

WorkSafe

Tools for building safer workplaces | worksafemagazine.com | May / June 2022



**Workplace design
has a positive impact
on workers** p7

**Managing risks in
cannabis processing** p5

**Uniting safety training
with technology** p10



Traffic cone?

Pylon?

Life saver.

**Whatever you call it, a Cone Zone
helps protect your workers.**



As an employer, it's your responsibility to provide your roadside workers with supervision, training, equipment and resources to help keep them safe.

Download your free Employer Tool Kit at ConeZoneBC.com



**WORK ZONE
SAFETY ALLIANCE**

Contents

May / June 2022 | Volume 22 | Number 3

Features

5 | **Ask an officer** **Managing risks in cannabis processing**

Processing and extracting cannabis can be dangerous and requires careful safety planning. Occupational safety officer Kimiko Banati answers questions about the risks associated with this expanding industry.

By Jesse Marchand

7 | **On the cover** **Workplace design has a positive impact on workers**

When a larger dairy producer was seeing an increase in musculoskeletal claims, the employees at this firm got on board. Together, they helped increase worker safety and satisfaction, and introduce health and safety improvements.

By Marnie Douglas

10 | **Safety spotlight** **Uniting safety training with technology**

It's never too early to learn how to stay safe on the job. BCIT's foundation programs combine traditional measures — like safety talks and signage — with a technological twist that provides safety with a swipe.

By Jesse Marchand and Nicole Scudamore

Departments

4 | **From the editor**

12 | **WorkSafeBC updates**

17 | **Safety on the agenda**

18 | **Penalties**

35 | **Injunctions**

On the front cover: Dairyworker Brian MacDonald adjusts controls in the cheese production room at Saputo's Abbotsford facility.

Kelowna tower crane collapse a stark reminder of our need to build safe workplaces

This July 12 marked the first anniversary of the catastrophic tower crane collapse in Kelowna where five people were killed, including four workers and a worker unrelated to the construction site. While multiple investigations are ongoing, the tragic loss of life is a stark reminder of our collective responsibility to build healthy and safe workplaces.

This issue looks at health and safety from several angles — participatory risk assessments, student training, and learning the ropes of a new industry. Read about employers who are committed to making positive changes that are responsive to the needs of their workers.

In our cover story (page 7), we see how an employer engages workers to improve ergonomics, resulting in reduced injuries and increased job satisfaction. Our “Safety spotlight” (page 10) highlights measures BCIT’s trades programs took to make safety top of mind for its students; an engaging combination of signage and technology teaches students how to safely operate machinery. And in the growing cannabis industry, “Ask an officer” (page 5) examines how to stay on top of the many risks in cannabis processing.

Sadly, workers continue to get injured and die every year as a result of their jobs. Approaching safety from many angles and at every stage of our career is one way to make positive changes in our workplaces.



Terence Little
Editor-in-chief

WorkSafe

Editor-in-chief: Terence Little | **Managing editor:** Kristine Carrick

Assistant editor: Tobi Matilda

Graphic designer: Jane Tang

Photographer: Khalid Hawe | **Photo safety advisor:** Andrew Lim

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

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

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

Subscriptions To start or stop a free subscription to *WorkSafe Magazine*, or to update mailing information, follow the “Subscribe” link on our website at worksafemagazine.com.

Advertising For information about advertising your product or service in *WorkSafe Magazine*, please contact Kevin Dergez of Strategis Communications at 250.574.7171 or kevin@strategis-communications.com.

Contact us Email: worksafemagazine@worksafebc.com. Mailing address: *WorkSafe Magazine*, PO Box 5350 Station Terminal, Vancouver, BC V6B 5L5. Courier: WorkSafeBC Communications, 6951 Westminster Highway, Richmond, BC V7C 1C6.

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

WORK SAFE BC



Jesse Marchand

Jesse is a former managing editor for *WorkSafe Magazine* and has worked in publishing and journalism for nearly 20 years. In this issue, she interviews Kimiko Banati in “Ask an officer” (page 5) about risks in cannabis processing. In collaboration with co-writer Nicole Scudamore, Jesse also explores BCIT’s safety training in trades in our “Safety spotlight” (page 10).



Sarah Ripplinger

Sarah has a passion for storytelling that turns heads, excites, and inspires. When she’s not typing away or in a meeting, you might see her on a bike, at the beach, or off in the mountains somewhere. In this issue, she provides one of our updates about training for legislative changes made to better protect tow truck operators (page 12).



Marnie Douglas

Marnie is a Kelowna-based writer and communications professional. In this issue, she reports on the role ergonomics played in making work safer and more enjoyable for Saputo’s employees (page 7). She also shares a personal story from the winner of our Student Safety Video contest in a “WorkSafeBC update” (page 15).

Managing risks in cannabis processing



Kimiko Banati

Occupational hygiene officer

Region: Richmond

Years on the job: 10

Since the industry was legalized in 2018, we have been engaging with employers in cannabis processing. Employers have had questions about how to safely install equipment and what regulations and jurisdictions apply. Occupational hygiene officer Kimiko Banati answers some of the most frequently asked questions.

Q. Where should I start with controlling risks in cannabis processing?

A. Start early. It’s never too soon in the planning stage to think about health and safety. Ask yourself what health and safety concerns you have and what you’re currently doing to control them.

Once hazards are identified, select and implement effective and reliable controls using the hierarchy of controls: elimination, substitution, engineering controls, administrative controls, and personal protective equipment. For example, use engineering controls to pipe the pressure relief devices to the outside of the building, or bleed bolts to secure pressure vessels. These measures help prevent uncontrolled releases of hazardous solvents.

Employers must be familiar with relevant standards and regulations to ensure controls are implemented (for example, ULC 1389 and ULC 4400 are Canadian Standards relevant to cannabis processing).

Q. How can I ensure my equipment meets regulations?

A. Processing and extraction equipment is highly sophisticated and requires careful planning to safely operate. The facility, equipment, and human interactions need to be looked at together or potential failures can be missed. Factors to consider when analyzing the process:

- Processing procedures
- Hazard properties including quantities and locations

- Facility and equipment design
- Worker interactions with the system

Engaging early with experts will help prevent expensive and possibly dangerous mistakes.

Whether installing new equipment or maintaining current equipment, employers must follow the manufacturer's instructions. When hiring an engineer, they should be well versed on the equipment and understand the associated regulations for cannabis processing.

Q. How can I maintain my equipment and health and safety program?

A. Ensuring workplace health and safety is an ongoing process. Employers must monitor their systems, engage with workers, and test controls. This will let you know that the controls are reliable and will work when you need them.

Connecting with workers provides valuable insight. Proposed controls may only work if they are suitable and practicable for your workers to use. Feedback and insight can prevent a disastrous outcome you thought was being controlled.

Keep track of controls: document maintenance, repairs/replacements, calibrations, and inspections.

Q. How can I manage the different jurisdictions in my industry?

A. This is a tall task; at times, regulatory requirements can be daunting. Take time to understand what jurisdictions or regulations apply to you. If you are unsure — ask. We are here to help and provide information. Other authorities for health and safety requirements:

1. Office of the Fire Commissioner
2. Technical Safety BC (pressure vessels, natural gas systems)

Q. Where can I get more information?

A. Visit worksafebc.com for the following resources:

- [2021–2023 Agriculture Initiative](#)
- [The basics of risk management](#)
- [Health and safety in cannabis cultivation](#)

If you have questions about health and safety in your workplace or industry, call the Prevention Information Line at 1.888.621.SAFE, to be connected with an occupational safety or hygiene officer.

Looking for answers to your specific health and safety questions? Send them to us at worksafemagazine@worksafebc.com and we'll consider them for our next "Ask an officer" feature. 🙋



**PROTECT INTERNATIONAL
RISK AND SAFETY SERVICES**

Most organizations have legal duties to deal with violence or the threat of violence, and for some organizations this is one of their core responsibilities.

We can help.

- Workshops
- Webinars
- Threat Assessments
- Conduct Investigations
- Legal Consultation
- Support Services
- Program Evaluation
- Policy Review

www.protect-international.com

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

On the cover



At Saputo's milk and dairy alternative beverage facility in Port Coquitlam, Tony Di Cicco, regional health & safety specialist, and WorkSafeBC's Gina Vahlas discuss ergonomic design in the Batch Tank room.

Workplace design has a positive impact on workers

By Marnie Douglas

At Saputo's milk and cheese production plants in Port Coquitlam and Abbotsford, design is everything — ergonomic design, that is.

In 2010, the dairy processor was seeing an increased level of musculoskeletal injury (MSI) claims. The employer had identified that their MSIs were coming from the cheese production area, and they were committed to finding a solution. They consulted with WorkSafeBC to find solutions aimed at preventing these workplace injuries.

MSIs make up about one third of all claims WorkSafeBC sees in a year. These injuries affect the soft tissues of the body, such as muscles, tendons, joints, and nerves.

Identifying the challenges

"Preventing these injuries requires taking a close look at work tasks and equipment, and making the necessary workplace changes," says Gina Vahlas, an occupational hygiene officer (OHO) with WorkSafeBC. Before moving to her OHO role, Vahlas was an ergonomist, assisting prevention officers and employers in designing their workplaces to prevent MSIs and other injuries. "We start by using a participatory approach, talking to workers and supervisors to get an understanding of how they perform their work tasks and what the challenges may be, before moving to developing solutions."

Vahlas visited Saputo's Abbotsford plant and interviewed workers, analyzing how staff interacted with equipment, their workspaces, and observing work on the production floor looking for MSI risk factors. This process helped her to better understand the challenges workers were facing and gather their ideas for possible controls.

Her report, presented to the now-retired plant manager, Raynald Leclerc, and the joint health and safety committee, provided a starting point to educate the group about MSI risk factors and ergonomics. With the commitment of Leclerc, and the collaboration of the safety team and staff, a participatory ergonomics process was introduced.

