

## CRANE CONSULTATION MEETING 2 FEBRUARY 22, 2006

Alley, Doug	BC Business Council
Antonio, Frank	BCRMCA
Block, Jason	CLAC
Bruce, Allan	IUOE International
Carr, Frank	IUOE – Local 115
Clarke, Greg	Western Wood Truss Association
Cocks, Fraser	BCACS - Speaker
Cochrane, Brian	IUOE-Local 115
Elliott, Gordon	IUOE Local 115 – Training Plan
Davidson, Jack	BC Road Builders & Heavy Const. Assoc
Davis, Phil	EITI
Gauthier, Gene	Petroleum Services Assoc. of Canada
Hawk, Darrell	Pile Drivers Local 2404
Hayner, Doug	
Hochstein, Phil	Independent Contractors Assoc
Koloska Markus	Min. of T&H
Lenz, Irv	BCRMCA
Lucus, Al	BC Marine & Pile Driving
MacDonald, Mac	Hunter Industries
MacKay, David	LCS Compliance
Mackenzie, Grant	Pivot Industrial Training
Magee, Robert	Mobile Crane Association
Brent Marchessault	Enform
Randall, Brad	IUOE Local 115 Training Plan
Robertson, Russ	ITA
Stevens, Geoff	ITA
Rollins, Ron	BCIT
Roome, Catherine	BC Safety Authority
Schmidt, Robert	CLAC
Siefert, Stu	Malaspina College
Sinclair, Larry	BC Marine & Pile Driving
Smith, John	Durham College
Torrence, Steve	Road Building Safety Network
Tracy, George	Building Supply Dealers' Association of BC
Tucker, Barbara	BCACS-Recorder
Vetter, Robert	Ives Training Group
<hr/>	
Frank Brookes	WorkSafeBC
Anita Cairney	WorkSafeBC
Sat Combow	WorkSafeBC
Betty-Ann Lee	WorkSafeBC Recorder
George Matheson	WorkSafeBC
Jeryl Merryweather	WorkSafeBC
Don Nelson	WorkSafeBC – Host Speaker
Frank Nielsen	WorkSafeBC
Mike Nielsen	WorkSafeBC
Noreen Nomura	WorkSafeBC
Gerald Schmidt	WorkSafeBC
Kathy Sheppard	WorkSafeBC
Vincent Russell	WorkSafeBC
Bill Webster	WorkSafeBC
Mark Venables	WorkSafeBC

The above referenced crane consultation meeting, hosted by WorkSafeBC, was held on February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2006 at Richmond City Hall.

The meeting opened with an update presentation from Don Nelson, Manager, Construction, Industry & Labour Services, WorkSafeBC. This presentation indicated the purpose of the meeting and included background information on the current Regulation, the 2004 proposed amendment, WCB Board of Directors directive and the 2006 Proposed Regulation applicable to all cranes and the 2006 Proposed Regulation applicable to mobile tower and boom cranes. A history of Crane Operator Qualifications was also included. Don pointed out that WorkSafeBC's mandate is to promote a high standard of safety for crane operators determined by competency evaluation of new and existing operators. It was anticipated that only qualified 3<sup>rd</sup> party assessors as determined by a master assessor will perform assessments. Training for existing operators or new operations may need to be provided by employers through in-house programs or by other program providers. Information regarding "Learners" and "Interim" Certificates was also included in the presentation package.

A presentation was then given by Fraser Cocks, Executive Director, BC Association for Crane Safety (BCACS). The BCACS is developing an infrastructure to support the new requirements, a program for assessing operator competency and a "proof of competency" document and data base. Fraser's presentation included background information and work to date, organizational structure and relationship with other agencies, deliverables/operational objectives and outcomes, consolidated budget and timelines, as well as outstanding issues.

Don's presentations were handed out at the meeting and Fraser's presentation will be E-mailed out to all attendees. Both presentations will be posted on WorkSafeBC.com and BCACS.ca.

A short video was shown providing an example of an existing crane operator practical examination that is current being used in the United States.

