

FIRE PROTECTION CASE SUMMARIES 2013

CASE #10-67

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Registered Fire Protection Technician (RFPT) certified in Fire Extinguishers (EX) and Unit Emergency Lighting (EM), installed a commercial kitchen exhaust system that did not comply with BC Building and Fire Code standards and ASTTBC RFPT practice guidelines including the use of stamp when tagging and reporting the work.

INVESTIGATION:

If the allegation were found to be true, the actions of the Respondent would be contrary to the ASTTBC Code of Ethics Principle 1, and the RFPT policy on the use of stamp guidelines.

The Complainant, who was also an RFPT, with certification in EX and EM had submitted and lost the bid to install the commercial kitchen exhaust system at the subject restaurant.

The investigation determined that the Respondent was not following the BC Building and BC Fire Codes. The subject restaurant is located in a municipality that does not have a bylaw requiring fire protection work to be done by ASTTBC registered technicians. However, the Respondent was an RFPT and therefore must comply with ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

In addition, the Complainant was found to have violated the Code of Ethics, by falsely representing himself as an Inspector and by trespassing onto the client's site without the owner's permission to investigate the work done by the Respondent.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that the Respondent write a letter to the ASTTBC Registrar explaining the requirements for installing fire suppression systems in commercial kitchens. The Respondent was also required to provide a letter attesting that using preprinted tags would be discontinued, that the RFPT stamp would be used only as per the Stamp and Tag guidelines and further, that the Respondent would not inspect fire protection equipment outside the scope of certification. A fine of \$500.00 was recommended as a deterrent to future violations of the BC Building and Fire Codes and ASTTBC Code of Ethics & Practice Guidelines.

The PRB also recommended that the Complainant provide a written letter of assurance, acceptable to the Registrar, promising to refrain from future misrepresentation to the public. A fine of \$500.00 was recommended as a deterrent to future violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics & Practice Guidelines.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent did not comply with the PRB censure conditions and was temporarily removed from the Register. The ASTTBC database was flagged requiring all PRB censure conditions to be fulfilled by the Respondent prior to any reinstatement. Approximately 18 months later, the Respondent complied with the PRB censure conditions and was reinstated as an RFPT.

The Complainant did not comply with the censure conditions and was subsequently struck from the registry because of non-payment of membership dues. The PRB recommended that, as the Complainant was no longer an RFPT, no further action was possible and the file was closed. The ASTTBC database was flagged requiring all PRB censure conditions to be fulfilled by the Complainant prior to any reinstatement.

Approximately 18 months later, the Complainant met with the Registrar regarding reinstatement. The discussion resulted in the Complainant realizing the poor judgment made in the past that led to the

complaint and the PRB-recommended censure conditions. The Registrar observed that the Complainant acknowledged the previous conduct that had led to a breach of the Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines and promised to abide by the ASTTBC Code of Ethics in the future. In light of this discussion, the requirement to submit a letter of assurance was waived by the Registrar. The Complainant paid the fine and all outstanding dues. In addition, the Complainant was provided the current Fire Protection Certification Policy and applicable Practice Guidelines to review and then provide a written statement, acceptable to the Registrar that the Complainant had read, understood and was up-to-date on all current standards and policies. The Complainant's written statement was to also include an assurance of compliance with all current policies and procedures of the Fire Protection Certification Board in future practice as a Fire Protection Technician. The Complainant provided the necessary documents. The PRB ratified the actions of the Registrar, and recommended that the file be closed.

CASE #11-37

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Registered Fire Protection Technician (RFPT) with certification in Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Cleaning (CO) improperly cleaned and serviced a restaurant kitchen exhaust system.

INVESTIGATION:

If the allegation were found to be true, the actions of the Respondent would be contrary to Principle 1 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The tag signed by the Respondent indicated that the hood, fan, and vents were clean, with a notation that the cleaning was "razor scraped to bare metal". Upon inspecting the rooftop vent, it was determined that the vents had not been properly cleaned. Photographs taken within a week of the tag being posted show an excessive accumulation of dirt and grease that should not be evident one week after proper cleaning of the exhaust system.