This process included consulting with employees who shared, first-hand, their challenges and ideas about what might help them with their work. Vahlas then was able to facilitate a brainstorming session with the team

to develop solutions to prevent MSIs and other types of injuries.

As part of this, and with Vahlas' help, Saputo's team decided on and implemented engineering design controls. "Ideally, solutions are mocked up and tested before they are implemented to make any necessary adjustments," she noted. "It doesn't have to be an expensive prototype; I have used something as simple as cardboard to mock up a proposed solution."

At the Abbotsford plant, those changes included reconfiguring equipment to fit the worker — a process that involved "making physical workplace changes to reduce risk factors and prevent injuries," says Vahlas.

Prevention by design

"The plant manager committed to using a consultative approach with their workers to implement controls," she explains. "In follow-up visits, I observed the changes to engineering controls, such as lowering tracks to reduce over shoulder height work, using vacuum lifts to reduce force, making stacks of materials smaller, and using a height adjustable pallet jack to be able to adjust lifting heights between hip and shoulder height."

Vahlas shared that an ergonomic approach will help prevent MSIs and other injuries but it goes beyond that; it also helps create process efficiencies and improve workplace health and safety culture.

Tony Di Cicco, Saputo's regional health and safety specialist, says employees noticed the improvements in their discomfort immediately, as well as improvements in communication and morale, particularly for those who had been with the company for many years.

"It was a bit of a surprise to all of us, to be honest. We didn't realize how much ergonomics could play a role in employee health and safety, and it really made us look closer at ergonomics overall," he says.

Saputo took what it had learned through the implementation of ergonomic design at the Abbotsford plant and incorporated it when constructing its state-of-the-art milk and dairy alternative beverage facility in Port Coquitlam. Says Di Cicco: "When we had the opportunity to build a new facility, we kept ergonomic design top of mind."

For example, at the new Port Coquitlam facility, which opened in August 2021, valves and maintenance



Tony Di Cicco and Gina Vahlas talk about health and safety considerations in the milk receiving bay at Saputo's Port Coquitlam facility.

controls were made accessible from the floor as opposed to using ladders. Also, the offloading milk station above trucks was constructed with guardrails instead of relying on personal fall protection equipment. These design considerations improve work processes and create efficiencies while helping to reduce injuries and prevent incidents, like falls.

"Employees are definitely noticing a difference; they're not having to lift or strain to complete tasks," adds Colleen Nechvolodoff, Saputo's environmental health and safety coordinator. "There's also been significant positive feedback."

In addition, Saputo has a physiotherapist on-site two days per week to further support the health and safety culture for the plant's employees.

Long-term benefits

The improvements are paying off for Saputo — overall, MSI claims dropped significantly between 2010–2019,

but more importantly staff feel like their health and safety matters, especially when they see their feedback leading to positive changes.

Vahlas hopes that Saputo's success can help other businesses learn from the company's commitment to the participatory ergonomics process, and inspire design improvements as a means to sustainable health and safety.

"The best time to incorporate ergonomics is at the start: when you are designing, planning, and procuring your workplace facilities, workstations, equipment, and setting up processes and workflow," remarks Vahlas. "People come in different shapes and sizes and perceive their surroundings differently. All of this needs to be considered in the design — ultimately it will lead to better health and safety performance."

For more information on workplace ergonomics visit worksafebc.com/ergonomics. ☺

Allen Emes, instructor, BCIT Electrical Trades program, leads students through a daily toolbox talk on health and safety.

Uniting safety training with technology

By Jesse Marchand
and Nicole Scudamore

Teachers through BCIT's trades programs offer safety training, orientation, and supervision with a technological twist.

Anyone can get injured at work, but young workers are particularly at risk. Injuries can result from inadequate training, orientation, and supervision; inexperience; and lack of awareness of their workplace rights and responsibilities. BCIT is one of many higher education facilities responsible for training the next generation of workers. At the core of their programs is healthy and safe work habits — and the tips they use could be implemented anywhere, even in a real-world workplace.

Getting into the safety mindset

Like many workplaces, BCIT's Joinery Foundation class starts every day with a toolbox talk. This is where students read and sign safety protocols before operating any equipment. Instructor Andrew Pavle then opens up the floor to a Q&A before students go to their workstations. For Pavle, talking about safety is a critical mindset to have before entering the workforce.

"When I instruct, it's important that students hear the real stories and examples about workers getting hurt on the job so they don't make the same mistakes and so they know that the risks are real. I often tell a personal story where a piece of wood flew off a table saw just like a bullet, damaging objects in its path and penetrating a leather chair."

He's not alone when it comes to putting that mindset front of mind. In the Piping Foundation program, the first three weeks of class are dedicated strictly to safety training theory. Only the students who pass the safety tests (minimum grade of 70 percent) can move to the floor — a standard for all of BCIT's construction courses.

"One thing I learned from my safety training so far is that it's better to ask for help from an instructor if we're unsure of how to operate a piece of machinery than to try anything on the floor," says student Michael Li.

Combining QR codes with classic safety signage and training

Once students are ready for hands-on learning, technology allows for safety training at their fingertips.

At the entrance to each shop, students can easily access a virtual tour via QR codes to help familiarize themselves with their space and specific areas of the room, which include safety protocols, emergency exits, and more.

Each piece of machinery also has a QR code that students can scan to take on-the-spot safety training without having to leave their station. What makes the QR code different from just posting the instructions, is that it links to videos on how to operate safeguards correctly so students can see examples of the machine in work and in lockout.

Using technology for training is extremely useful, but it's meant to be a follow up to hands-on training, and ongoing supervision — not every workplace can safely allow phones and other devices on the shop floor. Each trade has a 16:1 student/instructor ratio, ensuring there is a mentor nearby at all times. Open communication between instructors and students is also supported and encouraged. Before moving on to the individual work stations, instructors demonstrate procedures and open up the floor to questions.

BCIT also uses traditional signage at entrances, and throughout all the shops, giving clear instructions for students and instructors alike to help ensure a safe learning environment. Each shop is equipped with floor decals marking work zones and signage around PPE requirements.

Understanding the purpose of de-energizing and lockout

To prepare his students for the real world, Pavle uses learner-focused teaching methods when training his students on locking out and de-energizing machinery.

“Our machines are equipped with the highest standard of safety features — such as lockout switches on equipment,” says Pavle. “To prepare students for a real-world scenario where they may be dealing with older or different equipment, we teach them the ultimate safety measure — to unplug the equipment to ensure their safety.”

The teaching staff also don't shy away from sharing real-life scenarios of things gone wrong. “A common mistake I would see at the mill was for a worker to lock the machine door without locking the switch,” says Allen Emes, an instructor for the Electrical Trades programs. “Because you never know where these students will end up working, I try to give real examples

of what I've seen in all types of fields ... so they're prepared for any situation.”

As a school, they are responsible to ensure that students know using equipment at the workplace isn't going to be a cookie-cutter experience. “One of the set-backs of using equipment with all of these safety features is that students could develop a false sense of security — so I ensure they're mindful of other areas of the machinery that could be a safety hazard if they're not paying attention,” adds Pavle.

Students learn from the industry experiences of their instructors and know that an injury could happen to anyone. On top of that, safety standards are always changing.

“Without this type of safety training, I would never have known about all the health and safety precautions that exist in the field,” says Shiori Ito, Joinery Foundations student and future young worker. “Because of the focus on safety training in the program, I feel confident that if I were to enter a workplace where safety protocols weren't followed, I would recognize the hazards and would feel confident to speak up and refuse unsafe work.”

For more information

Visit worksafebc.com/youngworkers where you can find out more and view the following resources:

- [Training and orientation for young and new workers](#)
- [Young and new worker orientation checklist](#)
- [Staying safe at work](#) — a guide for people who are new to Canada

Check out BCIT's [YouTube](#) page for tips on creating your own training videos, health and safety tips, and more. 📺

The advertisement features a dark background with a blurred image of a person working. On the left, a yellow rectangular box contains text about penalties and downtime. On the right, the UBSafe Inc. logo is displayed in red and yellow, followed by contact information.

UBSafe inc.

Penalties, claim costs and downtime can be disruptive and costly for your business – contact us for a free consultation

Your safeguarding experts – from start to completion

safety@ubsafe.ca
www.ubsafe.ca
778.847.4047

Driver Troy Grabowsky, Mario's Towing, performing a pre-trip inspection before heading out to work.

Online course offers OHS Regulation updates

By Sarah Ripplinger

Tow truck operators work 24/7 in all kinds of weather and road conditions. Some calls put them in close proximity to fast-moving vehicles and complex traffic situations. They get called to accident scenes for the removal of damaged vehicles, and their work often continues after paramedics and other first responders have left the scene.

On December 1, 2021, amendments to the Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) Regulation came into effect to better protect tow workers. The changes to Part 18 of the Regulation align with the latest edition of the Traffic Management Manual for Work on Roadways issued by the BC Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure (MoTI).

“Tow truck drivers can become accustomed to risks associated with their work,” notes Dale Alcock, supervisor, Prevention Field Services, with WorkSafeBC in Kelowna. “This rewritten Regulation recognizes the important work tow truck operators

carry out as part of emergency scene management. Employers need to inform their workers about the hazards of moving traffic and factors that may put them at risk of injury.” The updates also outline that an employer must develop and implement controls that eliminate or reduce risks for these workers, to the lowest level.

“Whenever traffic control measures are needed — for example, working to take a vehicle out of a ditch — employers should have a safety plan and protocols in place for workers to follow,” says Alcock.

Employers are encouraged to investigate partnering with traffic control companies for flagging and other hazard identification equipment, Alcock adds.

“In many ways, the regulatory amendments are a paradigm shift across the industry, designed to bring into effect risk management-based principles to minimize risks and better protect workers.”

What to know about the changes

The OHS Regulation amendments have established new definitions and requirements for different types

and duration of work: from brief-, long-, and short-duration work to emergency work. For example, towing and recovery operators who present at an emergency scene where traffic control is required are now classified as “emergency responders.”

