

Survey details

If you will be completing the survey on behalf of an organization, a PDF copy of the questionnaire can be downloaded for your reference while consolidating your feedback.

After compiling your organization's feedback, please enter your organization's response as a survey submission. This ensures that your input will be accurately captured and reflected in the data set.

This form will take **60 to 90 minutes** to complete and closes **July 8, 2026**. For optimal functionality, it is recommended to complete this survey on a desktop, not on a mobile phone.

Important: Please note that progress cannot be saved. Closing this window or navigating away will clear all responses. Please allow sufficient time to complete the survey in a single, uninterrupted session.

Section 1: Demographic information

1. Which of the following fields do you primarily work in? (Select only one) *

- Agriculture
- Construction and Construction Trade Services
- Education
- Electrical Utilities
- Forestry
- Fireworks and other explosives
- Government or Public Administration
- Health Services
- Hospitality and Entertainment
- Manufacturing and Processing
- Mining
- Non-Profit
- Oil and Gas or Energy
- Retail and Wholesale Trade Services
- Transportation
- Other (please specify)

Which ministry or department are you completing this survey on behalf of?

Other (please specify)

2. I am providing input on behalf of: (Select only one) *

- Myself
- An organization or group

3. I am providing input on behalf of myself as a: (Select only one) *

- Academic
- Employer
- Supplier
- Service provider
- Professional
- Worker
- Member of the public

Approximately how many workers do you employ in Alberta? (Select only one) *

- Less than 5
- 5 to 19
- 20 to 39
- 40 to 100
- More than 100

Are you under a collective agreement or union? (Select only one) *

- Yes
- No
- Unsure
- Prefer not to say

4. The group I am providing input on behalf of is my: (Select only one) *

- Employer or industry organization
- Health and safety association
- Professional organization
- Worker organization (e.g., union)
- Indigenous government, social group, or training institute
- Metis government, social group, or training institute
- Municipality
- Post secondary institution
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

5. Organization name: *

6. Approximately how many people in Alberta are represented by your group? (Select only one) *

- Less than 100
- 100 to 500
- 501 to 1,000
- 1,001 to 5,000
- More than 5,000
- Unsure

Section 2: Part 36 – Mining (Section 533)

Currently, section 533 lists the elements that must be included on a mine plan and requires a mine plan be updated at reasonably practicable elements. Required elements are:

- Survey of workings, current within three months.
- Extensions of workings, current to one month.
- General direction and inclination of strata, and thickness of the bed or strata being mined.
- Legal description of the land.
- Any right of way for pipelines or other utility corridors.
- Locations of exploration drill holes.

Change A:

To align with the terminology in the definition, it is proposed to change the term “mine plan” to “mine map.” A corresponding change to terminology will also be made to section 681.

Do you agree with the proposed change in terminology to section 533 (Change A)? (Select only one)

*

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed terminology changes? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 533 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 533 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 533 (Change A) of the OHS Code? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To improve clarity as to when a mine map must be developed, it is proposed to clarify a mine map must be developed before work begins at the work site.

Do you agree with the proposed change to section 533 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 533 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 533 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 533 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 533 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To improve clarity that the survey of the workings and extensions to the workers need to be reviewed and updated on a routine basis, it is proposed to move these elements to the subsection which speaks to review and update of the mine plan at reasonably practicable intervals. The requirements for timeframes for updating this information would be unchanged.

Do you agree with the proposed change to section 533 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 533 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 533 would create an error. *

Describe how Change D to section 533 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 533 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change D:

To ensure that elements are included on a mine map based on the specific circumstances of the work site, it is proposed to add "any other matter required to ensure the health and safety of workers at the work site" to the list of elements that must be included on the mine map.

Do you agree with the proposed change to section 533 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 533 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change D to section 533 would create an error. *

Describe how Change D to section 533 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 533 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 533.1, 542)

There are proposed changes impacting sections 533.1 and 542. Questions on these changes are in the sections 533.1 and 542 will be in the Miscellaneous Changes survey.

Part 36 – Mining (Section 544)

Currently, section 544 lists the incidents which are reportable for the purposes of section 33(3) of the OHS Act:

- An unexpected major ground fall or subsidence that endangers or may endanger workers, equipment or facilities.
- An unplanned stoppage of the main underground ventilation system for more than 30 minutes.
- Emergency conditions resulting in workers being withdrawn from a hazardous location.
- Electrical equipment failures or incidents that cause, or threaten to cause, injury to workers or damage to equipment or facilities.
- Outbursts and inrushes.
- An incident involving a hoist, sheave, hoisting rope, shaft conveyance, shaft, shaft timbering or headframe structure.
- The integrity of a dam or dike is affected by cracking or evidence of weakening or subsidence of a dam or dike, unexpected seepage or the appearance of springs on the outer face of a dam or dike, the freeboard of a dam or dike being inadequate, or a washout or significant erosion to a dam or dike.

Change A:

To ensure that all types of electrical incidents that may injure workers are reported and align wording with the OHS Act, it is proposed to update the requirement to report “electrical equipment failures or incidents that cause, or threaten to cause, injury to workers or damage to equipment or facilities” to “electrical equipment failure or other event involving electrical equipment that causes a serious injury or illness or that has the potential of causing a serious injury or illness or threaten to cause, injury to workers or damage to equipment or facilities”.

11. Do you agree with the proposed change to terminology in Section 544 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed terminology changes to section 544 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to terminology in section 544 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to terminology in section 544 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to terminology in section 544 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To provide greater clarity, it is proposed to change “outburst and intrushes” to “outburst or intrushes” as these are different types of incidents which may not happen at the same time.

12. Do you agree with the proposed change to Section 544 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 544 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 544 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 544 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 544 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To provide greater clarity, it is proposed to update the terminology “sheave, hoisting rope, shaft conveyance, shaft, shaft timbering or headframe structure” to “conveyor or shaft infrastructure” which reflects the types of equipment rather than the components of the equipment.

13. Do you agree with the proposed change to Section 544 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 544 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 544 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 544 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 544 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 546)

Currently, section 546 requires the employer to ensure designated rescue and emergency workers:

- Qualify as basic first aiders;
- Have completed training approved by a Director; and
- Are familiar with the complete mine and mine site layout, location of entrances and exits to work areas so an effective rescue or evacuation can be carried out.

To remove burden on employers and training providers to get training approved and align with a new mine rescue training standard in Canada, it is proposed to remove the requirement for workers to take training approved by a Director and instead require training meet the Western Canada Mine Rescue Manual, Alberta Edition, February 2018.

14. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 546? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 546? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 546 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 546 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 546? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 560)

Currently, section 560 requires the employer to ensure the installation, maintenance and operation of electrical equipment meets CSA Standard M421-16, Use of electricity in mines, for equipment installed on or after March 31, 2023.

The employer must ensure the electrical system is designed to and meets specifications certified by a professional engineer. This does not apply to portable or temporary electrical power equipment at a mine or mine site where an employer has ensured the portable or temporary electrical power equipment has been properly installed and grounded.

The employer must ensure electrical equipment and systems are installed, repaired, serviced, maintained and tested by an electrician or a worker under the direct supervision of an electrician.

The employer must ensure testing is performed at reasonably practicable intervals and includes testing to verify:

- The effectiveness of the ground fault tripping and ground conductor monitoring circuits.
- The integrity of ground electrodes at a surface mine and at the surface of an underground mine for electrical current continuity.
- Ground electrodes at a surface mine and at the surface of an underground mine for adequate capacity to ground electrical current.

Change A:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the referenced technical standard CSA Standard M421-16 to the more current version CSA Standard M421-23, Use of electricity in mines.

15. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 560 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 560 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 560 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 560 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 560 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To clarify employer responsibilities, it is proposed to add a new section that requires employers to ensure electrical systems in a mine are grounded before testing for grounding is done.

16. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 560 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 560 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 560 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 560 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 560 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 574)

Currently, section 574 requires the employer to ensure:

- Rubber-tired, self-propelled equipment used in an underground mine meets CSA Standard M424.3-M90 (R2020), Braking Performance — Rubber-Tired, Self-Propelled Underground Mining Machines.
- The brake system of rubber-tired, self-propelled equipment used in a surface mine meets ISO 3450:2011, Earth-moving machinery — Wheeled or high-speed rubber-tracked machines — Performance requirements and test procedures for brake systems.
- All accumulators used in braking and steering systems of rubber-tired, self-propelled equipment with a GVW more than 32 000 kilograms have a Canadian Registration Number for a pressure vessel as defined by CSA Standard B51:19, Boiler, pressure vessel, and pressure piping code.

The section does not apply to any vehicle or powered mobile equipment permitted to be used under the Traffic Safety Act.

Change A:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the referenced technical standard to CSA Standard B51:2419, Boiler, pressure vessel, and pressure piping code.

17. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 574 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 574 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 574 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 574 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 574 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To improve clarity of the requirement, it is proposed to amend the wording of the requirement to clarify that having a CRN number on a boiler is a requirement in the referenced standard, rather than "defined by" the standard.

18. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 574 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 574 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 574 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 574 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 574 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 585)

Currently, section 585 requires the employer to ensure that the service brakes on rubber-tired, self-propelled equipment in their fleet with a GVW of more than 32 000 kilograms and travels at a speed of more than 10 kilometers per hour in normal operations are tested at reasonably practicable intervals at the equipment’s normal operation speed, and without using auxiliary retarding devices. This testing must be done within a 3-year period.

An employer must ensure the following are measured when service brakes are tested:

- The distance travelled by the equipment from the initial point of application of the service brakes to the final stopping position.
- The forward speed of the equipment at the time the service brakes are applied.

If the equipment does not meet the minimum brake performance requirements, an employer must remove the equipment from service until it meets the requirements.

To improve clarity for when testing of service brakes must be done, it is proposed to change the timeframe for testing from “within a 3-year period” to “at least once every 3 years.”

19. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 585? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 585? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 585 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 585 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 585? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 588)

Currently, section 588 requires the employer to ensure rubber-tired, self-propelled equipment that depends on hydraulic power for steering has an auxiliary power source that enables the worker operating the equipment to steer the equipment to a safe stop.

To reflect that they are small transient operations that do not typically use mining equipment, it is proposed to add an exemption for pits from the requirements for auxiliary steering.

20. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 588? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 588? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 588 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 588 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 588? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 589)

Currently, section 589 requires the employer to ensure an auxiliary steering system on rubber-tired, self-propelled equipment meets SAE Standard J1511 FEB94/ISO 5010:2007, Steering for Off-Road, Rubber-Tired Machines.

To reflect that they are small transient operations that do not typically use mining equipment, it is proposed to add an exemption for pits from the requirements for auxiliary pumps.

21. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 589? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 589? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 589 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 589 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 589? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 590)

Currently, section 590 requires the employer to ensure an auxiliary steering system on rubber-tired, self-propelled equipment meets SAE Standard J1511 FEB94/ISO 5010:2007, Steering for Off-Road, Rubber-Tired Machines.

Change A:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the current technical standard to the most current version ISO 5010:2019, Earth-moving machinery - Wheeled machines - Steering requirements.

22. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 590 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 590 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 590 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 590 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 590 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To reflect that they are small transient operations that do not typically use mining equipment, it is proposed to add an exemption for pits from the requirements for auxiliary steering standards.

23. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 590 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 590 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 590 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 590 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 590 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 592)

Currently, section 592 requires the employer to ensure that rubber-tired, self-propelled equipment has clearance lights that indicate clearly from all sides of equipment for the overall width of the equipment, and meet SAE Standard J2042 July 2006, Clearance, Sidemarker, and Identification Lamps for Use on Motor Vehicles 2032 mm or More in Overall Width. The overall width does not include blades on motor graders or rubber-tired dozers, or buckets on front-end loaders. An employer must also ensure that the clearance lights are on when the equipment's engine is on.

Change A:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the referenced technical standard to SAE Standard J2042_202411 Clearance, Sidemarker, and Identification Lamps for On-Road Vehicles 2032 mm or More in Overall Width.

24. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 592 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 592 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 592 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 592 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 592 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To focus on the elements of the equipment that need to be considered when determining lighting requirements, rather than the specific types of equipment, it is proposed, change "blades on motor graders or rubber dozers" to "blades" and "buckets on front-end loaders" to "buckets".

25. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 592 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 592 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 592 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 592 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 592 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To reflect that they are small transient operations that do not typically use mining equipment, it is proposed to add an exemption for pits from the requirements for clearance lights.

26. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 592 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 592 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 592 would create an error *

Describe how Change D to section 592 is not practicable for this industry or activity *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 592 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 594)

Currently, section 594 requires the employer to ensure rubber-tired, self-propelled equipment meets ISO 12509:2004, Earth-moving machinery — Lighting, signaling and marking lights, and reflex reflector devices.

Change A:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the referenced technical standard to the most current version ISO 12509:2023, Earth-moving machinery - Lighting, signaling and marking lights, and reflex reflector devices.

27. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 594 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 594 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 594 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 594 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 594 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To reflect that they are small transient operations that do not typically use mining equipment, it is proposed to add an exemption for pits from the requirements for lights.

28. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 594 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 594 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 594 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 594 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 594 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 598)

Currently, section 598 requires the employer to ensure a conveyor belt meets CSA Standard M422:14 (R2019), Fire-performance and antistatic requirements for conveyor belting, has fire-resistant belting approved by the United States Mine Safety and Health Administration, or is certified by a professional engineer as meeting another international standard.

Change A:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the referenced technical standard to the most current version M422:23, Fire-Performance and antistatic requirements for conveyor belting.

29. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 598 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 598 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 598 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 598 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 598 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To remove a restriction on the standard which can be selected by the professional engineer, it is proposed to change "international standard" to "standard".

30. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 598 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 598 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 598 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 598 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 598 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 604)

Currently, section 604 requires employers to ensure a conveyor is inspected at reasonably practicable intervals to identify any hazards to workers.

To ensure prompt identification of hazards, it is proposed to require conveyors be both inspected and monitored to allow for advancements in technology for remote monitoring in addition to physical inspections.

31. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 604? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 604? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 604 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 604 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 604? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 681)

Currently, section 681 requires an employer to ensure that a mine plan for an underground mine required by section 533 is certified by a professional engineer and submitted to a Director annually before the last day of September. The mine plan must include:

- A proposed underground operations working plan for the next year of operation;
- A ventilation plan for the next year of operation; and
- The locations of all firefighting pipelines, water control valves, fire stations and fire cabinets.

A mine plan is defined in the OHS Code as “a map, including a profile or section, of a mine or part of a mine, certified as correct by a surveyor”.

Change A:

To improve clarity as to when a mine map must be developed for an underground mine, it is proposed to clarify a mine map must be developed before underground mining begins at the work site.

32. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 681 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 681 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 681 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 681 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 681 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To reduce administrative burden on employers, it is proposed to remove the additional requirement to submit the mine plan annually to government in the OHS Code as OHS officers and directors already have the authority to collect this information under section 34 and 36 of the OHS Act.

33. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 681 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 681 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 681 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 681 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 681 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To ensure all of the hazards at the underground mine site are identified, it is proposed to introduce a new requirement that the locations where there are accumulations of water or gas that may be impacted by mining activities, inactive working, and seam outcrop or subcrops be included on the mine map.

34. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 681 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 681 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 681 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 681 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 681 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change D:

To ensure workers know where all firefighting equipment is located in the underground mine, it is proposed to include "and any other thing used for firefighting" to the items which must be included on the mine map.

35. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 681 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 681 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change D to section 681 would create an error. *

Describe how Change D to section 681 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 681 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 683)

Currently, section 683 requires an employer to ensure that workers working underground are supervised by an underground mine manager or an underground mine foreman.

Change A:

To reduce administrative burden, it is proposed to remove the requirement for an underground mine manager or underground mine foreman to obtain a certificate as the designations do not have duties beyond those of a supervisor under the OHS Act. Sections 685, 707, 749.4 and 749.8 would be repealed as well as related definitions for underground mine manager, mining certificate and underground mine foreman.

36. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 683 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 683 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 683 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 683 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 683 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To clarify the responsibility of supervisors at underground mine work sites, it is proposed to add new responsibilities for the supervisor at an underground mine site to ensure requirements are complied with, in addition to that for the employer. These responsibilities would relate to the following sections: 686, 687(1 and 2), 689, 690 (1 and 2), 693.1, 693.2(1 and 2), 693.3(1), 693.5, 694(1 and 2), 696.1(3), 696.2(4), 697.2(1, 2 and 3), 701(4), 702(b), 703.3(2), 703.4(1,2 and3), 707(5), 711(3), 711(4), 711(5), 712, 716(4), 716(5), 719, 722, 723(1 and 2), 724(1 and 3), 725(1), 729, 730(2), 730(3), 730(4), 730(5), 731(1)(b)(c) (d), 731(2), 731(3), 733(2), 738(4), 743(2, 4 and 5), and 749.

37. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 683 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 683 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 683 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 683 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 683 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 686)

Currently, section 686 requires an employer to ensure that surface mining operations and underground mining operations are coordinated if surface mining operations and underground mining operations take place simultaneously, and they are close enough to each other that mining in one may impact health and safety of workers in the other.

To improve clarity, it is proposed to add the health and safety intent which is coordination on work sites with combined surface and underground mining operations, so that they do not create a health and safety hazard to each other.

38. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 686? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 686? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 686 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 686 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 686? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 687)

Currently, section 687 requires an employer to ensure that no worker works alone at a working face where coal is mined except a worker who is sampling, testing or inspecting at a working face where coal is mined.

To improve health and safety, it is proposed to broaden this requirement to apply to all underground mines, as the hazard of working alone in an underground mine does not depend on the type of material being mined.

39. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 687? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 687? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 687 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 687 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 687? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 689)

Currently, section 689 requires an employer to ensure entrances to any area determined to be unsafe has signage at sufficient distances, and is fenced, cordoned or taped off to prevent workers from entering the area.

To make it clear that signing is required for any area that is unsafe, it is proposed to revise “area determined to be unsafe” to “area that is unsafe”.

40. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 689? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 689? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 689 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 689 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 689? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 693.1)

Currently, section 693 requires an employer to ensure nothing made of or containing aluminum, magnesium, titanium, a light metal alloy or any other reactive metal is brought into an underground mine if it may create a spark or ignition source.

To clarify the intent of the requirement, it is proposed to update the wording to specify the requirement applies when a fire or explosion hazard may be created by the reactive metal.

41. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.1? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed change to section 693.1? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 693.1 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 693.1 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 693.1? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 693.2)

Currently, section 693.2 requires an employer to ensure appropriate gas monitors are installed in any hazardous location, are continuously monitored, and will warn workers if the content of the atmosphere exceeds 20 percent of the lower explosive limit of the gas being monitored. The employer must ensure that any equipment used for testing and measuring where flammable and combustible conditions exist or may exist is intrinsically safe.

Change A:

To clarify the intent of the requirement, it is proposed to change the wording to specify the requirement applies to measurement of explosion hazards. The term “combustible conditions” is also proposed to be changed to “explosive atmospheres” to align terminology in the section.

42. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.2 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.2 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 693.2 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 693.2 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

**What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.2 (Change A)?
(Select only one) ***

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To clarify the desired outcome of the requirement is monitoring of potential explosion hazards, rather than focus on the tool being used, it is proposed to change "appropriate gas monitors" to "equipment used for testing and measuring potential explosive atmospheres".

43. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.2 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.2 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 693.2 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 693.2 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.2 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To account for the need to monitor for airborne substances that may not be gases (e.g. are vapours or may be dusts), the term "gas" is proposed to be changed to "substance".

44. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.2 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.2 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 693.2 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 693.2 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.2 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 693.3 & 693.4)

Currently, section 693.3 requires an employer to ensure:

- All flammable liquid is stored in a fireproof receptacle or chamber.
- Flammable or combustible material does not accumulate in any working part of the underground mine.
- Mine material likely to cause a fire is kept in fireproof containers that are removed and disposed of at reasonably practicable intervals.
- Flammable and combustible construction material is not used in an area of the underground mine where there is or may be an ignition source that could ignite it.
- Propane is not used in the underground mine except in heaters within portals.
- All components of the ventilation system are constructed of non-combustible material or treated to make them fire-resistant.
- Dust suppression devices are used if concentrations of dust may create a hazard to workers.
- Conveyor belt transfer points have automatic fire-warning devices that activate an alarm in a permanently attended monitoring station at the surface.

An employer must ensure equipment brought into an underground mine uses fire-resistant hydraulic fluids that meet CSA Standard M423:M87 (R2021), Fire resistant hydraulic fluids. This does not apply to vehicle and powered mobile equipment components which are axles, fluid couplings, braking systems that employ totally enclosed friction elements immersed in a cooling liquid, braking systems with hydraulics that are independent of any other hydraulic system. An employer may alternatively use a vehicle or powered mobile equipment that uses an automatic fire suppression system and associated automatic engine shutdown approved by a Director.

Section 693.4 requires employers to ensure roadways and linings of a conveyor transfer or loading points in an underground mine are constructed of non-combustible materials or are otherwise made fire-resistant.

Change A:

To improve health and safety, it proposed to add a new requirement to ensure equipment and supplies brought into an underground mine are fire resistant, stored in a fire-resistant enclosure or removed from the underground mine if they may create a fire or explosion hazard.

45. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.3 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 693.3 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 693.3 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

**What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change A)?
(Select only one) ***

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To remove duplication, it is proposed to consolidate requirements for ensuring ventilation components and conveyor material transfer points are made of non-combustible material or are treated to make them fire resistant in the current sections 693.4 and section 693.3.

46. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.3 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 693.3 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 693.3 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To improve clarity and ensure employers have the ability to use the appropriate mechanism to control dust, it is proposed to change "dust suppression devices" to "dust suppression system".

47. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.3 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 693.3 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 693.3 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change D:

To clarify the intent of the requirement, it is proposed to change "permanently attended monitoring station" to the health and safety outcome which is "continuously monitored."

48. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.3 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change D to section 693.3 would create an error. *

Describe how Change D to section 693.3 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change E:

To improve clarity as to the types of equipment hydraulic fluids may be used in, it is proposed to revise "Subsection (5) does not apply to the following vehicle and powered mobile equipment components" to "Despite (5), non fire resistant hydraulic fluids can be used in the following components."

49. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.3 (Change E)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change E)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change E to section 693.3 would create an error. *

Describe how Change E to section 693.3 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change E)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change F:

To reduce burden on employers to apply for an approval, it is proposed to remove the requirement for a vehicle or powered mobile equipment that uses an automatic fire suppression system and associated automatic engine shutdown which does not meet the referenced technical standard to be approved by a statutory director and instead require an employer to ensure such systems meet specifications certified by a professional engineer.

50. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.3 (Change F)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change F)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change F to section 693.3 would create an error. *

Describe how Change F to section 693.3 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.3 (Change F)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

51. The OHS Code uses the terms “fireproof” and “fire resistant” in Part 36, including in section 693.3. In the context of these requirements, which term is best reflective of the requirements and why?

Part 36 – Mining (Section 693.5)

Currently section 693.5 requires an employer to ensure adequate clearance is maintained between the bottom rollers of conveyor belt systems and the floor of the roadway to permit workers to safely remove spilled material. If the clearance is obtained by mounting the conveyor belt system on pillars, the pillars must be either non-combustible or otherwise made fire-resistant.

To improve clarity, it is proposed to specify the requirement applies where a fire or explosion hazard exists or may exist to recognize that fire and explosion hazards may not be present in some underground mines.

52. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.5? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.5? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 693.5 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 693.5 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 693.5? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 693.8)

Currently, section 693.8 requires an employer to ensure that:

- A water supply system used for fire suppression is designed and constructed to, and meets specifications certified by a professional engineer.
- A water supply system is available at all times to supply water to all areas of the underground mine at the pressure and volume necessary for firefighting.
- The power supply for the water supply system is independent of the main electrical system.
- The supply control valves are located at appropriate intervals in the intake air roadways, if any component of the water supply system is located in a return air roadway.

Change A:

To improve clarity and add the flexibility to use systems that do not use water to extinguish fires in an underground mine, it is proposed to change “water supply system used for fire suppression to “fire detection and fire extinguishing systems” throughout the section.

53. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.8 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.8 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 693.8 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 693.8 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

**What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.8 (Change A)?
(Select only one) ***

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To ensure that installed fire detection and fire extinguishing systems are operating properly, it is proposed to add a new requirement that fire detection and fire extinguishing systems be tested to ensure they meet specifications certified by a professional engineer.

54. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.8 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.8 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 693.8 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 693.8 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.8 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To improve clarity as to the intent of the requirement, it is proposed to change "water supply system is available at all times to supply water to all areas of the underground mine at the pressure and volume necessary for firefighting" to "fire detection and extinguishing system required under subsection (1) is available at all times to all areas of the underground mine for firefighting".

55. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 693.8 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 693.8 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 693.8 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 693.8 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 693.8 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 694)

Currently, section 694 requires an employer to ensure areas at the surface with ignition hazards are clearly marked.

Change A:

To improve clarity as to the intended outcome for the requirement, it is proposed to change “ignition hazards” to “fire or explosion hazards” in the section.

56. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 694 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 694 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 694 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 694 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 694 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To ensure work site parties are responsible for preventing fire and explosion hazards by not bringing sources of ignition into marked areas, it is proposed to add responsibilities for employers to ensure ignition sources are not brought into the marked area and for workers to not bring ignition sources into the marked area.

57. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 694 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 694 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 694 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 694 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 694 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 695)

Currently, section 695 requires the employer to ensure underground propane installations are installed and maintained in accordance with the Safety Codes Act.