During the investigation, several errors were noted regarding the Respondent's improper use of tags and reporting. The Investigator observed that the record of test results was missing or not communicated properly.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that the Respondent provide a written letter of assurance, acceptable to the Registrar, explaining the Respondent's understanding of the proper use of Tags, Reports and Owners Log for Fire Protection Inspections and Tests. A fine of \$250.00 was recommended as a deterrent to future violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent submitted a letter that was not acceptable to the Registrar. The Manager, Fire Protection Registrations, was requested to meet with the Respondent to address the Registrar's concerns. The Manager had a thorough discussion with the Respondent regarding the proper use of tags and the importance of preparing reports on systems only after all work had been completed. The Respondent promised to comply with the Tag and Report Guideline in the future, and also paid the fine. The Manager reported the details to the Registrar.

The PRB ratified the actions of the Registrar in substituting a discussion between the Respondent and the Manager, Fire Protection Registrations in lieu of a letter of assurance to be provided by the Respondent. Since the Respondent met the intent of the PRB censure conditions no further action was required and the case was closed.

CASE #11-79

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Registered Fire Protection Technician (RFPT) with certification in Emergency Lighting (EM), and Fire alarm systems (AL) conducted an improper verification of a fire alarm system.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principle 1 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The Investigator confirmed that the Respondent had verified the subject fire alarm system. The Respondent did not reply to the allegations in the complaint or to subsequent follow-up by ASTTBC Staff. Without a response, it was not possible for the PRB to determine if there were any reasons for not reporting or noting deficiencies in the alarm system or whether the Respondent was even aware of the applicable CAN/ULC Standards. Verification of fire alarm systems is required prior to issuing an occupancy permit following construction of new buildings, after major renovations, or for replacement of a fire alarm system.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that the Respondent write a letter of assurance promising to follow the applicable standards, practices and requirements while conducting future inspections, tests and verifications. Upon receipt of the PRB recommendations, the Respondent provided new information in response that merited further attention and was sent to the Complainant for rebuttal. The case was re-opened and the previous PRB recommendations were tabled until further investigation was completed.

The re-investigation found that there was insufficient evidence to prove that the Respondent was the only person working at the site, and that the Respondent was responsible for the errors found by the Complainant. Further, it was determined that the Complainant did not see the full Verification report and that the allegations may have been based solely on the Verification Tag.

The PRB determined that there was insufficient evidence to support the allegation that the Respondent performed the verification work. Therefore, the previous PRB recommendations were rescinded.

OUTCOME:

No further action was required and the case was closed.

CASE #11-81

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Registered Fire Protection Technician (RFPT) certified in Fire Alarm Systems (AL), Fire Extinguishers (EX), Emergency Lighting (EM), Special Fire Suppression Systems (SP) and Water-Based Fire Protection Systems (WA), incorrectly conducted and signed off on a fire alarm system verification.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principle 1 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines. At the time of the inspection, the Respondent was not ASTTBC certified in Verification of Fire Alarm Systems (VI).

The PRB investigation determined that, when the Respondent was certified by ASTTBC, the Respondent was provided with a letter outlining the requirements and limitations of practice as an RFPT with respect to certification. By conducting the verification of a fire alarm system, the Respondent breached Code of Ethics Principle 2: "Undertake and accept responsibility for professional assignments only when qualified by training and experience". Such an action was contrary to the Fire Protection Certification Policy.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that the Respondent submit a written letter of assurance, acceptable to the Registrar, that the Respondent understands the conditions and obligations of RFPTs. A fine of \$500.00 was recommended as a deterrent to future violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent submitted a written explanation acceptable to the Registrar and paid the fine. The Respondent assured the Registrar that the necessary courses required to obtain the Verification discipline would be taken, and no fire alarm system verifications would be conducted until the required certification was achieved. Since all recommendations were successfully completed, no further action was necessary and the file was closed.

CASE #12-10(2)**STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:**

That the Respondent (an RFPT) verbally threatened the Complainant (also an RFPT) over incidents of inappropriate and unprofessional business practice.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principle 7 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The Respondent was starting a new fire protection business. ASTTBC received concerns regarding unethical business practices by the Respondent while attempting to attract new clients. The Respondent and the Complainant worked in the same city and encounters between the two were inevitable. On one occasion at a local retail store the meeting resulted in the Respondent verbally threatening the Complainant. Subsequently, a complaint was submitted to ASTTBC.