Other changes include:

- Requirements for written risk assessments and traffic control plans
- New flagging requirements for tows that take longer than 15 minutes
- Using traffic control persons only after other control measures have been deemed insufficient in a given circumstance and only when safe and permissible — roads with speed limits that exceed 70 km/h are prohibited
- Minimizing worker exposure to traffic in work zones — including using constructed detours, alternative routes, or barriers — or through control measures such as temporary traffic control devices or administrative controls
- New requirements for the positioning of traffic control persons, training for all workers involved in controlling traffic, and supervision of traffic control

Online training available for new guidelines

To make it easier for employers and tow truck operators to become familiar with the amendments, the Automotive Retailers Association (ARA) created an Emergency Response Traffic Control for Towing and Recovery Operators online course that breaks down all sections of the new training requirements into several modules.

“First and foremost, it’s about why tow operators need to understand how to set up an effective traffic control zone,” says Ken Hendricks, senior advisor with the ARA. “Next, the course provides essential information about how to properly conduct a risk assessment and what’s involved with that. It explains the essential steps and considerations before a worker begins work — which are extremely important.”

The course provides an overview of the most up-to-date information outlined in the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure’s traffic management manual. This includes tools and resources that explain various aspects of the work zone, principles of traffic

management, how to use a buffer vehicle to protect the workplace, how to conduct a risk assessment, personal protective clothing, and traffic control devices and equipment.

The online training costs \$39 and can be completed anytime in approximately 2 to 2.5 hours, making it an accessible option for tow workers across the province, says Hendricks. “The towing and recovery technical advisory committee and others helped us create the course curriculum.”

The responsibility for conducting practical assessments of tow operators’ ability to apply the knowledge they acquire in the course to real-life situations will rest with employers, he adds.

Making safety the motto

For Nicholas Moretto, general manager at Mario’s Towing Ltd., based in Kelowna, B.C., worker safety is paramount at the family owned and operated business.

Moretto grew up riding alongside his dad to towing jobs. “It was our time together,” recalls the now 39-year-old who has three kids of his own. Safety was the cardinal rule, even at a time when industry standards and regulations were much different than they are today.

Now overseeing more than 100 tow operator employees and an equal number of trucks, Moretto is still focused on safety, providing his staff with the training, equipment, and support they need to stay safe on the job.

It’s first-hand experience for me,” states Moretto. “My dad always said to me, ‘Never ask anybody to do anything you wouldn’t be willing to do’. Take care of your staff; get them home safe.”

Simple steps can save a life

Mario’s Towing Ltd. asks all drivers to do a site assessment to determine if the tow scene is safe and if they need flagging, such as illuminated signage or personnel to direct traffic around a tow site.

The company’s employees are provided personal protective equipment, such as safety vests, steel-toe boots, and gloves, as well as hard hats for when there are overhead hazards. A supervisor and support staff are only a phone call away, as are online training documents through the company’s website.

New hires are partnered with a senior driver for their first week of work before starting with easier tows, such as smaller vehicles and less complex scenarios. They work their way up to situations that require more practical knowledge, such as hauling semi-trucks and working on busier roadways or at challenging crash sites.

About half of the workers at Mario's Towing have completed WreckMaster training for light, medium, and heavy duty tow scenarios.

"Mario's Towing has invested time and money to ensure worker safety comes first," says Moretto. He hopes other employers and contractors will take heed of the new regulations, and make the necessary changes to keep everyone in the industry safe.

"My uncle was hit and killed in Castlegar doing a tow on the side of the road with the beacons on," Moretto shares. "It's important to me that we protect workers and the reputation of our industry."

To take the ARA's new online course, visit ara.bc.ca and select Training, then View courses, and scroll down to select "Emergency Response Traffic Control for Tow and Recovery Operators". ☺



ASSISTING EMPLOYERS WITH WORKERS' COMPENSATION ISSUES

✓ CLAIMS ✓ ASSESSMENTS ✓ OHS

Advice, Assistance, Education and Representation

Our services are independent from WorkSafeBC and **PROVIDED AT NO CHARGE.**



Employers' Advisers Office

Attend our free seminars, speak with an expert at **1 800 925-2233**, or visit gov.bc.ca/employersadvisers



Jeff Russell, occupational safety officer with WorkSafeBC, discusses the importance of driver and vehicle safety with Mario's Towing staff, Nick Moretto, general manager, and Troy Grabowsky, driver, at its Kelowna workyard.

COMPLIANCE CONCERNS?

- Hazardous Materials Inspection
- Risk Assessment Report
- Air Monitoring and Clearance

Hire a qualified professional to keep your project on track.





(604) 553-3370 | info@epochenvironmental.ca



Providing Province-wide Education for Joint Occupational Health & Safety Committees

- OH&S Committee Part 1 & 2 • Investigations
- Improving Committee Effectiveness • Mental Health First Aid
- Bullying & Harassment • Mental Health & The CSA Standard Risk Assessments
- Ergonomics • Violence Prevention • Supervisor OH&S

Public schedule and course descriptions available at:

healthandsafetybc.ca  
In-house and Virtual training option available

\$155 per person
when registering 14 days in advance

Each 8 hr course satisfies Sec. 41 of the Workers Compensation Act
OH&S Committee Part 1 satisfies 3.27 Minimum training requirements for new joint committee members

*funded by WorkSafeBC



Students take to the screen to tackle mental health

By Marnie Douglas

Eric Shuai knew he wanted to pull together a submission as soon as he saw the poster at his Port Moody Secondary School for the WorkSafeBC student safety video contest.

The theme of this year's contest — “My mental health matters” — explores the importance of mental health in maintaining a healthy and safe workplace. It was fitting, as the grade 12 student admits his own mental health was labouring under the pressures of school and work.

“I’m in the International Baccalaureate program at school and I’ve had a lot of work going on, my mental health was not in a great place at times,” Shuai recalls. “So when I saw the contest and the theme, I thought it was still fresh in my mind and it would be good to do a video.”

Shuai has a talent for video production and has put together many over the past several years. His abilities were clearly evident to the judges, as his video “Are you ok?” was one of four winners taking home a \$2,500 prize, which includes \$1,500 for his school. The annual contest, sponsored by Seaspam, London Drugs, and ActSafe, awards a total of \$10,000 in cash prizes

to four winners in grades 8 to 12. The contest gives students the chance to make a high-quality video from start to finish, including writing, storyboarding, filming, and editing.

Other winners were from Richmond Secondary, Riverside Secondary in Port Coquitlam, and Powell River Digital Film School.

In addition to being one of the top WorkSafeBC awards, Shuai's video received additional prize money for being a regional qualifier in the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (CCOHS) Focus on Safety Youth Contest, and took third place in the national CCOHS contest, competing against entries from across Canada.

“I’m not at all surprised that Eric won,” says Giovanni Valente, Port Moody Secondary teacher who sponsored Eric's submission. “He’s a fantastic student who takes initiative including helping other students with tech support. He is truly deserving of this award.”

Even with his obvious skills, Shuai admits the video was a challenge to create. He'd never done animation before plus he shorted himself in production time. “It was down to the wire for sure,” he adds.

Spotlight on mental health

Entries were judged on the impact of their health and safety message, original creative concept, the accessibility of the safety message, and technical execution. The contest is in its 17th year, and each year speaks to a different theme with a focus on young workers.

Robin Schooley, occupational health and safety consultant with WorkSafeBC who has been involved in the contest for 14 years, says this year's theme around mental health seemed a natural fit considering the last two years of COVID-19 pandemic.

"The pandemic has likely affected everyone's mental health to a certain degree, but young people have really struggled and it's affected them in many different ways," she says.

Valente agrees the topic this year was well-timed and an important one.

"Mental health is often an area that people, and especially kids, don't want to talk about. But it's becoming a subject that is more in the forefront, and the contest really helps keep it in the spotlight," he adds.

Compelling entries

This year's entries topped 72 — the second highest number of submissions in the history of the contest. Schooley says the contest was promoted to nearly 600 schools province-wide. She's continually amazed with both the students' technological skills and their creative interpretations of the theme each year. "Technology has changed significantly since the contest started, submissions were mailed to us on VHS tapes. Now students post their video to YouTube and send us the link."

Schooley described this year's submissions as "compelling, powerful, funny, and thought-provoking." She noted that Shuai's video was very well-received by the judges and one of the most interesting ways to tell a story that she's seen.

Schooley adds that, every year, she's honoured and excited to be a part of the contest.

"I love seeing kids so engaged in safety. It's far more effective when peers are sharing messages and content than when adults are pushing it out. They seem to be more engaged and take the messaging to heart."

Shuai will be attending the University of British Columbia in Vancouver in the fall to study science and eventually computer science, and plans to save most of his winnings as he heads to university. "I did take my family out for a nice dinner, though, to celebrate," he laughs.

More information

The videos are available on YouTube, and can be found at [worksafebc.com](https://www.worksafebc.com), by searching for the words "student safety video contest." The theme for the 18th WorkSafeBC Student Safety Video Contest will be announced in the fall. ☺



TSS Total Safety Services Inc.®

- Industrial Hygiene Services
- Hazardous Materials Surveys & Management
- Asbestos Laboratory Services

Contact Info:

O: 604.292.4700

#112-4595 Canada Way
Burnaby, BC V5G 1J9

Web:

[pacificchh.totalsafety.com](https://www.pacificchh.totalsafety.com)

Did you know?

WorkSafeBC offers crisis support to injured workers in emotional crisis 24-hours a day, 7 days a week. If you need help, call the Crisis Support Line at 1.800.624.2928.

WORK SAFE BC

Safety on the agenda

Looking for health and safety inspiration? Check out these conferences and events happening online and in North America in 2022.

