

FIRE PROTECTION CASE SUMMARIES 2020

CASE #19-06

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Registered Fire Protection Technician (RFPT) certified in the Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Cleaning (CO) endorsement conducted inadequate cleaning, inspection and testing of a commercial kitchen exhaust system in a restaurant.

This allegation, if found to be true, would be to contrary to Principles 1 and 9 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and also to the RFPT Standard of Practice.

The Respondent, at the time of the complaint was the owner and operator of a general commercial cleaning business that provided commercial kitchen exhaust system cleaning as one of its services. The Complainant was a fire services officer with the Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ).

INVESTIGATION:

While conducting a new business license inspection at a restaurant, the Complainant noted that the kitchen exhaust system had been cleaned the day before. The system had been inspected and tagged as having no deficiencies. When the Complainant went through the kitchen and onto the roof to examine the kitchen exhaust vent fan, the condition and evidence indicated inadequate cleaning. Finding this unacceptable, the AHJ ordered that the system be more thoroughly cleaned and re-inspected.

The investigation found that the Respondent's crew had to stop work due to problems with the cleaning equipment. The Respondent planned to return on another day to complete the work. However, the commercial kitchen exhaust system was tagged indicating all parts of the system had been cleaned and inspected. When the cleaning was subsequently completed, the AHJ re-attended the site and again found the work unacceptable.

When components of a commercial kitchen exhaust system have not been cleaned as per the RFPT Standard of Practice the label should be punched 'fail' and 'see report' for each component that has not been cleaned to the applicable standard. Similarly, if any pre-existing conditions such as improper installation, deficiencies or damage to the kitchen exhaust system are observed during cleaning they should be noted in the report and the owner advised.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

Upon review of the complaint, the PRB found that the Respondent's actions were contrary to Principles 1 and 9 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and also to the RFPT Standard of Practice.

The PRB noted that this was the fifth complaint received against the Respondent. Prior complaints suggested the Respondent may be providing pre-stamped tags or labels to employees that were not RFPTs. During a meeting with the Registrar, the Respondent was warned against the practice of allowing non-registered cleaning staff to do the cleaning in the absence of on-site supervision by an RFPT with CO endorsement. The PRB also noted that the Respondent complied with all penalties imposed in relation to prior complaints, which include submitting an explanation of their understanding of acceptable RFPT practice, and payment of fines. However, there appears to be recurring non-compliant practice as a RFPT.

The PRB required the Respondent to undergo a Practice Assessment Review (PAR) to assess competence and compliance with prevailing standards specific to their certification, as well as the content and conduct of their practice. As part of the PAR, the Respondent was required to conduct commercial kitchen exhaust system cleaning and inspections at 5 systems in the presence of an ASTTBC Quality Assurance Specialist (QAS). The QAS would attend the sites, oversee the Respondent conducting the cleaning, and review all related documentation prepared by the

Respondent. As part of the ongoing investigation, the PRB would review and consider the results of the PAR.

OUTCOME:

Upon receipt of the PRB decision the Respondent advised ASTTBC that they had decided to discontinue their kitchen exhaust system cleaning service, and subsequently returned their stamp to ASTTBC. Their membership was accordingly cancelled and is displayed as such on ASTTBC's register.

The Authority Having Jurisdiction was advised of the change in the Respondent's registration status. If the Respondent applies for reinstatement, this file shall be reopened and concluded to the satisfaction of the PRB, as a condition of reinstatement.

No further action was required and the file was closed.