In response to the complaint, the Respondent denied all allegations. The Complainant was in the presence of colleagues who witnessed the alleged threat over a cell phone with the speaker activated. Through the ASTTBC investigation signed statements were obtained from witnesses.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended censure conditions. Upon receiving the PRB conditions, the Respondent's legal counsel requested ASTTBC to provide evidence of the Respondent's violation of the Code of Ethics. The requested information was provided to the law firm. The Respondent then requested a meeting to discuss available options to resolve the complaint. The request was granted and the parties to the complaint agreed to attend separate meetings at the ASTTBC offices. As a result of the meetings, the investigation of this complaint was concluded. An offer of a Stipulated Order was made to the Respondent, which was accepted.

The conditions on the Stipulated Order were that the Respondent:

- a) Accept that there was a breach of Principle 7 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.
- b) Pay a fine of \$500.00.
- c) Submit to a Practice Assessment with the Manager, Fire Protection Registrations or designate. The practice assessment would also include a review of business practices that included document management, inspection reports and reporting.
- d) Provide to the ASTTBC Registrar proof of insurance coverage of a minimum of one million dollars for errors and omissions and public liability insurance.
- e) Clearly represent their business to clients, the public and competitors as a fire protection service company separate and independent from that of the Complainant and any other fire protection service company.

- f) Meet with the Registrar to review and agree to abide by the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines. The Complainant will be invited to attend this meeting.
- g) After carefully considering this matter, accept the above conditions and acknowledge that, in the event the above conditions are not fulfilled within the time periods specified, the RFPT's certification will be suspended and will not be reinstated until after the above conditions are successfully completed.
- h) Accept that a concealed identity summary of this Stipulated Order will be made available to the public on the website of the Applied Science Technologists and Technicians of British Columbia as part of its duty to protect the public interest and to keep the public informed of disciplinary matters.

OUTCOME:

The Stipulated Order was ratified by the PRB, and provided to the Respondent for signature. The Respondent signed the Stipulated Order. All PRB recommended conditions were completed to the satisfaction of the PRB and the case was closed.

CASE #12-19

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, an RFPT with certification in Fire Alarm Systems (AL), Fire Extinguishers (EX), Emergency Lighting (EM), Smoke Control Systems (SM), Special Fire Suppression Systems (SP) and Water-Based Fire Protection Systems (WA), performed an incorrect verification on a fire alarm system.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principle 1 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that the actions of the Respondent compromised the ULC certification as confirmed by a representative of ULC. The Respondent claimed that the actions were appropriate as a temporary fix because the fire alarm system was going to be upgraded in the near future. Although this temporary fix may not affect the operation of the fire alarm system, it was in direct violation of the CAN/ULC-S537-04 and CAN/ULC-S536-04 standards. The PRB recommended further investigation with Authorities having jurisdiction, and the re-investigation determined that the Respondent's employer had obtained the necessary permit to upgrade the fire alarm system.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that, to provide assurance of an understanding of Principle 1 of the Code of Ethics and CAN/ULC-S537-04, Verification of Fire Alarm Systems and the requirements to follow the ULC standard, the Respondent was required to submit a written statement acceptable to the Registrar, promising to abide by the Code of Ethics and the latest version of CAN/ULC-S537, Verification of Fire Alarm Systems. A fine of \$250.00 was recommended as a deterrent to future violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent submitted the required letter, which was found to be acceptable by the Registrar, and also paid the fine. Since all recommendations were successfully completed, no further action was necessary and the case was closed.

CASE #12-20

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Registered Fire Protection Technician (RFPT), certified in Fire Alarm Systems (AL), Fire Extinguishers (EX), Emergency Lighting (EM) and Water-Based Fire Protection Systems (WA), incorrectly filled out and signed off on an Inspection tag for a fire alarm system.