ICHSRW 2022

International Conference on
Health and Safety Regulations in Workplace Environment
World Academy of Science, Engineering, and Technology
August 08–09, 2022 | In-person
Vancouver, B.C.
waset.org

BC Road Builders and Heavy Construction Association

2022 Fall Conference
September 18–20, 2022 | In-person
Kelowna, B.C.
roadbuilders.bc.ca

ICWHS 2022

International Conference on Workplace Health and Safety
World Academy of Science, Engineering, and Technology
September 20–21, 2022 | In-person
Toronto, Ontario
waset.org

Pacific Safety Center

BC Safety Committee Conference
September 27, 2022 | In-person
Langley, B.C.
pacificsafetycenter.com

BC Municipal Safety Association

Joint Annual Conference and Trade Show
October 4 and 5, 2022 | In-person and online
bcmsa.ca

SafeCare BC

Hearts & Hands Conference
Langley – Oct 26 | Kelowna – Oct 28 | Victoria – Nov 1 |
In-person
safecarebc.ca 📍

Please note: Information and links that appear in this section are provided as a resource. Listings do not necessarily constitute an endorsement from WorkSafeBC.



The BC Construction Safety Alliance is a not-for-profit association that provides services to over 52,000 construction companies employing over 220,000 workers.

Contact us today!

Email: info@bccsa.ca

www.bccsa.ca



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

The penalty amount is based on the nature of the violation, the employer’s compliance history, and the employer’s assessable payroll. Once a penalty is imposed, the employer has 45 days to appeal to the Review Division of WorkSafeBC. The Review Division may maintain, reduce, or withdraw the penalty; it may increase the penalty as well. Employers may then file an appeal within 30 days of the Review Division’s decision to the Workers’ Compensation Appeal Tribunal, an independent appeal body.

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

For more up-to-date penalty information, you can search our penalties database on our website at [worksafebc.com](https://www.worksafebc.com). Find it easily by entering the word “penalties” into our search bar.

Construction

1076451 B.C. Ltd. | \$5,000 | Surrey | March 10, 2022

This firm was conducting renovation work at a pre-1990 house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed that potential asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) had been disturbed. No hazardous materials survey had been conducted, and a stop-work order was issued. A hazardous materials inspection completed by another firm confirmed the presence of ACMs. During two follow-up inspections, WorkSafeBC observed that additional renovation work had taken place in violation of the stop-work order. The firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order, a high-risk violation.

1230635 B.C. Ltd. / Elemental Asbestos and Mold Removal | \$18,620.52 | Langford | April 7, 2022

This firm was conducting asbestos abatement at a house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and determined that no hazardous materials survey was available on site as required, and the firm’s work procedures were insufficient for the level of asbestos risk present in the building. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. The firm failed to provide workers with task-specific work direction that addressed the hazards and controls for handling asbestos. The firm also failed to ensure a written report identifying the location and nature of all hazardous materials was available at the workplace before work began. In addition, the firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were all repeated violations.

1238437 B.C. Ltd. / Green Clover Asbestos | \$80,000 | Richmond | April 28, 2022

This firm had conducted abatement at a house slated for demolition and issued a clearance letter indicating all asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) had been contained or removed. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed dust and debris from drywall, a confirmed ACM, present throughout the building. Vinyl sheet flooring and duct tape, both confirmed ACMs, were also still present, and ACM waste was improperly bagged and labelled. The firm failed to have a qualified person ensure and confirm in writing that all hazardous materials had been safely contained or removed. The firm also failed to take the necessary precautions to protect workers before allowing work that would disturb ACMs, and failed to prevent the spread of asbestos dust and debris into other areas. These were all repeated and high-risk violations.

1257078 B.C. Ltd. / Dan City Framing | \$2,947.81 | Coquitlam | March 24, 2022

WorkSafeBC attended this firm’s residential construction worksite in response to an incident. While conducting framing from an elevated work area, one of the firm’s workers fell about 4.2 m (13.75 ft.) to the ground, sustaining injuries. WorkSafeBC determined that no fall protection had been in use at the time of the incident. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

1260412 B.C. Ltd. | \$2,500 | Abbotsford | April 5, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's construction worksite and observed a worker standing on the top plate of a second-storey exterior wall. No fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk of about 7.3 m (24 ft.). A second worker, a representative of the firm, was observed without fall protection at a fall risk of greater than 3 m (10 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

1322014 B.C. Ltd. | \$2,500 | Burnaby | March 15, 2022

This firm was working on the construction of a house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed four workers, one of whom was a representative of the firm, installing sheathing on the 4:12 sloped roof. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk greater than 6.1 m (20 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Aerial Roofing Ltd. | \$8,298.54 | Victoria | May 17, 2022

This firm was roofing a two-storey house. WorkSafeBC observed two workers on the 6:12 sloped roof. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of about 4.6 m (15 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Alexandre Dube / Shingle Master | \$2,500 | Castlegar | May 11, 2022

This firm was working on the construction of a two-storey house. WorkSafeBC observed two workers installing shingles on the 5:12 sloped roof. No compliant form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk greater than 5.2 m (17 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation.

All Seasons Roofing (2001) Ltd. | \$2,500 | Burnaby | April 5, 2022

This firm was roofing a new house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed one worker on the 4:12 sloped roof. No fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk greater than 7.6 m (25 ft.). WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation.

Amar Exteriors Ltd. | \$2,250 | Maple Ridge | February 17, 2022

This firm was installing exterior materials at a three-storey townhouse construction site. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed a worker on an elevating work platform without an effective fall arrest system. The firm failed to ensure that a worker on an elevating work platform wore a personal fall arrest system secured to a suitable anchorage point. This was a repeated violation.

A.M.J. & Sons Holding and Construction Ltd. | \$1,250 | Port Moody | May 17, 2022

This firm was working on the construction of a new house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed a pit that had been dug for a pool. No guardrails or barriers were in place to prevent workers accessing the work area adjacent to the pit. The firm failed to ensure that a pit or opening accessible to workers was securely covered, and failed to ensure work areas with a fall risk had guardrails. These were both repeated violations.

Artisan Roofing Ltd. | \$6,602.37 | West Kelowna | May 11, 2022

This firm's worksite was a house under construction. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed a worker on the roof. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk greater than 4.6 m (15 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Ballagan Construction & Framing Ltd. | \$10,000 | Vancouver | May 31, 2022

This firm was framing a new two-storey house. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed two workers, one of whom was a representative of the firm, standing on top of the second-floor exterior walls. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of up to 7.3 m (24 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information,

**Quality software
and exceptional
support can
transform your
business.**

**We'll show
you how.**



LEARN MORE TODAY
GetDATS.com

instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both repeated violations.

BC Safe Enviro Demolition Ltd. / Got Asbestos? | \$2,500 | Burnaby | April 26, 2022

This firm was conducting asbestos abatement at a house slated for demolition. WorkSafeBC inspected the site while work was underway and observed the shower used for decontamination was not operational. WorkSafeBC also determined workers inside the containment were wearing their street clothes under their protective suits. The firm failed to ensure all necessary precautions had been taken to protect workers before disturbing asbestos-containing material (ACM), a repeated violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both high-risk violations.

Being Human Framing Ltd. | \$5,000 | Surrey | April 26, 2022

This firm was framing a two-storey house. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed two workers at the leading edge of the second floor. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of about 6.1 m (20 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Big Guns Roofing Ltd. | \$5,884.49 | Chilliwack | April 12, 2022

This firm was roofing a new three-storey apartment building. WorkSafeBC observed one worker on a 5:12 sloped section of the roof. The worker was wearing a fall protection harness but was not connected to a lifeline. No other form of fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk of about 10.4 m (34 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Canadian Quality Stucco Ltd. | \$7,500 | Coquitlam | May 17, 2022

This firm was installing stucco at a new three-storey house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed workers on an unguarded balcony, setting up a wood-frame scaffold. Two of the workers, one of whom was a representative of the firm, then started work from the platform. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to fall risks of up to

6.1 m (20 ft.). WorkSafeBC issued a stop-use order for the platform until guardrails could be installed. WorkSafeBC later determined that the firm had conducted further work from the platform in violation of the stop-use order. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, and failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order, both repeated violations. The firm also failed to ensure work platforms were designed and installed according to applicable standards, and failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were all high-risk violations.

Chilliwack Roofing Ltd. | \$18,999.42 | Chilliwack | March 8, 2022

This firm was re-roofing a house. WorkSafeBC observed two workers at the leading edge of the sloped roof, throwing roof materials into a bin. The workers were wearing fall protection harnesses but were not connected to lifelines. No other form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk greater than 6.7 m (22 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both repeated violations.

Coast Roofing Ltd. | \$4,424.52 | Duncan | May 31, 2022

This firm was roofing a two-storey house under construction. WorkSafeBC inspected the site in response to an incident where a worker fell from the 8:12 sloped roof. No form of fall protection had been in place and the worker fell about 6.1 m (20 ft.), sustaining serious injuries. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was in place, and failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both high-risk violations.

Coastal Demolition Ltd. | \$2,500 | Coquitlam | March 22, 2022

This firm was conducting asbestos abatement at a pre-1990 house slated for demolition. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed multiple deficiencies with the firm's practices for safely handling asbestos-containing materials (ACMs). The firm failed to ensure that workers required to wear respirators were clean-shaven to create an effective seal with the face, a repeated violation, and failed to ensure that workers

We help companies streamline management processes, create efficiencies, improve morale, and increase productivity.

Hundreds of organizations rely on DATS, and our network of Coaches and Customer WOW Specialists, to help manage health, safety, quality, environmental, and HR management systems.



Aviation

Forestry

Mining

Oil & Gas

Transportation

Manufacturing

Health Care

Municipalities



Life is too short to use bad software.

EXPERIENCE THE DIFFERENCE

GetDATS.com



Penalties (continued)

wore respirators adequate for the anticipated level of exposure. The firm also failed to ensure its containment was adequately ventilated to maintain an inward airflow, and failed to ensure windows and other openings were secured to prevent the release of asbestos fibres into other work areas. In addition, the firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were all high-risk violations.

