

# RECOMMENDED ORDER to the DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE ENGINEERING, AND GEOSCIENCE PROFESSIONS ACT,

AND

IN THE MATTER OF THE CONDUCT OF Glenmore Fabricators Ltd. (P11162)

Investigation Case: #2024-36

## APEGA Recommended Order to the Discipline Committee

#### In the matter of the Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act

#### and

### In the matter of the conduct of Glenmore Fabricators Ltd.

The Investigative Committee of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) has conducted an investigation into the conduct of Glenmore Fabricators Ltd. (Glenmore) an APEGA permit holder. The complaint was initiated by John Corriveau, P.Eng., then Deputy Registrar & Chief Regulatory Officer, APEGA (the "Complainant"). The complaint was submitted on November 26, 2024.

#### A. The Complaint

The Complainant alleged that Glenmore engaged in unprofessional conduct and/or unskilled practice arising from a workplace incident that occurred on August 16, 2021, where a worker (on the night shift) suffered fatal injuries after becoming trapped under a steel I-beam on which he had been working.

The incident was investigated by Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) and the matter was resolved through the Alberta Court of Justice by Glenmore's guilty plea to contravening s.13(2) of the OHS Code. Because of this admission, the Complainant alleged that:

#### Allegation 1:

Glenmore violated the *Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act (EGP Act)* - s. 44(1)(b) and Rule of Conduct #4 which states that professional engineers and geoscientists shall comply with applicable statutes, regulations and bylaws in their professional practices.

#### B. Agreed Statement of Facts

#### i. Background:

C. At all relevant times, Glenmore held a valid APEGA permit to practice and was thus bound by the EGP Act and the APEGA Code of Ethics.

- 2. The APEGA Investigation Committee placed significant weight on both the OHS investigation findings (as OHS was the appropriate body to investigate these matters<sup>1</sup>) and the Alberta Court of Justice decision.
- 3. A total of 11 charges were initially brought forward against Glenmore by OHS. All charges were dropped with the exception of Count #5:

COUNT 5: ON OR ABOUT AUGUST 16, 2021 AT OR NEAR THE CITY OF CALGARY IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA, BEING AN EMPLOYER, WHERE THIS CODE REQUIRES ANYTHING TO BE DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS AND THEY ARE NOT AVAILABLE OR DO NOT EXIST, DID FAIL TO DEVELOP AND COMPLY WITH PROCEDURES THAT ARE CERTIFIED BY A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER AS DESIGNED TO ENSURE THAT A THING IS DONE IN A SAFE MANNER OR HAVE THE EQUIPMENT CERTIFIED AS SAFE TO OPERATE BY A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER AT LEAST EVERY 12 CALENDAR MONTHS, CONTRARY TO S. 13(2) OF THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE 2009 AS ADOPTED BY THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE ORDER, ALBERTA REGULATION 87/2009 PURSUANT TO THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT, S. A. 2017, CHAPTER 0-2.1, AS AMENDED.

#### ii. Facts Relating to Allegation 1

Whether Glenmore contravened Rule of Conduct #4:

Professional engineers and geoscientists shall comply with applicable statutes, regulations and bylaws in their professional practices.

#### The Incident

- 4. There were no witnesses to the incident and the exact details of how it unfolded remain unknown.
- 5. There were six possible/probable causes outlined in the Alberta Court of Justice Agreed Statement of Facts that could have caused the beam to fall on the worker.
- 6. The incident occurred when the worker used a set of plate clamps at his sole discretion, outside of Glenmore's prescribed procedure for moving beams.
- 7. A third party forensic engineering investigation determined the clamps were not faulty and did not fail.
- 8. Glenmore was initially prepared to contest the charge (Count 5); however, Glenmore elected to plead guilty to not subject the worker's family to the legal process and trial that would result.

2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> OHS mandate is to prevent work-related injuries, illnesses and fatalities by working with employers and workers. https://www.alberta.ca/occupational-health-safety

#### Admission to Count 5

- 9. Glenmore plead guilty to Count #5 facilitated by an Agreed Statement of Facts (ASF)<sup>2</sup>.
- 10. Glenmore, in the ASF, admitted that they did not know the manufacturer of the set of clamps that were used to move the beam, that Glenmore failed to take independent steps to confirm the identity of the "true manufacturer" of those clamps, and that Glenmore failed to confirm the specifications for those clamps.

#### Glenmore responds to the incident:

In response to the incident, Glenmore took proactive steps and measures to improve their practice, which included:

- 11. The distribution of a memo to all shop employees advising that clamps were only to be used where appropriate and in accordance with Glenmore's safe work procedures.
- 12. Held a safety meeting with all employees to ensure they clearly understand the hazards of lifting and moving I-beams to eliminate and control hazards.
- 13. Updated the hazard assessment for rigging and use of the overhead crane.
- 14. Retained the services of a qualified third party to provide additional training to all overhead crane operators and performed competency assessments of all such workers.
- 15. Undertook a comprehensive review of its internal health and safety program.
- 16. The hiring of a full-time health and safety professional to replace a company that had been previously sub-contracted.
- 17. Retained to review the use of the lifting clamps to provide an opinion on whether Glenmore's use and procedures associated with such clamps was appropriate, to which acceptable.
- 18. As noted, obtained a forensic engineer that determined the clamps did not fail
- 19. Contacted the supplier of the clamps, to request a copy of the manufacturer's specifications as they had not been previously provided.