To improve clarity, it is proposed to change the reference to the Safety Codes Act to the appropriate technical standards for propane installations (CSA B149.1:25, Natural Gas and Propane Installation Code” and CSA B149.2:25 Propane Storage and Handling Code) in the Safety Codes Act.

58. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 695? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 695? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 695 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 695 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 695? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 696, 704, 705)

Currently requirements for bulk fuel storage are split between sections 696, 704 and 705 in Part 36.

Section 696: Bulk fuel storage

An employer must ensure that bulk fuel storage facilities are not located underground, located on a surface that is impervious to the substances being stored, and are designed, constructed and maintained to prevent fuel from unintentionally entering the underground mine.

Section 704: Underground fuel locations

An employer must ensure that no bulk fuel is stored underground. However, if bulk fuel storage is required underground, an employer must ensure designated underground fuel stations are designed and constructed to and meet specifications certified by a professional engineer, which must include controls to prevent spills and associated hazards.

An employer and supervisor must ensure diesel fuel tanks of vehicles and equipment that must be filled underground are filled only at designated underground fuel stations.

Section 705: Diesel fuel

An employer must ensure:

- The quantity of diesel fuel stored at a designated underground fuel station is not greater than the quantity of fuel required for 24 hours' work.
- Diesel fuel is prevented from spilling while the fuel tanks are filled.
- All empty diesel fuel containers are removed from an underground mine daily.

Spilled oil, diesel fuel or any other combustible or flammable liquid is immediately taken up with a non-flammable absorbent material that is deposited in a fireproof receptacle, and removed from an underground mine at intervals of not more than every three days.

To improve clarity and reduce duplication, it is proposed to consolidate existing requirements for bulk fuel storage into one section without changing the requirements. Requirements for cleaning up spilled fuels (currently in section 705) will become a stand alone requirement in the updated section 696.1.

59. Do you agree with the proposed consolidated changes to the bulk fuel storage requirements?

(Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed consolidation? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed consolidation would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed consolidation is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed consolidation? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 697)

Currently, section 697 requires the employer to ensure that a communication system:

- Is installed between a permanently attended monitoring station at the surface and underground locations where workers may be located.
- Has a separate back-up power supply that operates if there is a power failure.
- Has an alarm that, in the case of an emergency, is initiated from the permanently attended monitoring station at the surface and activated to warn workers.

This does not apply to exploration drivages from the surface where visual or audible communication with the workers can be maintained while the workers are underground.

To improve clarity as to the type of system covered by this requirement, it is proposed to change "permanently attended monitoring station" with "continuously monitored communication system".

60. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 697? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 697? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 697 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 697 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 697? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 697.1)

Currently, section 697.1 requires the employer to ensure that battery charging stations are:

- Not located underground
- Located in a well-ventilated area to prevent the accumulation of flammable gases
- Used, installed, assembled, operated, serviced, stored, tested and maintained in accordance with and otherwise meet specifications certified by a professional engineer.

An employer must ensure that batteries are not repaired in an underground location or in a hazardous location.

Change A:

To future proof requirement to allow electric vehicles to be used in underground mines, it is proposed to remove the prohibition on battery charging stations underground, and require battery charging stations to be used, installed, assembled, operated, serviced, stored, tested, and maintained, in accordance with CSA Standard M421-23- Use of electricity in mines.

61. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 697.1 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 697.1 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 697.1 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 697.1 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 697.1 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To future proof requirements and improve health and safety since charging stations could be located underground, it is proposed to remove the prohibition on repairing charging stations underground and add "repair" to the list of activities that must be done in accordance with CSA Standard M421-23- Use of electricity in mines.

62. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 697.1 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 697.1 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 697.1 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 697.1 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 697.1 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 697.2)

Currently, section 697.2 requires an employer to ensure that only an electrician energizes and de-energizes electrical systems at an underground mine. However, an employer must ensure workers are able to energize and de-energize electrical systems at an underground mine in the event of an emergency when an electrician is not available.

It also requires an employer at a work site where coal is mined to ensure electrical distribution switchgear is not located nearer to the working face than the last ventilated cross cut.

To improve clarity of the intended outcome for the requirement and address applicability to non-coal mines, it is proposed to clarify the requirement applies where a fire or explosion hazard exists or may exist and remove the reference to coal mining in the provision.

63. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 697.2? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 697.2? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 697.2 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 697.2 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 697.2? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 697.4)

Currently, section 697.4 requires the employer to ensure that diesel-powered equipment used in an underground mine is certified by the United States Mine Safety and Health Administration or certified by a professional engineer to meet:

- CSA Standard M424.1-16, Flameproof non-rail-bound, diesel-powered machines for use in gassy underground coal mines
- CSA Standard M424.2-16, Non-rail-bound diesel-powered machines for use in non-gassy underground mines
- United States Mine Safety and Health Administration 30 CFR (2002).

Change A:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the referenced technical standard to the most current version CSA Standard M424.1-22, Flameproof non-rail-bound, diesel-powered machines for use in gassy underground coal mines.

64. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 697.4 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 697.4 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 697.4 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 697.4 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 697.4 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the referenced technical standard to the most current version CSA Standard M424.2-22, Diesel-powered machines for use in non-gassy underground mines.

65. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 697.4 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 697.4 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 697.4 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 697.4 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 697.4 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the referenced technical standard to the most current version United States Mine Safety and Health Administration 30 CFR (2026).

66. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 697.4 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 697.4 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 697.4 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 697.4 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 697.4 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 700)

Currently, section 700 requires an employer to ensure that all parts of a portal are constructed of non-combustible materials and are designed and constructed to specifications certified by a professional engineer.

An employer must ensure that, before a portal is constructed, a professional engineer prepares and certifies a portal construction plan that:

- Includes drawings, diagrams and instructions detailing the design of the portal.
- Specifies how the portal is to be safely constructed and positioned while protecting workers from falling or collapsing ground.

Change A:

To add the health and safety outcome and reflect there may be additional factors and hazards than currently listed which may need to be considered by the professional engineer in the design of a portal based on the circumstances of the work site, it is proposed to remove prescriptive rules related to what the professional engineer must consider when preparing the portal construction plan and instead require the design to protect the health and safety of workers.

67. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 700 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 700 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 700 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 700 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 700 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To ensure the location of portals are considered in the engineer's specifications, it is proposed to add "located" to the list of items the employer must ensure are done in accordance with professional engineer's specifications ("designed, located and constructed").

68. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 700 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 700 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 700 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 700 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 700 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 701)

Currently, section 701 requires the employer to ensure there are at least two separate and independent outlets by which workers can exit an underground mine. This does not apply to:

- A new underground mine where entrances to a mine or outlets are being constructed.
- A location where the mine voice communication system is in the process of being constructed between mine openings.
- A location where ground is being excavated for the purposes of searching for or proving mineral deposits.

An employer must ensure the outlets are designed and constructed to and meet specifications certified by a professional engineer, which must include the provision of at least one outlet that will allow egress of workers in the event of any reasonably foreseeable incident.

If there is only one exit from an area of an underground mine where work is being done, an employer must ensure that only those workers necessary to complete the work are present.

To improve clarity as to the sequence of steps the employer needs to take and ensure the location of outlets is considered in the engineer's specifications, it is proposed to reorder the existing subsections (1) and (2) and add "located" to the list of items the employer must ensure are done in accordance with professional engineer's specifications ("designed, located and constructed"). Editorial changes are also proposed to streamline wording ("which must include the provision of at least one outlet that will allow egress of workers in the event of any reasonably foreseeable incident" is proposed to be changed to "to ensure workers have means of egress in the event of an incident").

69. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 701? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 701? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 701 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 701 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 701? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 702.1)

Currently, section 702.1 requires an employer to ensure that there are refuge stations located at strategic places in an underground mine, that those refuge stations are designed and installed in accordance with and otherwise meet specifications certified by a professional engineer, are of sufficient size to accommodate the number of workers who may need to use them in the event of an emergency, available to and accessible by workers in the event of an emergency, and stocked with sufficient supplies to provide necessities of life for the foreseeable duration of an emergency.

To improve health and safety, it is proposed to add a new requirement to ensure workers have what they need to be safe in an emergency by requiring employers to ensure “supplies, equipment and personal protective equipment” are provided in a refuge station, rather than just “supplies”.

70. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 702.1? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 702.1? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 702.1 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 702.1 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 702.1? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 703.2)

Currently, section 703.2 requires an employer to ensure a mock exercise for evacuation of an underground mine is conducted with all workers at least annually, and a report is made of the exercise, including identifying any remedial actions undertaken to address any deficiencies.

To reflect mock training exercises may be required more or less frequently depending on the conditions of the work site, it is proposed to change the required frequency for a mock evacuation exercise from “annually” to “reasonably practicable intervals”.

71. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 703.2? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 703.2? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 703.2 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 703.2 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 703.2? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 707)

Currently, section 707 sets out the requirements for geotechnical analysis for the strata and structures and the design of support systems in an underground mine. An employer must ensure that stability of the support system is maintained when supports are installed, maintained or removed.

An employer and underground mine manager must ensure that the removal of any supports is performed in accordance with the professional engineer's specifications.

Change A:

To improve health and safety, it is proposed to change "if an entry or roadway is to be excavated" to "if an excavation occurs" as a geotechnical analysis is required in all ground disturbances to ensure the mine structure is not compromised. Reference to the term "roadway" is also proposed to be removed throughout the section.

72. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 707 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 707 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 707 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 707 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 707 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To clarify requirements, it is proposed to reorganize provisions for the geotechnical analysis to separate out unique requirements, add a requirement that the geotechnical analysis be done before excavation commences and align with language in the OHS Act for reports ("made" versus "prepared").

73. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 707 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 707 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 707 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 707 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 707 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To clarify requirements, it is proposed to change “removal of any supports” to “removal of any pillars and support equipment” to reflect that temporary supports must also be removed following the engineer’s specifications. In addition, the intent of the procedures, which is to prevent the hazard of collapse or failure is proposed to be added.

74. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 707 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 707 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 707 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 707 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 707 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 711)

Currently, section 711 requires an employer to ensure a mechanical ventilation system is designed, constructed and installed to and meets specifications certified by a professional engineer, which must include:

- Construction of the mechanical ventilation system and equipment.
- Provision of a sufficient supply of fresh air to work areas.
- Control of airborne dust.
- Control of exposure to harmful substances or the creation of hazardous conditions.
- Prevention of the build-up of flammable and combustible substances in the air.

An employer must develop and implement safe operating procedures for the mechanical ventilation system to specifications certified by a professional engineer, which must include:

- Maintenance of the ventilation system and equipment.
- Maintenance of air pressure, air flow and velocity.
- Provision of sufficient ventilation.
- Testing requirements.
- Location of testing.
- Frequency of testing and maintenance.

An employer must ensure that a competent worker reviews maintenance and testing performed to verify the mechanical ventilation system is operating in accordance with the safe operating procedures.

Change A:

To ensure any ventilation system used in an underground mine is properly designed, it is proposed to change "mechanical ventilation system" to "ventilation system" throughout the section.

75. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 711 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 711 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 711 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 711 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 711 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To align with defined terminology in the OHS Code for “flammable substances,” it is proposed to change “flammable and combustible substances” to “flammable substances”.

76. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 711 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 711 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 711 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 711 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 711 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To ensure requirements for safe operating procedures are clear and cover all areas they need to, it is proposed to make the following changes:

- "Maintenance of the ventilation system and equipment" is proposed to be changed to "maintenance of the ventilation system".
- "Maintenance of air pressure" is proposed to be changed to "regulation of air pressure".
- A "catch-all" provision is proposed to be added ("any other thing that is required to ensure the safe operation of the mechanical ventilation system").

77. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 711 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 711 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 711 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 711 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 711 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change D:

To ensure the review of the maintenance and testing is done when it needs to be, and clarify the intent of the review, it is proposed to make the following changes:

- The review must be completed at “reasonably practicable intervals”.
- The review must verify the system is operating “properly”.
- The intended outcome for the review is added to ensure the system “does not create a hazard to workers”.

78. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 711 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 711 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change D to section 711 would create an error. *

Describe how Change D to section 711 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 711 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 712)

Currently, section 712 requires an employer to ensure a ventilation system in an underground mine maintains a minimum air velocity at working faces to prevent methane layering from occurring.

To enhance health and safety and address the hazard of potential buildup of substances other than methane such as combustible dusts or diesel exhaust, it is proposed to add the requirement that a ventilation system in an underground mine maintains a minimum air velocity at working faces to "prevent other hazards to workers from occurring".

79. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 712? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 712? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 712 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 712 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 712? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 716)

Currently, section 716 requires an employer to ensure:

- Worked out or inaccessible areas of an underground mine are sealed off as soon as reasonably practicable after an area has been worked out or becomes inaccessible
- Seals are designed, constructed and installed to, and otherwise meet specifications certified by a professional engineer, which must include the measures to be taken to contain fires, spontaneous heating or other hazards to workers
- A seal is monitored to ensure that a hazard to workers is not created
- If a hazard to workers is detected at the seal, all work that may be impacted by the hazard stops, except for work necessary to eliminate or control the hazard.