Croydon Holdings Ltd. | \$2,500 | Squamish | May 12, 2022

This firm was the prime contractor of a multi-building residential construction site. Over several inspections, WorkSafeBC observed multiple safety deficiencies relating to workplace inspections, guardrails, ladders, fall protection, and striking a gas line. As prime contractor of a multiple-employer workplace, the firm failed to establish and maintain a system or process to ensure compliance with the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Dalcon Construction (2001) Ltd. | \$28,148.12 | Victoria | April 28, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's construction worksite and observed a worker at the leading edge of a second-storey deck. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk of about 5.2 m (17 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Diesel Environmental Services Ltd. | \$1,250 | Richmond | May 3, 2022

This firm conducted asbestos abatement at a house and issued a clearance letter indicating all asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) had been removed. WorkSafeBC inspected the site as it was being demolished and observed identified ACMs still in the house, including vinyl sheet flooring, duct tape, and floor mastic. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. The firm failed to safely contain or remove all hazardous materials, and failed to ensure a qualified person confirmed hazardous materials were safely contained or removed.

Dogtooth Log and Timber Ltd. | \$15,353.66 | Golden | March 31, 2022

This firm was framing a new two-storey house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed two workers installing roof trusses. One worker was standing on the top step of a ladder, adjacent to the outside exterior wall. The second worker was on the top work platform of a steel scaffold. No fall protection system was in place, exposing the workers to fall risks greater than 4.6 m (15 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Dwight Gordon Fengstad / Roof Guys | \$2,500 | Sidney | March 10, 2022

This firm was re-roofing a building. WorkSafeBC observed two workers near the edge of the sloped roof, installing roofing materials. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk greater than 6.1 m (20 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Elite Island Ventures Inc. / Elite Island Roofing | \$5,000 | Nanaimo | May 17, 2022

WorkSafeBC observed one of this firm's workers unloading roofing materials on the sloped roof of a house under construction. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk of about 5.2 m (17 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

ENK Construction Corp. | \$5,000 | Burnaby | April 28, 2022

This firm had conducted asbestos abatement at a pre-1990 house slated for demolition and issued a clearance letter indicating all asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) had been removed. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed vermiculite, an identified ACM, still present in the building. In addition, a worker was observed inside the building without respiratory protection or protective clothing. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. The firm failed to safely contain or remove hazardous materials, and failed to ensure a qualified person confirmed that hazardous materials had been safely contained or removed. The firm also failed to take the necessary precautions to protect workers before allowing work to begin. These were all repeated and high-risk violations.

Focus Remediation Ltd. | \$2,500 | Burnaby | March 10, 2022

This firm was conducting pre-renovation asbestos abatement at a house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and determined that inward airflow into the containment had not been established and there was no evidence that airflow tests had been performed. WorkSafeBC also observed deficiencies with some of the workers' respirators. The firm failed to ensure that the containment was ventilated to ensure inward airflow, a repeated violation. The firm also failed to ensure that personal protective equipment was available, worn properly, and inspected and maintained. These were both high-risk violations.

Forestech Industries Ltd. | \$2,500 | Egmont | April 28, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's worksite in response to an incident that resulted in a worker sustaining fatal injuries. WorkSafeBC issued orders related to requirements for supervision, inspection, and pre-work safety planning. A stop-work order for hand-falling activities was also issued until compliance could be achieved. During a follow-up inspection, WorkSafeBC determined that a process for effectively supervising fallers had not been implemented, and additional hand-falling work had taken place in violation of the stop-work order. The firm failed to comply with the OHS Regulation and with WorkSafeBC orders.

Friendly Construction Ltd. | \$8,483 | Maple Ridge | May 11, 2022

This firm was working on the construction of a townhouse development. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed multiple health and safety deficiencies. The firm failed to ensure work platforms were designed and installed according to applicable standards. The firm also failed to provide first aid services adequate for the workplace. In addition, the firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety, and failed to ensure new and young workers received training and orientation specific to the worksite. These were all repeated violations. Furthermore, the firm failed to ensure that a stairway was provided to each floor level before beginning construction of the next level.

Friends Roofing Ltd. | \$10,000 | Abbotsford | May 3, 2022

This firm's worksite was a two-storey house under construction. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed five workers on the sloped roof. The workers were wearing fall protection harnesses but were not connected to lifelines. No other form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to fall risks of up to 9.1 m (30 ft.). WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation, and failed to ensure a written fall protection plan was in place. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were all repeated violations.

Friends Roofing Ltd. | \$10,000 | Kelowna | May 12, 2022

This firm was installing torch-on roofing to a new two-storey house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed a worker at the edge of a section of roof. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk greater than 4.6 m (15 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

FRS Framing Ltd. | \$2,500 | Kelowna | April 12, 2022

This firm was framing a house. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed a worker, who was also a representative of the firm, standing on a top plate, installing trusses. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk greater than 3.7 m (12 ft.). WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Ghilarducci Construction Co. Ltd. | \$2,500 | Burnaby | March 22, 2022

This firm was demolishing a pre-1990 house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and issued a stop-work order after determining that no hazardous materials survey had been conducted. A survey conducted later confirmed the presence of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs), including vinyl flooring and exterior stucco. The firm failed to inspect the building to identify hazardous materials before beginning demolition work, a high-risk violation.

Penalties (continued)

G & M Royal Construction Ltd. | \$2,500 | Surrey | April 19, 2022

This firm was working on a new house construction. WorkSafeBC observed three workers, one of whom was a representative of the firm, conducting framing activities on the roof. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of up to 6.9 m (22.5 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, and failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both repeated and high-risk violations.

Grether Contracting Corporation | \$2,500 | Sun Peaks | April 26, 2022

WorkSafeBC observed one of this firm's workers, who was also a representative of the firm, chipping ice and snow off the roof of a three-storey commercial building. The worker was wearing a fall protection harness but was not connected to a lifeline. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used for work at heights 3 m (10 ft.) or greater, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Greyledge Custom Homes Inc. | \$2,500 | Naramata | April 26, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's construction worksite and observed two workers on a job-built scaffold. No guardrails were installed on the scaffold and no other form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of about 4 m (13 ft.). Another worker was observed on an elevating boom lift without a fall arrest system. WorkSafeBC also issued a stop-use order for the boom lift after determining that it had not been inspected and certified annually as required. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, and failed to ensure a person on an elevating work platform wore a personal fall arrest system secured to a suitable anchorage point. The firm also failed to ensure the health and safety of all workers at its worksite. These were all repeated and high-risk violations.

Icon Concrete and Placing Ltd. | \$5,000 | Mission | May 17, 2022

This firm was pouring concrete at a residential construction site. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite while work was underway and observed that no work platforms had been built for concrete placing activities. The firm failed to ensure work platforms were provided for and used by workers for activities requiring positioning at elevations. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

Ifat Hamid / IS Environmental | \$5,000 | North Vancouver | April 5, 2022

This firm was conducting asbestos abatement and removal of non-asbestos finishes at a house slated for demolition. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and determined that the containment had been removed and demolition work had begun while asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) were still present in the building. In addition, the electricity to the building had not been disconnected during abatement work. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. During follow-up communications, WorkSafeBC determined that the firm had provided false information about its abatement and testing procedures. The firm failed to effectively isolate and control energy sources, a repeated violation. The firm also failed to safely contain or remove all hazardous materials, and failed to have a qualified person ensure and confirm in writing that hazardous materials had been safely contained or removed. These were all high-risk violations. In addition, the firm provided a WorkSafeBC officer with false information.

Ifat Hamid / IS Environmental | \$5,000 | Burnaby | May 12, 2022

This firm was conducting pre-demolition asbestos abatement at a house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site while abatement work was underway and observed that the soffit vents were not sealed. The firm failed to ensure that, prior to starting work with asbestos-containing material (ACM), all openings were adequately sealed to prevent the release of asbestos fibres into other work areas. This was a repeated and high-risk violation.

IM Concrete Finishing Services Ltd. | \$1,250 | Chilliwack | April 28, 2022

This firm was conducting concrete finishing activities at a commercial construction site. WorkSafeBC observed one worker operating a brush hammer. The worker was wearing a half-face respirator but was not clean-shaven as required for the respirator to effectively seal with the face. The firm failed to ensure workers required to wear respirators were clean-shaven, a repeated violation.

Jagpal Development Ltd. | \$1,250 | Port Coquitlam | April 14, 2022

This firm was working on the construction of a six-storey apartment building. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed multiple safety deficiencies, including upper levels that lacked stairway access, and elevator, stair, window, and door openings that lacked guardrails. The firm failed to ensure it provided stairways to each floor level before undertaking construction of the next level, and failed to ensure elevated work areas had guards or guardrails. The firm also failed to conduct regular inspections of its workplace to prevent the development of unsafe working conditions. These were all repeated violations.

Madge Custom Roofing Ltd. | \$12,515.34 | Summerland | May 11, 2022

This firm's worksite was a two-storey house under construction. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed a worker on the sloped roof who was wearing a fall protection harness but was not connected to a lifeline. No other form of fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk greater than 7.3 m (24 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Malaspina Contracting Ltd. | \$8,804.02 | Powell River | April 26, 2022

This firm was renovating a pre-1990 commercial building. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed debris from drywall, a suspected asbestos-containing material (ACM), on the ground. WorkSafeBC determined no hazardous materials inspection had been conducted, and a subsequent assessment confirmed the drywall debris as ACM. The firm failed to ensure that, before work began, a qualified person inspected the building to identify hazardous materials. This was a high-risk violation.