INVESTIGATION:

If the allegation is true, the actions of the Respondent would be contrary to Principle 1 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that the actions of the Respondent compromised the ULC certification. The investigation revealed several errors regarding the Respondent's notations on the tags, which were a violation of ASTTBC's "Tags and Reports for Fire Tests and Inspection Guideline". The PRB recommended further investigation with Authorities Having Jurisdiction (AHJ), and the re-investigation determined that the Respondent's employer had obtained the necessary permit to upgrade the fire alarm system.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that, to provide assurance of an understanding of the Tags and Reports for Fire Tests and Inspection Guideline and the requirements to follow CAN/ULC-S536-04, Inspection & Testing of Fire Alarm Systems, the Respondent was required to submit a written statement acceptable to the Registrar, promising to abide by the Tags and Reports for Fire Tests and Inspection Guideline and the latest version of CAN/ULC-S536, Inspection & Testing of Fire Alarm Systems in the future. A fine of \$250 was recommended as a deterrent to future violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent submitted the required letter, which was found to be acceptable by the Registrar, and also paid the fine. Since all recommendations were successfully completed, no further action was necessary and the file was closed.

CASE #12-30**STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:**

That the Respondent, an RFPT certified in Fire Alarm Systems (AL), Fire Extinguishers (EX), Emergency Lighting (EM), Special Fire Suppression Systems (SP) and Water-Based Fire Protection Systems (WA), incorrectly informed a customer about being fully manufacturer-certified to work on commercial kitchen exhaust fire suppression systems. The Respondent then proceeded to service the system and stamp a tag to certify the kitchen exhaust system was clean and fully functional.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principles 1 and 2 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that the exhaust system required upgrading because new deep fryers had been installed, needing additional chemical and nozzles to meet the manufacturer's installation requirements. The ductwork required a change of nozzle as well. The Respondent inspected and tested the fire suppression system based on the documentation provided when attending the site. The Respondent did not question if there had been any changes to the system since it was initially installed and if the authority having jurisdiction had approved the changes.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that the Respondent provide a letter acceptable to the Registrar, conveying an understanding of the nature of the violation. The PRB also levied a fine of \$250.00, as a deterrent to future violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics & Practice Guidelines.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent paid the fine and submitted the required letter, which was found to be acceptable by the Registrar. The Respondent also conveyed that one of the lessons learnt from this experience was that in the future, one of the first questions to ask a customer is if there had been any changes to the system since

original installation. The Registrar was also advised that the Respondent would be taking a manufacturer's course in the future. Since all recommendations were successfully completed, no further action was necessary and the file was closed.

CASE #12-34

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Registered Fire Protection Technician (RFPT), certified in Fire Alarm Systems (AL), Fire Extinguishers (EX), Emergency Lighting (EM), Smoke Control Systems (SM), Special Fire Suppression Systems (SP) and Water-Based Fire Protection Systems (WA), was servicing special fire suppression systems when not certified by the manufacturer to do so and therefore did not have access to UL/ULC listed replacement parts.

INVESTIGATION:

The Complainant expressed concern that the Respondent did not have access to manufacturer certified replacement parts required to service the fire suppression system. The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principles 1 and 2 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that the Respondent, when servicing fire suppression systems, obtained UL/ULC listed parts online using eBay and therefore accessible to the public. The investigation determined that manufacturer certification for fire suppression systems covered design, installation, operation and maintenance, but did not make any reference to inspection and testing. In the case of this complaint, the Respondent was doing the annual inspection and testing.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that, while there was insufficient evidence to substantiate a violation of the Code of Ethics or Standards of Practice, the Respondent was required to submit a written statement acceptable to the Registrar, confirming that, when conducting the annual inspection, testing and maintenance on special fire suppression systems any replacement parts used will be ULC-listed for that system.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent submitted the required letter, which was acceptable to the Registrar. The letter assured that when conducting special fire suppression systems inspections (semi-annual and annual), the Respondent has been and will continue to use ULC-listed replacement parts. These parts included fusible links, CO₂ cartridges, nozzle seals and caps. Since all recommendations were successfully completed, no further action was necessary and the file was closed.