#### Alberta Court of Justice Penalties

- 20. Glenmore was sentenced on October 15, 2024, and ordered to pay \$174,000 to the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (SAIT) to purchase equipment for its electrical and welding apprenticeship programs.
- 21.\$25,000 was to be paid to the Manufacturers' Health and Safety Association (MHSA) to improve its rigging resource centre website.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Court File No. 230696858PI

- 22. In addition to these payments, Glenmore was fined \$1,000, which included a 20 per cent victim fine surcharge.
- 23. Glenmore would also be subject to two years of enhanced regulatory (OHS) supervision.
- 24. There were no findings or evidence found by OHS that determined that Glenmore engaged in unsafe practice with respect to their workplace and standard operating procedures.
- 25. As outlined in the ASF, Glenmore admitted to violating s.13(2) of the OHS Code.

#### C. Conduct

- 26. Further to Glenmore's admission to Count 5, Glenmore freely and voluntarily admits that they have violated s. 44(1)(b) & Rule of Conduct # 4 of the EGP Act.
- 27. Glenmore acknowledges that the conduct described above constitutes unprofessional conduct.

#### Section 44(1) of the Act states:

- 44(1) Any conduct of a professional member, licensee, permit holder, certificate holder or member-in-training that in the opinion of the Discipline Committee or the Appeal Board
- (a) is detrimental to the best interests of the public;
- (b) contravenes a Code of Ethics of the profession as established under the regulations;
- (c) harms or tends to harm the standing of the profession generally;
- (d) displays a lack of knowledge of or a lack of skill or judgment in the practise of the profession or;
- (e) displays a lack of knowledge or lack of skill or judgment in the carrying out of any duty or obligation undertaken in the practise of the profession.

Whether or not that conduct is disgraceful or dishonorable, constitutes either unskilled practice of the profession or unprofessional conduct, whichever the Discipline Committee or the Appeal Board finds.

#### The Rules of Conduct of the APEGA Code of Ethics state:

- 1. Professional engineers and geoscientists shall, in their areas of practise, hold paramount the health, safety and welfare of the public and have regard for the environment.
- 2. Professional engineers and geoscientists shall undertake only work that they are competent to perform by virtue of their training and experience.
- 3. Professional engineers and geoscientists shall conduct themselves with integrity, honesty, fairness and objectivity in their professional activities.
- **4.** Professional engineers and geoscientists shall comply with applicable statutes, regulations and bylaws in their professional practices.
- 5. Professional engineers and geoscientists shall uphold and enhance the honour, dignity and reputation of their professions and thus the ability of the professions to serve the public interest.

#### D. Recommended Orders

- 28. On the recommendation of the Investigative Committee, and by agreement of Glenmore with that recommendation, and following a discussion and review with the Discipline Committee Case Manager, the Discipline Committee hereby orders that:
  - a) Glenmore shall be reprimanded for their conduct and this order shall serve as the reprimand.
  - b) This matter and its outcome will be published by APEGA as deemed appropriate and such publication will name Glenmore.

In recommending the sanctions noted above, the Investigative Committee recognizes the significant penalties already imposed against Glenmore by the Alberta Court of Justice, and the proactive measures implemented by Glenmore resulting from the incident.

I, Jason Gillen, P.Eng., as the Resonsible Member of Glenmore, acknowledge that before signing this Recommended Order, I consulted with legal counsel regarding Glenmore's rights or that I am aware of Glenmore's right to consult legal counsel and that on behalf of Glenmore I hereby expressly waive Glenmore's right to do so. I confirm that Glenmore agrees to the facts and admissions as set out above in this Recommended Order, and that Glenmore agrees with the Orders in Section D that are jointly proposed.

Further to the above, I acknowledge that a copy of this Order naming Glenmore will be disseminated to all provincial and territorial engineering and geoscience regulators in Canada.

Further to the above, I acknowledge that a copy of this Order naming Glenmore shall be provided to the APEGA Practice Review Board.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned agrees with the Agreed Statement of Facts and Acknowledgment of Unprofessional Conduct in its entirety.

#### Glenmore Fabricators Ltd.



Jason Gillen, P.Eng. (RM)

#### **APEGA Investigative Committee**



George Caraganis, P.Eng. (Panel Chair)

#### **APEGA Discipline Committee**

By:

Johanne Poirier Mouallem Signed with Consign O Cloud (2025/07/15) Verify with verifio.com or Adobe Reader.

July 15, 2025

Case Manager

6