Manvir S. Lally / Lally Roofing Co. | \$2,500 | Mission | April 19, 2022

WorkSafeBC attended this firm's worksite in response to an incident. One of the firm's workers was installing membrane on the 6:12 sloped roof of a commercial building. The worker fell about 9.1 m (30 ft.), sustaining fatal injuries. WorkSafeBC determined that no fall protection had been in place. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

MK Roofing Ltd. | \$2,500 | Vancouver | March 1, 2022

This firm was roofing a two-storey house under construction. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed a worker on the 4:12 sloped roof wearing a fall protection harness, but not connected to a lifeline. The worker, who was in the direct view of a representative of the firm, was exposed to a fall risk of up to 7.6 m (25 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both repeated violations.

Moga Construction Ltd. | \$5,037.52 | Burnaby | March 10, 2022

This firm's worksite was a two-storey house under construction. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed three workers installing roof sheathing. No effective fall protection system was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of about 7.3 m (24 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Mondiale Development Ltd. | \$21,198.98 | West Vancouver | May 26, 2022

This firm was the prime contractor at a house construction site. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and issued a stop-work order after observing multiple health and safety violations. The firm failed to ensure elevated work areas had guardrails that met acceptable criteria, and failed to ensure stairways had acceptable handrails. The firm also failed to ensure scaffolds were assembled and used according to the manufacturer's instructions. These were all high-risk violations. The firm also failed to maintain adequate first aid services and up-to-date first aid procedures, both repeated violations. In addition, the firm failed to conduct regular inspections of its workplace, failed to identify all confined spaces, and failed to ensure its work area was arranged to allow safe movement, a site drawing was available showing emergency procedures, protruding objects were removed or guarded, and buildings and structures were capable of withstanding stresses. The firm failed to provide new or young worker training and

Penalties (continued)

orientation, to develop and implement a procedure for checking the well-being of workers assigned to work alone, and to have written rescue and evacuation procedures for work over water. Furthermore, as prime contractor, the firm failed to ensure a system of regulatory compliance, a repeated violation, and failed to ensure WorkSafeBC received a written notice of project (NOP) at least 24 hours before construction work began.

Mondiale Development Ltd. | \$10,599.49 | West Vancouver | May 26, 2022

This firm was the prime contractor at a house construction site. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and issued a stop-work order after observing multiple health and safety deficiencies. During a follow-up inspection, WorkSafeBC observed work being conducted in violation of the stop-work order. The firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order.

Mrozinski Construction Ltd. | \$2,604.34 | Esquimalt | March 15, 2022

This firm's worksite was a two-storey house under construction. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed three workers, one of whom was a representative of the firm, at the leading edge of the second floor. No fall protection system was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of about 4.1 m (13.5 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Palmieri Bros. Paving Ltd. | \$13,544.87 | Surrey | May 11, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected a multi-unit commercial building where this firm was replacing a leaking water main valve. One worker was observed conducting work inside a confined space. WorkSafeBC determined there were multiple deficiencies with the firm's work procedures for confined space entry. During the inspection, a representative of the firm was un-cooperative and verbally abusive to the WorkSafeBC officers. The firm failed to prepare and implement a written confined space entry program before allowing workers to enter a confined space. The firm also failed to conduct a hazard assessment and develop written procedures to eliminate or minimize those hazards, failed to assign a supervisor for confined space work, and failed to conduct pre-entry testing and inspection. In addition, the firm failed to ensure a confined space was ventilated continuously, and failed to assign trained rescue personnel. Furthermore, the firm failed to co-operate with WorkSafeBC officers. These were all high-risk violations.

Pine Wood Constructions Ltd. | \$2,500 | North Vancouver | May 26, 2022

This firm was installing siding at a duplex under construction. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed two workers on sloped sections of the roof, setting up a ladder-jack system. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to fall risks of up to 6.1 m (20 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, and failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both repeated and high-risk violations.

Precision Asbestos Services Ltd. | \$2,500 | Langley | March 15, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's laboratory facility and identified issues related to its analysis of asbestos and other fibres using phase-contrast microscopy (PCM). An order was issued for the firm to stop all analysis work using this method until the firm could demonstrate it had addressed the issues. During follow-up communications, WorkSafeBC determined that the firm had continued to conduct analyses in violation of the stop-work order. The firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order.

Premier Craft Homes Ltd. | \$5,279.42 | Kelowna | February 15, 2022

This firm had installed concrete formwork for the foundation of a new house, as well as a scaffold to facilitate the concrete placement. A worker from another firm was seriously injured during the concrete placement process when the scaffolding failed. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed that the scaffold and formwork had been installed in an unsupported excavation with near-vertical cut sides and a depth of about 2.7 m (9 ft.). The excavation work had not been done in accordance with the written instructions of a qualified professional. The firm failed to ensure that, prior to worker entry, excavations were sloped, benched, shored, or otherwise supported as required.

This was a high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety, a repeated violation.

Proline Roofing Ltd. / Proline Gutters | \$14,129.23 | Victoria | April 26, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's worksite and observed two workers installing plywood sheeting on the 9:12 sloped roof of a house. No compliant fall protection system was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of up to 12.2 m (40 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation, and failed to have a written fall protection plan in place. These were both repeated violations.

Rai Star Custom Homes Ltd. | \$2,781.17 | Burnaby | March 15, 2022

This firm's worksite was a house under construction. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed three workers standing on plywood sheeting adjacent to unguarded floor openings. No fall protection was in place, exposing workers to a fall risk greater than 3.2 m (10.5 ft.). In addition, no stairway had been constructed for worker access to the basement level. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated violation, and failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both high-risk violations. The firm also failed to ensure that a stairway was provided to each floor before construction of the next floor was undertaken.

Rebo Beton Pumping Ltd. | \$14,868.51 | Kelowna | March 10, 2022

This firm was supplying concrete pumping services for the construction of a house. One of the firm's workers accessed a wood frame scaffold inside an excavation to place the concrete with a concrete line hose. The scaffold failed and the worker fell into the excavation, sustaining serious injuries. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and determined that the scaffold lacked guardrails and had not been erected according to applicable standards, and the excavation work had not been done in accordance with the written instructions of a qualified professional. In addition, the firm had not conducted a hazard assessment related to the scaffold or the excavation that had been put in place by another firm. This firm failed to ensure that, before worker entry, an excavation was benched, shored, or otherwise supported as required. The firm also failed to ensure that scaffolds used by workers were safe and able to withstand the load, regardless of who erected the scaffold. These were both high-risk violations.

Reem Roofing Ltd. | \$2,500 | Surrey | May 26, 2022

This firm was re-roofing several two-storey townhouses. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed four workers, one of whom was a representative of the firm, on a 6:12 sloped roof. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk greater than 4.9 m (16 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

R & M Gill Enterprise Ltd. | \$5,000 | Squamish | April 12, 2022

This firm was roofing a new three-storey house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed two workers on the 4:12 sloped roof. No compliant form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of about 9.1 m (30 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation, and failed to have a written fall protection plan in place. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were all repeated violations.

Scott Asbestos and Hazardous Material Removal Ltd. | \$10,643.98 | Maple Ridge | May 3, 2022

This firm was conducting pre-renovation asbestos abatement at a house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site while work was underway and observed multiple health and safety deficiencies related to containment, personal protective equipment, and decontamination. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. The firm failed to ensure that, before starting work that would disturb asbestos-containing material (ACM), the necessary precautions had been taken to protect workers. The firm also failed to ensure all openings were adequately secured, to ventilate a containment to ensure inward airflow, to prevent the spread of asbestos dust and debris to other work areas, and to isolate and

Penalties (continued)

effectively control energy sources. Furthermore, the firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were all repeated and high-risk violations.

Singh Masonry Ltd. | \$4,505.43 | Burnaby | May 24, 2022

This firm was working on the construction of a mixed-use building. WorkSafeBC observed one worker standing on the work platform of a manufactured scaffold system. No guardrails were installed and no other form of fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk of about 6.1 m (20 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Talofa Removals & Demolition Limited | \$5,000 | White Rock | March 10, 2022

This firm was conducting pre-demolition asbestos abatement at a building. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed multiple deficiencies with the firm's procedures for handling asbestos-containing materials (ACMs), including a lack of inward air flow into the containment. WorkSafeBC also observed workers entering the containment without protective clothing or equipment, and exiting the containment without decontaminating. A stop-work order was issued. The firm failed to take the necessary precautions to protect workers before allowing work that would disturb ACMs. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both repeated and high-risk violations.

Toor Framing Ltd. | \$5,000 | Vancouver | March 31, 2022

This firm was working on the construction of a two-storey house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed one of the firm's workers standing on a board spanning roof trusses. No fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk of about 9.3 m (30.5 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Trevor Brown & Carol Brown / R Brown & Sons Roofing | \$2,500 | Chilliwack | April 26, 2022

This firm was roofing a new two-storey house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed one worker on the 5:12 sloped roof. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk greater than 4.3 m (14 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

Triple A Roofing Ltd. | \$7,500 | Surrey | March 21, 2022

This firm was performing construction work at a pre-1990 house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and determined asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) had been disturbed without controls in place to protect workers. In addition, the firm had not conducted a hazardous materials survey before starting work. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. During subsequent inspections, WorkSafeBC observed evidence that work had continued on the site in violation of the stop-work order. The firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order, a high-risk violation.

TVC Contracting Ltd. | \$2,500 | Kelowna | March 10, 2022

This firm was the prime contractor for the construction of a house. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed an excavation with depths up to 4 m (13 ft.). A concrete foundation had been poured in proximity to the excavation's near-vertical sides. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order after determining that the firm had not followed the written instructions of a professional engineer for work in the excavation and the use of temporary shoring. The firm failed to ensure that, before worker entry, its excavation was supported as required by the instructions of a professional engineer. This was a high-risk violation.

West-Struct Contracting Ltd. | \$2,500 | Chilliwack | May 17, 2022

This firm was framing a new two-storey house. WorkSafeBC observed two workers on the 4:12 sloped roof. No form of fall protection was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of up to 7.6 m (25 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation. The firm also failed to ensure elevated work areas had guards or guardrails installed. These were both repeated violations.