CASE #12-36

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Registered Fire Protection Technician (RFPT) certified in Fire Extinguishers (EX) and Unit Emergency Lighting (EM) entered a business and was inappropriately soliciting work while the Complainant, also an RFPT, was on the premises doing the annual inspection, testing and servicing of the Emergency Lighting units.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principles 3, 4 and 7 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that the Respondent informed the customer that the Complainant was unnecessarily replacing the lighting unit battery, and also spoke to the business owner in a language other than English, advising them that the Respondent could do the job cheaper than the Complainant. The investigation confirmed the Respondent's presence at the business on the date and time of the incident. It

was also confirmed that the Respondent did speak with the owner in another language about cheaper rates and that the emergency lighting unit battery did not need to be replaced.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that the Respondent provide a written statement acceptable to the Registrar, promising to abide by the Code of Ethics in the future, and also levied a fine of \$250.00, as a deterrent to future violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics & Practice Guidelines. Upon receipt of the PRB recommendations, the Respondent provided further information, based on which, a re-investigation was recommended by the PRB and the previous recommendations were tabled.

The re-investigation determined that the Respondent's actions in providing the additional information to the PRB were done in an attempt to alter the outcome of the investigation. The PRB concluded that multiple violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics had occurred and therefore, the complaint that professional misconduct occurred was further substantiated.

The PRB recommended that the previous censure conditions specified remain in effect. In addition, the PRB recommended that whereas the Respondent's actions were not conducted with integrity, fairness, honesty, courtesy and good faith towards the client, the Respondent was in violation of ASTTBC Code of Ethics principles 3, 4 and 7; therefore, the Respondent was levied an additional fine of \$500.00, with the total fine being \$750.00.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent submitted the required statement, which was found to be acceptable, providing assurance that the Respondent would follow the guidelines set by ASTTBC in the future.

With respect to the fine of \$750.00, on the Respondent's request, ASTTBC agreed to payments in 4 equal monthly installments.

Since the Respondent had agreed to comply with the PRB recommendations, no further action was required and the file was closed.

CASE #13-11

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a RFPT Trainee in Fire Extinguishers (EX) performed an annual inspection and testing of a Fire Alarm system, without being certified to do so.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principle 2 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that the Respondent performed the inspection along with another individual who was not certified by ASTTBC. In addition, the system panel was tagged by a third individual, who was an RFPT. The PRB investigation determined that the allegations were valid and that the Respondent was in violation of the Trainee Practice Guidelines, and the Tag, Reports and Owners Log for Fire Tests and Inspections Guidelines.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that the Respondent provide written assurance of understanding of the proper application of the guidelines for Tags, Reports and Owner's Log for Fire Tests and Inspections. The Respondent was also required to submit a written statement acceptable to the Registrar promising to abide by the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Fire Protection Certification Policy in the future. In addition, the PRB levied a fine of \$250.00, as a deterrent to future violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics & Practice Guidelines.

OUTCOME:

Rather than comply with the recommendations, the Respondent chose to cancel membership with ASTTBC and returned the RFPT stamp.

The PRB recommended that, as the Respondent was no longer a member of ASTTBC, no further action was possible at the time, and the file was closed. The ASTTBC database was flagged and if the Respondent applies for certification, this file will be reopened and all PRB recommendations successfully completed prior to reinstatement. Further, all applicable Fire Protection Certification Board policies and guidelines will be considered and applied at the time of reinstatement.

CASE #13-12**STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:**

That the Respondent, an RFPT certified in Fire Alarm Systems (AL), Fire Extinguishers (EX), Emergency Lighting (EM) and Water-Based Fire Protection Systems (WA), was the lead technician at a job site for an annual inspection on a Fire Alarm system. Two individuals, one a RFPT and the other a RFPT Trainee were also present at the site; however, the Respondent did not properly follow ASTTBC Trainee Practice Guidelines, and the Tag, Reports and Owners Log for Fire Tests and Inspections Guidelines.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principle 2 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that the Respondent's reporting did not follow the prescribed guidelines. Although the Respondent's name appeared on the tag applied to the system, it did not appear on any of the test reports. In addition, the Respondent was also found to have not followed the Trainee Practice Guideline.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB upheld the allegations made by the Complainant. The PRB required the Respondent to submit a written statement, acceptable to the Registrar, promising to abide by Code of Ethics, the Trainee Practice Guidelines, and the Tag, Reports and Owners Log for Fire Tests in the future. In addition, the PRB levied a fine of \$500.00, as a deterrent to future violations of the Code of Ethics and also given the higher level of accountability as a supervisor.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent submitted the required letter, outlining an understanding of the prescribed documentation and providing assurance of abiding by these documents, and also paid the fine. Since all recommendations were successfully completed, no further action was necessary and the file was closed.

