firm failed to provide adequate instruction and supervision at this workplace. The firm also failed to ensure that a preliminary inspection of the workplace to identify hazards associated with falling trees close to energized high voltage lines was conducted.	1

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000621	DN FRAMING LIMITED	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-02	\$2,500.00	721024	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were installing plywood sheathing on a roof about 6 m (20 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements. The firm also failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order requiring it to submit a written compliance report detailing the steps it was taking to address safety issues observed at its worksite.	
201000624	J.G ROOFING LTD	Review Rejected		2010-09-28	\$2,500.00	721051	Surrey	Three of this firm's workers were working on a roof more than 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements, including the requirement for a fall protection plan.	
201000649	RYAN TUBBS & DEBORA DOUGLAS	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-21	\$2,500.00	721051	Vancouver	This firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order requiring it to submit a written fall protection plan for its workplace.	
201000656	MANNY CONSTRUCTION LTD.	Under Review		2010-11-03	\$2,500.00	721027	Burnaby	Three of this firm's workers were working on roof trusses about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000702	RED HORSE ROOFING LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-20	\$2,500.00	721036	North Vancouver	This firm's co-principal was working on a roof 4m (13 ft) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000723	WESTEC FRAMING LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-11-29	\$2,500.00	721024	Delta	Two of this firm's workers were installing trusses while standing about 5.5 m (18 ft.) above grade on top of a wall under construction. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated high-risk violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000729	S B FRAMING LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-08	\$2,500.00	721024	Burnaby	This firm's workers were framing walls on the second level of a house under construction. An incorrectly built ladder was the only way for workers to get to this upper level. This was a repeated violation of the requirement to install stairs to each floor before building the next one.	
201000740	A1 VALLEY ROOFING LTD.	Under Review		2010-12-03	\$2,500.00	721051	Coquitlam	Three of this firm's workers were working on a sloped roof about 7.5 m (20 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000749	VANCO ROOFING LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-08	\$2,500.00	721051	Vancouver	Two of this firm's workers were installing roofing material on a sloped roof about 5 m (16 ft.) above grade. They were not using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
201000768	UPPAL PLASTERING & STUCCO LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-08	\$2,500.00	721042	Prince George	This firm's worker was standing about 6.5 m (21 ft.) above grade on a wood frame scaffold at a house under construction. He was not using any form of fall protection. In addition, the wood frame scaffolding on site had multiple deficiencies, posing a high risk of injury to workers. For example, it contained defective lumber, did not have guardrails, and its platforms were not as wide as required. These were repeated violations of the fall protection requirements as well as the design requirements for scaffolds.	
201000778	AM ROOFING LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-20	\$2,500.00	721027	Abbotsford	Two of this firm's workers were not using any form of fall protection while applying roofing materials on a steep roof. They risked falling over 3 m (10 ft.) to grade. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	

Document #	Employer Name	Current Status	Adjusted Amount	Event Effective Date	Amount	CU	Operating City	Reason Notes	Fatality Count
201000804	HARMAN PAINTING CO. LTD.	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-21	\$2,500.00	721042	Prince George	This firm's workers risked falls of up to about 6 m (19 ft.) while working on wood frame scaffolding without using any form of fall protection. In addition, the wood frame scaffolding on site had multiple deficiencies. For example, it contained defective lumber, did not have guardrails, and its platforms were not as wide as required. These were repeated high-risk violations of the fall protection requirements as well as the design requirements for scaffolds.	
201000840	JAGTAR SINGH KAHLON	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-23	\$2,500.00	721051	Vancouver	This firm's principal and two of its workers risked falls of about 9 m (30 ft.) while working on the sloped roof of house. They were wearing fall protection harnesses but were not connected to lifelines. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements as well as the requirement to provide workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their safety.	
201000852	AP STUCCO LTD	Within (90) Appeal Period		2010-12-23	\$2,500.00	721042	Vancouver	This firm's worker was standing on a job-built scaffold about 5 m (17 ft.) above the bottom of a concrete stairwell without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
200900049	GAUTHIER DEVELOPMENT LTD	Not Appealed		2010-01-07	\$1,000.00	721027	Courtenay	As the prime contractor on a multiple-employer worksite, this firm failed to maintain an effective system for complying with the Workers Compensation Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. Its violations include failing to ensure the use of appropriate personal protective equipment and failing to provide workers with Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System (WHMIS) training. It also failed to supply material safety data sheets (MSDSs) for controlled products and to ensure that workers were qualified to operate elevating work platforms.	
201000120	SEAN O'FLYNN	Not Appealed		2010-11-09	\$1,000.00	721051	Quesnel	Three of this firm's workers were installing shingles on a roof more than 3 m (10 ft.) above grade without using any form of fall protection. This was a repeated violation of the fall protection requirements.	
	256				\$3,136,898.14				10