After a short break, the group reassembled. Don Nelson introduced Rob Magee, Chair BCACS. Rob indicated that workshops involving many agencies have and are being held. Rob pointed out that everyone is doing something. However, there is the need to ensure that everyone is on the same page, using the same tools and processes, and that 'on the job' training utilizes these processes.

The following is an overview of some of the concerns expressed by those in attendance:

1. **Comment:** It was noted that the terms "Licence" and "Certificate" were used interchangeably throughout the presentations. Is there a consensus on the meanings of both these terms the concern being that there is a legal difference between the two terms that may have other implications? In the new proposed regulation the word certificate is used as to mean "certificate to operate" not "certificate of qualification".

2. **Question:** Would load loggers be included in the 14.34 (1 and 2) requirement? **At this time, it wasn't believed so. However, it could be included.**
3. Concern was expressed regarding the requirement of an operator holding a "learner's certificate" to operate only under the direct supervision of a person holding a valid operator's certificate. There are situations, due to location and/or shortage of crane operations, where there is only one operator in the area.  
**Response:** An interim process may be to plan more time on a simulator. It is not clear how this will shape up. However, requests for input will be sent out in the near future to see how we may address these types of issues.
4. **Question:** Would there be some expectation of a difference being recognized between someone coming new from the field and a boom operator with 20 years experience? **Answer:** There is no plan for a "grandfathering" clause at this time. The competency examination for the one with 20 years' experience should not be a problem for that operator. If exceptions are made, where is the line drawn? As pointed out in the presentation, there are between 4000 – 7000 operators out there with unknown skills and/or various credentials.
5. **Comment:** Following up on the question re the single operator, Jim Gauthier, Enform, mentioned that in the oil and gas industry, due to the shortage of trained operators, a lone operator is permitted allowed to be in contact with a licensed journeyman via cell or satellite. This works well. The operator must have had 1200 hours associated experience.
6. **Question:** Would the competency assessment be an "arms length" process? **Answer:** Yes, an examiner cannot examine anyone he has trained or employed.
7. **Question:** re mobile crane operators with a "Red Seal" Ticket (tower and boom truck), will they be required to write the same test? **Answer:** First reaction is yes. Some of their programs do not address trial lifts. Red Seal ticket could be many years old and it is not known what was included in their training or examination.
8. **Question:** Why is the WCB involving itself in crane operations when it is not involved with other occupations – example electricians? **Answer.** Don indicated that due to the large number of crane incidents and the high level of accidents, the Board must ensure that a credible system is in place.
9. **Concern:** was expressed that the WCB would be too rigid with their assessments. Bridge inspection cranes (limited purpose) were cited as an example of where flexibility by the Board should be used. **Response:** It was indicated that some flexibility may be possible and that undoubtedly there would be many "one-of" situations.
10. **Comment:** A comment was made that there should be more discussion around Licencing. **Response:** There will be a call for interest around this issue. Recommendations would be made and they would look for the best possible solutions.
11. **Question:** Would competency assessments be outcome based? **Response:** Yes – we are not looking at input or training. WCB and BCACS are not concerned with the type of training or the length of training rather how competent is the operator at the time of the exam.