CASE #13-13**STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:**

That the Respondent, an applicant for the ASTTBC Fire Protection Registration program, performed an annual inspection on a Fire Alarm system, without being certified to do so.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principles 1 and 2 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that the Respondent inspected and tested a fire alarm without following correct procedures and without supervision, and was therefore, in violation of the Stamp and Tag Guideline and the Trainee Practice Guideline.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that as the Respondent was not a member of ASTTBC, this file be closed with respect to practice as a Fire Protection Technician. However, since the Respondent was an applicant to ASTTBC Fire Protection Registration program, the PRB required the Respondent read and comply with the Fire Protection Technician Stamp and Practice Guideline, and the Trainee Guideline. The Respondent was required to submit to the Registrar, in writing, an acceptable explanation of an understanding of these guidelines. This statement was to be received prior to the Respondent being given any consideration for certification in the future.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent submitted a very detailed letter to the Registrar, outlining an understanding of the Fire Protection Technician Stamp Practice Guideline, the guideline on Tags and Reports for Fire Tests and Inspections and the Trainee Guideline, which was found to be acceptable. Since all recommendations were successfully completed, no further action was necessary and the file was closed. The Fire Protection Certification Board was advised accordingly.

CASE #13-24**STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:**

That the Respondent, previously registered with ASTTBC as an RFPT certified in Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Cleaning (CO), conducted vent cleaning after the ASTTBC membership had been cancelled because of non-payment of annual dues.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principles 1 and 2 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that, at the time of the cleaning, the Respondent had been struck from the ASTTBC registry for non-payment of dues. The Respondent did not reply to the notice of complaint. In a follow-up with the Respondent's employer, ASTTBC learned that the Respondent had resigned from the BC employer and moved to another Province.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB recommended that as the Respondent is no longer a RFPT, the database be flagged and if the Respondent applies for reinstatement, that the file be reopened and concluded to the satisfaction of the PRB. In addition, prior to reinstatement, the Respondent shall, in writing, satisfy the Registrar that the Respondent understands the Fire Protection Technician Stamp Practice Guideline and, assures the Registrar that practice as a RFPT will not be undertaken unless the Respondent is a member in good standing with ASTTBC. Further, the PRB required that the Registrar notify the Authorities having jurisdiction in each municipality with a bylaw requiring ASTTBC certification for Fire Protection Technicians, that the Respondent is no longer registered with ASTTBC as an RFPT.

OUTCOME:

No further action was taken at the time and the file was closed. The ASTTBC member database has been flagged to alert Staff of the outstanding PRB conditions should the former RFPT apply for reinstatement.

CASE #13-25**STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:**

That the Respondent, an RFPT certified in Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Cleaning (CO), and owner of a fire protection business, assigned a non-registered employee to conduct commercial kitchen exhaust cleaning.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegation, if found to be true, would be contrary to Principles 1 and 2 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

The PRB investigation determined that the Respondent's employee was previously registered with ASTTBC as an RFPT but had been struck from the registry for non-payment of annual dues. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Respondent directed the employee to pay the required dues and get reinstated. Further, the Respondent advised ASTTBC that, as 5 of the employees were RFPTs, a revision to staff protocol was implemented, wherein all employees who are RFPTs are required to furnish their receipt for payment of annual dues to ASTTBC as proof that they are in good standing with ASTTBC.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB concluded that the Respondent had carried out the necessary due diligence in ensuring that the company employees who were RFPTs were in good standing prior to conducting any RFPT-related duties.

OUTCOME:

The PRB recommended no further action was required and the file was closed.