Manufacturing

Blue-O Technology Inc. | \$1,463.30 | Burnaby | March 10, 2022

This firm operates a laboratory that conducts chemical reactions, some of which use a rotary evaporator to remove solvents by evaporation. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and issued an order for the firm to provide evidence that the rotary evaporator's ventilation system was designed and operated using established engineering principles to protect workers from exposure to harmful vapours. After multiple follow-up communications, the firm had still not complied with the order. The firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order.

Canadian Forest Products Ltd. / Canfor | \$172,533.94 | Houston | March 15, 2022

This firm operates a sawmill. WorkSafeBC inspected the site in response to an incident. A worker was on an elevated, unguarded work platform, clearing debris in a waste conveyor. The worker fell 3.8 m (12.5 ft.) from the work platform and sustained serious injuries. WorkSafeBC determined that no effective fall protection system had been in place at the time of the incident. The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a high-risk violation.

Parallel Wood Products Ltd. | \$30,171.24 | Williams Lake | April 14, 2022

WorkSafeBC investigated an incident at this firm's wood products manufacturing operation. A worker was seriously injured while attempting to clear a jammed board at the infeed roll section of a planer machine. WorkSafeBC determined it was routine practice at this workplace for workers to stop infeed rolls using control switches on the operator's console, which does not physically disconnect or isolate the energy source for infeed rolls. In addition, there was no written safe work procedure requiring de-energization and lockout of machinery prior to clearing jams. The firm failed to ensure machinery or equipment was shut down for maintenance and no work conducted until the energy isolating devices had been locked out, a high-risk violation. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure the health and safety of their workers. This was a repeated violation.

P.T.I. Punch Tools Inc. | \$20,474.24 | Surrey | May 3, 2022

This firm operates a manufacturing facility. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed several milling machines, drills, lathes, punch presses, and a surface grinder without safeguards. The firm failed to ensure that machinery and equipment was fitted with adequate safeguards to protect workers from contact with hazardous power transmission parts and to ensure workers could not access hazardous points of operation. These were both repeated violations. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were all high-risk violations.

Teck Metals Ltd. | \$55,060.11 | Trail | April 14, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's worksite in response to an incident. Liquid anhydrous ammonia was released when loss of containment occurred from a railcar at an unloading area. The site and adjacent workplaces were evacuated, and several people were exposed to the ammonia vapour. WorkSafeBC determined that the firm had not adequately communicated or trained its workers in safe work procedures for identifying and responding to ammonia leaks. This included a lack of practice drills for all workers involved in ammonia-related work, and a lack of clear procedures and supervision to ensure procedures were being followed. The firm failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. This was a high-risk violation.

Woodco Industries Ltd. | \$14,903.11 | Barriere | May 12, 2022

WorkSafeBC attended this firm's sawmill worksite in response to an incident. A worker had climbed onto a log infeed conveyor to conduct clean-up activities. The conveyor's push bar was activated, and the worker was pinned between the push bar and the edge of the conveyor. WorkSafeBC determined that the machine had not been locked out, and the firm's lockout procedures did not adequately describe the process to de-energize and lockout

Penalties (continued)

equipment before cleanup. The firm failed to ensure its machinery energy source was isolated and controlled, and failed to ensure energy-isolating devices were secured using locks in accordance with procedures made available to all workers. These were both high-risk violations. The firm also failed to provide personal locks to each worker required to lock out, a repeated violation.

Primary Resources

1964 Holdings Ltd. | \$5,885.44 | Lachmac River | May 24, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's forestry operation and issued a stop-work order after observing multiple health and safety deficiencies. The firm failed to ensure its forestry operations were planned and conducted in a manner consistent with acceptable safe work practices, a high-risk violation. The firm also failed to ensure that its mobile equipment had an alternative means of escape that could be opened from both inside and outside, and failed to ensure its equipment was capable of safely performing its function. In addition, the firm failed to provide hearing tests for workers exposed to high levels of noise, and failed to ensure it provided adequate first aid services. These were all repeated violations.

Probyn Log Ltd. | \$20,664.51 | Sproat Lake | May 11, 2022

This firm was the owner of a forestry cutblock. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed that the access road lacked instructional signage with radio call instructions. During a follow-up inspection, WorkSafeBC observed that signs had been placed but contained inconsistent information about the road name and radio frequency. The firm failed to ensure its traffic control system included instructional signs with kilometre and road name or number signs. The firm also failed to ensure its forestry operation planning accurately identified work activities and conditions at the workplace. These were both repeated and high-risk violations.



The Silent Killer

ASBESTOS

Safe, Efficient **ASBESTOS REMOVAL** Solutions

ENVIRO-VAC.com

Phone: [604] 513-1324 TF 1-888-296-2499

Sam Enterprises Ltd. | \$44,608.78 | Abbotsford | March 31, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's house renovation worksite and issued a stop-work order after determining a hazardous material survey had not been completed by a qualified person before work began. During a subsequent inspection, WorkSafeBC observed a worker completing drywall repair work in the house in violation of the stop-work order. In addition, a garbage bin that was part of the stop-work order had been removed from the site. This firm failed to comply with a WorkSafeBC order.

The Blue Goose Cattle Company Ltd. | \$26,813.12 | Ashcroft | May 31, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this employer's ranch and observed a tractor regularly used by workers that did not have a seatbelt. The tractor also had damage to the seat, the shroud attached to the rollover protective structure (ROPS), the access step, and the rear wheel fender. A stop-use order was issued for the tractor. WorkSafeBC also determined pre-shift inspections were not being conducted for the tractor. In addition, a written procedure had not been implemented for workers assigned to work alone and records regarding worker check-ins were not maintained. The employer failed to ensure a ROPS-equipped tractor had lap belts that met standards, a repeated and high-risk violation, and failed to ensure mobile equipment was inspected prior to operation. The employer also failed to develop and implement a written procedure for checking the well-being of workers assigned to work alone, a repeated violation.

Service Sector

1027850 B.C. Ltd. / Sutton-Max Realty & Property Management | \$5,250 | Langley | April 14, 2022

This firm's worksite was a pre-1990 house undergoing restoration work after flooding. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed that flooring and sections of drywall had been removed, both potential asbestos-containing materials (ACMs). WorkSafeBC determined that a hazardous materials survey had not been completed prior to work beginning. A subsequent hazardous material survey identified the linoleum backing of the flooring to be an ACM. The firm failed to ensure that, before work began, a qualified person inspected the building to identify hazardous materials. This was a high-risk violation.

1078444 B.C. Ltd. / Shack Shine Home Services | \$2,500 | Victoria | March 10, 2022

This firm was cleaning the gutters of a three-storey house. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed two workers on the 4:12 sloped roof. No fall protection system was in place, exposing the workers to a fall risk of up to 7.3 m (24 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

ABI Hazmat Corp. | \$2,500 | Kamloops | April 12, 2022

This firm had prepared a hazardous materials inspection report for a house undergoing demolition. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and determined there were deficiencies with the report. The report did not include representative samples of texture coat, a suspected asbestos-containing material (ACM), and contained conflicting information regarding identified ACMs. In addition, the report did not provide approximate quantities for identified lead-containing materials. The firm failed to ensure a qualified person fulfilled the requirements relating to identifying hazardous materials. The firm also failed to ensure the health and safety of all workers present at a workplace. These were both repeated violations.

Acciona Facility Services Canada Limited | \$109,387.37 | Vancouver | May 31, 2022

This firm was providing cleaning services for a poultry processing plant. As a worker was cleaning a machine, the worker became caught in a running auger and sustained serious injuries. WorkSafeBC determined that the machine had not been locked out at the time of the incident, and it was routine practice to run machinery during cleaning and sanitizing. In addition, no written lockout procedures were available. The firm failed to ensure that when lockout was required, energy-isolating devices were secured in the safe position using locks in accordance with procedures made available to all workers required to work on the equipment. This was a high-risk violation.

Penalties (continued)

Adel Kikanovic / Adelco Home Services | \$2,500 | Vancouver | May 31, 2022

This firm was washing the windows of a four-storey building. WorkSafeBC inspected the site in response to an incident where a telescopic brush tool a worker was using contacted an overhead, high-voltage power line and the worker received an electric shock. The firm failed to ensure workers maintained the minimum required distance from electrical equipment and conductors, and failed to ensure it obtained an assurance in writing signed by a representative of the power system owner. These were both high-risk violations.

AM PM Landscaping & Tree Service Ltd. | \$40,000 | Surrey | May 3, 2022

This firm was removing trees from an empty residential property. WorkSafeBC inspected the worksite and observed a worker operating a chainsaw to limb some felled trees. The worker did not have leg protection, eye or face protection, or steel-toed footwear. WorkSafeBC also determined that there was no climbing plan and the worker had not been informed about a dangerous tree on the property, which had been partially cut up. The firm failed to ensure workers were made aware of all known hazards, a high-risk violation. The firm also failed to plan the workplace to protect workers from danger, failed to ensure trees were felled or climbed by a qualified worker, and failed to provide them with adequate information and supervision, all of which were repeated and high-risk violations. Further, the firm failed to ensure workers used leg, face, and eye protection and wore appropriate footwear when operating a chainsaw, and failed to ensure tree climbers used a second means of securement. These were repeated violations.

B C Hydro & Power Authority | \$678,889.56 | Mica Creek | March 10, 2022

A crew of this employer's workers was replacing spacers and insulators on an electrical transmission tower. As one of the workers was removing a ground lead cable from a conductor, the worker sustained an electrical shock and was seriously injured. WorkSafeBC determined the conductor had not been completely isolated before work began. The employer failed to ensure that acceptable written safe work procedures were followed where isolating high-voltage electrical equipment was not practicable. The employer also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both high-risk violations.