12. **Comment:** Organizations such as TeckComnco already have their own training and assessments systems in place. Why would they be required to take additional training or assessment? **Answer:** No one is saying the operator requires additional training. The problem is that every organization has their own method of assessment and it makes it difficult for operators to move from one employer to another and for officers to determine competency.
13. **Comment:** Not keen on the BC Safety Authority (BCCA) getting involved. **Response:** Catherine Roome (VICE replied that the Safety Authority is involved because they were asked to be involved. She indicated that, although crane safety is not mandated under the Safety Standards Act, their job is public safety and they would like to be able to channel their assistance into the areas of highest risk. They have no enforcement role. Catherine believes that the BCSA can contribute and have the potential to be very good at managing qualifications and training. Rob Magee provided some further clarification.
14. **Comment:** A further comment was made that they would not like to see two regulatory organizations fighting over the crane operator regulation.
15. **Suggestion:** A suggestion was made that perhaps certificates for "single-use" cranes should be used.
16. **Comment:** A decision should be made whether a "Licence" or a "Certificate of Competency" is required.
17. **Comment/Question:** The Safety Network provides certificates for flaggers. Why couldn't they do cranes? **Answer:** It is possible.
18. **Question:** Why not "Licence for life" as electricians have? **Answer:** Current knowledge is a big issue with crane operators. Certificate is intended to be for a period of 3 – 5 years.
19. **Suggestion:** The practical competency assessment should be built in such a way to expose whether an operator is competent to perform a particular task.
20. **Suggestion:** Testing should be patterned after the Drivers' Licence Program.
21. **Question:** Will the certificate be portable and acceptable from site to site? **Answer:** Yes with the exception of limited use.
22. **Question:** Is July 07 the enforcement date or implementation date? **Answer.** Operators must be registered in the system by July 07. There may be some leeway or phased in time.
23. **Question:** Is it expected that "limited use" operators also be registered? **Answer.** Yes.
24. **Comment** re Training Program: Organizations such as TeckCominco or Alcan should be allowed to be part of discussion. **Response:** There is a designate from Alcan. They are not 100% on side but they are part of the discussions.
25. **Comment:** Having trouble telling operators that their training is not acceptable. **Response:** The proposed regulation does not question training. The regulation address the issue of is an operator competent. How current operators will be tested for competency is under discussions. Training of new operators is a smaller part of the discussion. As indicated in the handout, the association board

has representation from various organizations that have a stake in the development of the program, including Union and Non-Union.

26. **Question:** How is training and issuing of certificates being handled? What may have been developed for one organization's needs may not be at the same level. **Answer:** There will be a minimum competency level. There are a multitude of uses – that's the big issue. Not just in construction.- limited use and site specific.
27. **Comment** from Jim Gauthier, Enform: The oil and gas industry went through similar issues and concerns for about 5 years before everyone bought in. Now it is customer driven and issues have significantly dropped.
28. **Concern** re "limited use". Testing should be one-off, specific to job and it is felt that the WCB don't have the time or the manpower to implement by July 2007. **Response:** May need some extension but we plan to be ready for July 07. Past experience indicates that no matter how long a timeframe, people tend to leave it to the last minute to participate.
29. **Comment:** Lifting man basket requires highest standard.
30. **Question.** Any idea when the testing criteria will be ready to go? **Response:** Fraser indicated that it is his personal goal to have it in place by the end of this year. Rollout strategy is still to be discussed.
31. **Comment** by Rob Magee: There is no way we can afford the system to come to a grinding halt. The Province cannot afford it. There is a lot to discuss, including how to disseminate the existing workforce into the system. Rob re-iterated that the organizations using the crane operators are involved in the discussion. They are the ones making the decisions.
32. **Comment** from WCB officer. While it is recognized that the goal is not to make an officers' job easier, it is difficult for them to do a knowledge assessment. A certificate would eliminate a competency assessment. They would know that they met the minimum standard.
33. **Question:** Is the Board developing Competency and Best Practices for Crane Operators? **Response:** The association is undertaking this task.
34. **Comment:** The WCB will be developing a set of guidelines on the 3 types of cranes. Draft guidelines will be posted on the crane website and comments and feedback are encouraged and welcomed.
35. **Suggestion:** That the Board have more answers available before the public meetings to be held in April/May.
36. **Question:** Is there a consensus on the minimum standard of training for new operators? **Response:** External Agency will identify. Employers will be responsible to measure and make a judgment call as to whether the operator is competent. Should be a win/win for both. Employers will also be responsible to ensure that the employee is qualified for a specific task. The proposed regulation does not talk about training: it only require a demonstration of competency.

Attendees were encouraged to check the crane website for updates. If anyone has a question that was not covered in the meeting today, business cards containing email

addresses for Fraser, Don and Betty-Ann are included in the package of information handed out. Please feel free to send along questions/concerns.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.