D & G Gill Tire and Auto Ltd. | \$2,500 | Kamloops | March 17, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's worksite and issued stop-use orders for two of its lift trucks. During a follow-up inspection, WorkSafeBC observed that the trucks had been moved, the stop-use signage had been removed, and there were no lockout procedures in place to prevent workers from using the trucks. The firm failed to comply with WorkSafeBC orders.

Iron Bay Holdings Ltd. / Shack Shine | \$5,000 | Port Coquitlam | March 22, 2022

WorkSafeBC investigated an incident at this firm's worksite, a multi-unit residential building. As a worker was using a telescoping cleaning pole to clean windows, the pole contacted an overhead high-voltage power line and the worker sustained serious injuries. WorkSafeBC's investigation determined that the worker, who was also a new worker, had not been oriented to the electrical hazards at the worksite, and no control measures had been in place to reduce the risk of work around the power line. In addition, the firm's safe work practices noted the limits of approach in relation to ladder use but not in relation to telescoping cleaning poles. The firm failed to ensure workers were informed of high-voltage electrical hazards, and failed to ensure workers remained a minimum distance from electrical equipment. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety, a repeated violation. These were all high-risk violations. In addition, the firm failed to ensure new workers were provided with a workplace-specific safety orientation before beginning work, also a repeated violation.

Mt. Baldy Resort Inc. | \$7,031.05 | Baldy Mountain | May 17, 2022

WorkSafeBC attended this firm's worksite in response to an incident. Two workers were travelling in a snowcat (grooming machine) to conduct maintenance on another piece of equipment. The machine parked and one of the

workers exited the machine. The machine then inadvertently moved forward and the worker was caught under it, sustaining fatal injuries. WorkSafeBC's investigation determined that the machine's tiller had malfunctioned, preventing the operator from reversing the machine after the injured worker was caught. In addition, neither worker had been adequately trained on this machine, which lacked an interlock mechanism to automatically apply the parking brake when a door of the cab was opened. Furthermore, no hazard identification or risk assessment had been conducted for the planned maintenance activities and no safe work procedures had been developed. The firm failed to ensure the health and safety of all workers at its worksite, and failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both high-risk violations.

School District No. 83 North Okanagan-Shuswap | \$204,814.95 | Salmon Arm | March 22, 2022

This employer was conducting security upgrades at one of its school locations. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and determined that drilling work to install wiring had disturbed drywall and vermiculite, both identified as asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) on the building's hazardous materials survey. The employer failed to ensure hazardous materials were safely contained or removed before beginning renovation work that could disturb those materials. This was a repeated violation.

Skymix Services Ltd. / Shack Shine | \$7,797.20 | Vancouver | March 10, 2022

This firm was performing exterior house cleaning. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and observed one worker at the edge of the 4:12 sloped roof. No fall protection system was in place, exposing the worker to a fall risk of about 6.1 m (20 ft.). The firm failed to ensure fall protection was used, a repeated and high-risk violation.

York Hospitality Ltd. / Ashcroft River Inn | \$5,000 | Ashcroft | April 26, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's hotel worksite and issued health and safety orders, including orders related to requirements for a workplace violence risk assessment, an asbestos inventory, emergency eye washing facilities, and safe work procedures for staff handling hazardous substances. After multiple follow-up inspections and communications, the firm had not complied with these orders. The firm failed to comply with WorkSafeBC orders within a reasonable time, a repeated violation.

Trade

Craig's Bakery Ltd. | \$5,157.03 | Chase | April 26, 2022

This firm operates a bakery and deli in a pre-1990 building. WorkSafeBC inspected the site and issued an order for the firm to have an inventory conducted of asbestos-containing materials (ACMs). After multiple communications, the firm had not complied with the order. The firm failed to ensure a qualified person prepared an inventory of all ACMs and their locations.

Red Coat Hardware Ltd. / Lake Cowichan Home Hardware | \$2,500 | Lake Cowichan | April 26, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's retail facility and observed that renovation work was underway. Debris from drywall, a potential asbestos-containing material (ACM), was visible on shelves and the floor. No containment was in place and no hazardous materials survey was available on site. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-work order. A hazardous materials survey conducted later confirmed that the facility was cross-contaminated with asbestos fibres. The firm failed to ensure all hazardous materials were safely contained or removed, a high-risk violation.

Rona Inc. / Rona Home Centre / Dick's Lumber | \$330,507.98 | Penticton | May 19, 2022

WorkSafeBC inspected this firm's workyard and observed a large storage rack that had visible damage to its vertical members and cross-bracing. In addition, no information was available about the rack's rated capacity or loading and unloading instructions. WorkSafeBC issued a stop-use order for the rack. The firm failed to ensure that worn or damaged storage racks were repaired or replaced. The firm also failed to ensure that the rated capacity was posted

and readily visible to workers, and that instructions for loading, unloading, and maintaining the rack according to the manufacturer were readily available in the workplace. These were all repeated violations.

Transportation & Warehousing

1098369 B.C. Ltd. | \$2,500 | Burnaby | March 3, 2022

WorkSafeBC attended this firm's worksite, an industrial construction site, in response to an incident. As a worker was operating a dump truck at the site, the truck experienced a brake failure while descending a slope. The worker jumped from the truck, sustaining injuries, before the truck crashed into several items and rolled over. WorkSafeBC determined that the worker had heard air leaking and reported it to the employer, but the employer did not then direct the worker to take the truck out of service. A post-incident inspection determined that there was an air leak in one of the brake pots. WorkSafeBC also determined that there was no evidence a pre-shift inspection of the vehicle had been conducted. The firm failed to ensure its equipment was capable of safely performing its functions and was operated in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both high-risk violations.

British Columbia Ferry Services Inc. / BC Ferries | \$674,445.92 | Richmond | May 11, 2022

One of this firm's workers was conducting work on a ferry vessel that was docked at a maintenance facility. The worker leaned onto and over a panel of fabric webbing and was attempting to retrieve an item floating in the water. The fabric webbing panel broke away and the worker fell into the water and drowned. WorkSafeBC investigated the incident and determined that the worker had not been wearing a personal flotation device (PFD), and the fabric webbing panels were insufficient at controlling the hazard of falling into the water below. In addition, no safe work procedures had been developed for the task of retrieving objects fallen into the water. The firm failed to ensure the health and safety of all workers at its worksite. The firm also failed to provide its workers with the information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary to ensure their health and safety. These were both high-risk violations.

Did you know?

Everyone in the workplace has a role in health and safety. Find out more on the “**Roles, rights & responsibilities**” home page on worksafebc.com.

Injunctions

Injunctions are court orders from the Supreme Court of B.C. that require a person or business to comply with the *Workers Compensation Act*, occupational health and safety requirements, or a WorkSafeBC order. Injunctions may also restrain the person or company from carrying on work in their industry for an indefinite or limited period, or until the occurrence of a specified event. Publishing injunctions highlights the importance of making workplaces safe.

WorkSafeBC may pursue an injunction when there are reasonable grounds to believe that a person or company has not complied, or is not likely to comply, with the Act, the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation, or an order. WorkSafeBC may pursue an injunction in addition to other remedies under the Act, such as an administrative penalty.

When a firm or person continues to breach the provisions despite an injunction, WorkSafeBC may seek further orders. The court may issue an order declaring the firm or person in contempt of court; punishment usually consists of a fine, but may involve a custodial sentence. The court may also prohibit the firm or person from continuing to operate in the industry of the injunction order.

The summaries in this section are listed alphabetically by respondent and show high-level details from the court order. To see up-to-date injunctions or to read court orders in their entirety, visit [worksafebc.com/injunctions](https://www.worksafebc.com/injunctions).

G & D Construction Ltd. / Dalwinder Singh Kandola | Judgment imposing fine and sentence: May 18, 2022

On October 20, 2017, the Supreme Court of British Columbia ordered that G & D Construction Ltd., a firm engaged in the framing or residential forming industry in British Columbia, and its principal, Dalwinder Singh Kandola, were restrained from continuing or committing contraventions of the *Workers Compensation Act* or the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation and were required to comply with the Act and the Regulation in future.

On November 19, 2020, the Supreme Court of British Columbia found G & D Construction Ltd. and Dalwinder Singh Kandola in contempt of the injunction order of October 20, 2017 and ordered them to return to court to address the issue of penalty.

On February 25, 2021, the Supreme Court of British Columbia ordered G & D Construction Ltd. and Dalwinder Singh Kandola to each pay a fine of \$4,000 in relation to the contempt.

On May 18, 2022, the Supreme Court of British Columbia held that G & D Construction Ltd. and Dalwinder Singh Kandola were in contempt of the injunction order of October 20, 2017 for the second time and ordered G & D Construction Ltd. to pay a fine of \$25,000 and sentenced Dalwinder Singh Kandola (as principal) to two weeks in custody.

Green Clover Asbestos / Gurkanwar Virk / Gurshawn Virk | Injunction: April 22, 2022

On April 22, 2022, the Supreme Court of British Columbia ordered that 1238437 B.C. Ltd. (doing business as Green Clover Asbestos Services) and its principal, Gurkanwar Virk, and 11582577 Canada Ltd. and its principal, Gurshawn Virk — collectively, the Respondents — engaged in the asbestos abatement industry and the construction industry in British Columbia, are restrained from continuing or committing contraventions of multiple provisions of the *Workers Compensation Act* (R.S.B.C. 2019, c. 1) and the Occupational Health and Safety Regulation (B.C. Reg. 296/97). The Respondents are also required to comply with the same provisions of the Act and Regulation in future.

15th annual

Vancouver Island Safety Conference



Lead the Way

Resiliency, Opportunity, Engagement

Join us to explore how health and safety has evolved in the forestry and wood products manufacturing sectors.

Saturday, October 29, 2022

Vancouver Island Conference Centre, Nanaimo, B.C.

Conference and registration information is available at bcforestsafesafe.org



For more information, contact:
Mike Milholm, 250.751.8067
training@bcforestsafesafe.org



BC Forest Safety
Safety is good business

WORK SAFE BC