Change A:

To recognize hazards for coal and non-coal underground mines may be different, it is proposed to apply the requirement to seal worked out or inaccessible areas to coal mines only. A requirement for non-coal mines is proposed to be added to consider worked out or inaccessible areas as unsafe areas for the purposes of section 689 which requires unsafe areas to have signage and be fenced, cordoned or taped off to prevent entrance.

80. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 716 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 716 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 716 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 716 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 716 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To improve clarity of requirements and employer responsibilities where there is a hazard at a mine seal to a worked out area, it is proposed to make the following changes:

- "All work that may be impacted by the hazard stops" is proposed to be changed to "all work in the affected area is stopped and workers are withdrawn to a safe distance".
- The provision that the requirement to withdraw workers does not apply to work necessary to control or eliminate the hazard is split into a new subsection.

81. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 716 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 716 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 716 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 716 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 716 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 718)

Currently, section 718 requires an employer to ensure that an underground portion of a mine is divided into splits, and each split and each working face in a split is supplied with a separate current of fresh air.

To recognize fire and explosion hazards may not be present in some underground mines, it is proposed to specify the requirement for splits applies where there is or may be a flammable substance in an underground mine.

82. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 718? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 718? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 718 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 718 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 718? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 719)

Currently, section 719 requires an employer to ensure:

- All main fans are monitored with automatic continuous ventilating pressure monitoring devices that are checked daily.
- A mine has a standby main fan.
- A mine has an emergency power supply capable of running the main fans if the principal power source fails.

Change A:

To ensure the health and safety outcome is clear, it is proposed to add that the purpose of the inspection is to ensure the fans are operating properly.

83. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 719 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 719 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 719 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 719 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 719 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To ensure the health and safety outcome is clear, it is proposed to specify that the standby fan must be able to be put into service immediately should the main fan fail.

84. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 719 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 719 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 719 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 719 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 719 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 721)

Currently, section 721 requires an employer to ensure that main surface ventilating fans are offset by not less than 5 metres from the nearest side of the mine opening and have noncombustible air ducts and housing. The mine opening must be protected by one or more weak walls or explosion doors, or a combination of weak walls and explosion doors, located in direct line with possible explosive forces.

The main surface ventilating fan may be located directly in front of or over a mine opening if:

- The opening is not in a direct line with possible air blasts coming out of the mine; and
- There is another opening not less than 5 metres and not more than 30 metres from the fan opening that is in a direct line with possible air blasts coming out of the mine and has explosion doors.

Change A:

To clarify the health and safety outcome, it is proposed to clarify that employers must ensure that the fans are positioned in such a way that they are protected from dangerous energy releases and positioned so they cannot impede access or egress of workers from the area.

85. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 721 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 721 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 721 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 721 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 721 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To recognize that fire and explosion hazards may not be present in some underground mines, it is proposed to clarify the requirement to protect outlets from explosive energy applies where there is or may be the presence of a flammable substance.

86. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 721 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 721 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 721 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 721 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 721 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To recognize there may be more ways to control explosive forces, it is proposed to change "one or more weak walls or explosion doors, or a combination of weak walls and explosion doors, located in direct line with possible explosive forces" to "by structures or doors designed to absorb the possible explosive forces".

87. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 721 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 721 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 721 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 721 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 721 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 722)

Currently, section 722 requires an employer to ensure a booster fan does not restrict the free passage of air delivered by a main fan if the booster fan stops, stops if a main fan stops and is continuously monitored by a system that alarms at a permanently attended monitoring station if the fan stops or its performance falls below an established efficiency level.

88. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 722? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 722? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 722 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 722 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 722? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 723)

Currently, section 723 requires an employer to ensure that an auxiliary fan is electrically grounded. The employer must ensure a heading has an auxiliary ventilation system or a system of line brattices to direct ventilation so that the face of the heading is swept by the ventilating air supply if the heading is advanced more than 10 metres from the main ventilation circuit, and has a raise or sub-drift that is more than 10 metres from the main ventilation circuit. The distance must be measured from the nearest rib. If a heading to be ventilated is less than 200 metres long, the auxiliary fan interlock requirement of clause 7.2.3 of CSA Standard M421-16 (R2021), Use of electricity in mines, does not apply.

Change A:

To clarify the health and safety outcome for the operation of the ventilation system, it is proposed to change prescriptive requirements for how the ventilation system is to be operated with the health and safety outcome for the operation. Specifically, the requirements to advance more than 10 metres from the main ventilation circuit, has a raise or sub-drift that is more than 10 metres from the main ventilation circuit, and measure the distance from the nearest rib is proposed to be changed to “is moved in conjunction with the working face to maintain the sufficient supply of fresh air to work areas and is as close to the working face as is reasonably practicable.”

89. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 723 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 723 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 723 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 723 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 723 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To reflect best practices for health and safety, it is proposed to update the referenced technical standard CSA Standard M421-16 to the more current version CSA Standard M421-23, Use of electricity in mines.

90. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 723 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 723 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 723 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 723 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 723 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 724)

Currently, section 724 requires that if brattice or vent tubes are used to ventilate the working face, an employer must ensure the brattice or vent tubes are kept as close as reasonably practicable to the working face.

An employer must ensure any ventilation control devices used in an underground mine that have the potential for electrical static discharge, including brattices or vent tubes, are constructed of materials that meet CSA Standard M427-M91 (R2016), Fire-performance and antistatic requirements for ventilation materials.

To improve health and safety, it is proposed to introduce a new requirement for both employers and workers to ensure that workers are alerted before powered mobile equipment moves through a brattice curtain.

91. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 724? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 724? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 724 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 724 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 724? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 725)

Currently, section 725 requires an employer to ensure that if a fan associated with the ventilation system stops, workers in affected areas are immediately moved to a place that is adequately ventilated, and a competent worker tests and inspects the affected area to ensure it is adequately ventilated before workers enter or return to the area.

This requirement does not apply to the competent worker who must enter the affected area to conduct the testing and inspection.

To clarify health and safety intent of the requirement, it is proposed to specify that the place workers are moved to when the ventilation system stops is adequately ventilated with a source of fresh air.

92. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 725? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 725? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 725 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 725 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 725? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 730, 731, 732)

Currently, section 730 requires an employer to ensure when workers are present underground, a competent worker:

- Is located underground.
- Carries at all times a gas testing device for methane, carbon monoxide and oxygen.
- Within 4 hours of each shift commencing work, uses the device to inspect that part of the underground mine being worked, or intended to be worked, and all related roadways.
- Inspects for gas at the working face of every work area, at the edge of the gob, in roof cavities and anywhere else that gas may accumulate, at reasonably practicable intervals.

An employer must ensure that the competent worker makes a report on the conditions of the areas inspected and provides the report to the employer and a supervisor as soon as possible.

Currently, section 732 requires an employer to ensure a competent worker tests the air flow and the percentage of flammable or combustible gas present in the air at least once each week, and whenever an alteration is made in the quantity of air circulating. If a diesel vehicle is operated in an underground mine.

Change A:

To improve health and safety, it is proposed to add a requirement for an employer to ensure a competent worker tests the atmosphere in an underground mine and expand the list of substances which must be tested for to carbon monoxide, lower explosive limit, oxygen and any other harmful substance that does or may exist. Methane is removed from the list of substances which are specifically identified for testing as this would be captured by testing for lower explosive limit.

93. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 730 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 730 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 730 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 730 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 730 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To improve clarity, it is proposed to separate out the requirements for where testing must be done into a stand alone subsection.

94. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 730 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 730 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 730 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 730 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 730 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To remove duplication, it is proposed to consolidate requirements in sections 730 and 732 related to testing when diesel vehicles are operating in an underground mine into this section. Some editorial changes are also proposed (added "tested" and "in an underground mine" changed "flammable and combustible gases" to "flammable substances").

95. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 730 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 730 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 730 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 730 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 730 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change D:

To improve clarity and ensure testing is done as soon as possible once the work shift begins, it is proposed to move the existing subsection (1) to after the provisions on what to test for and where to do testing and make the following changes:

- Change "gas testing device" to "gas testing equipment" and "device" to "equipment".
- Add that the worker must carry equipment capable of monitoring for carbon monoxide, lower explosive limit, oxygen and any other harmful substance that exists or may exist.
- Change the time requirements for the testing from "within 4 hours of each shift commencing" to "as soon as possible after the work commences."
- Change the term "inspect" to "test".
- Change "roadways" to "passageways".

96. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 730 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 730 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change D to section 730 would create an error. *

Describe how Change D to section 730 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 730 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Section 731

Currently, section 731 requires an employer to ensure specific controls are in place to monitor and control flammable and/or combustible gas levels to ensure they do not exceed 40 percent of the lower explosive limit.

Section 732 requires an employer to ensure that a competent worker tests the air flow and the percentage of flammable or combustible gas present in the air at least once each week, and whenever an alteration is made in the quantity of air circulating if a diesel vehicle is operated in an underground mine.

If the percentage of flammable or combustible gas measured exceeds 15 percent of the lower explosive limit, an employer must ensure a competent worker performs further tests, and immediately notifies the employer and a supervisor of the results of the tests.

If the percentage of flammable or combustible gas tested exceeds 15 percent of the lower explosive limit continuously over a 24-hour period, an employer must install a system for the continuous monitoring of flammable and combustible gases.

An employer must ensure the continuous monitoring continues until the percentage of flammable or combustible gas measured is less than 15 percent of the lower explosive limit, or a system for the continuous monitoring of flammable or combustible gas is installed.

Change A:

It is proposed to clarify the requirement for monitoring applies where a fire or explosion hazard exists or may exist to recognize that fire and explosion hazards may not be present in some underground mines.

97. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 731 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 731 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 731 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 731 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 731 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To clarify the intent that air testing is required when any type of engine is operated in an underground mine, it is proposed to remove the qualifier "diesel" on the requirement that diesel engines not be used if the amount of flammable or combustible gas in the air exceeds 20 percent of the lower explosive limit.

98. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 731 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 731 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 731 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 731 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 731 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To remove duplication and consolidate like requirements, it is proposed to consolidate requirements from section 732 (2), (3) and (4) related to thresholds for where additional monitoring is required or changes to the operation of equipment is required. These requirements would be incorporated into section 731.

99. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 731 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 731 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 731 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 731 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 731 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 738)

Currently, section 738 requires an employer to ensure that coal-cutting equipment is equipped with detection equipment that continuously monitors the levels of flammable and combustible gases and outlines specific requirements for features and functions that detection equipment must have, including that it automatically cuts off power to the cutting head if the level of flammable or combustible gas reaches 25 percent of the lower explosive limit.

To recognize that fire and explosion hazards may not be present in some underground mines, it is proposed to clarify the requirement for detection equipment and alarms apply where there is or may be the presence of flammable or combustible gases.

100. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 738? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 738? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 738 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 738 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 738? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 741)

Currently, section 741 requires employers to ensure that any roof bolting equipment has specific safety features to address fire and explosive hazards.

To recognize that fire and explosion hazards may not be present in some underground mines, it is proposed to clarify the requirement for monitoring, controls and alarms for roof bolting equipment apply where a fire or explosion hazard exists or may exist.

101. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 741? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 741? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how the proposed change to section 741 would create an error. *

Describe how the proposed change to section 741 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed change to section 741? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 742)

Currently, section 742 requires employers to ensure there is a water supply designed to suppress airborne dust where a mineral is transferred from a conveyor to a chute, a vehicle or another conveyor, and at the cutting teeth or picks of coal-cutting equipment, and exemptions to the requirement.

Employers must ensure that a roadway used by rubber-tired vehicles is treated or wetted to minimize the creation of airborne dust, and that there is an ongoing program for monitoring the concentration of respirable dust to which workers are exposed.

Change A:

To improve health and safety, it is proposed to add a new requirement to allow employers to use other dust suppression systems that are equally effective to water suppression systems.

102. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 742 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 742 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 742 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 742 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 742 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To clarify employer responsibilities, it is proposed to remove the employer responsibility to “design” the dust suppression system. The employer is responsible to ensure the system is effective, not design it.

103. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 742 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 742 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 742 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 742 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 742 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To reflect that dust must be controlled so that it does not become airborne, it is proposed to remove the "airborne" qualify on dust in the section.

104. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 742 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 742 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 742 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 742 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 742 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change D:

To reflect occupational exposure limits for airborne dusts which must be complied with, it is proposed to change "respirable dust" to "airborne dust." For airborne dusts there are both respirable and total occupational exposure limits.

105. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 742 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 742 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change D to section 742 would create an error. *

Describe how Change D to section 742 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 742 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 743)

Currently, section 743 requires the employer to ensure:

- Accumulation of combustible dust in an underground mine is kept as low as reasonably practicable.
- Stone dusting application and dust testing procedures are developed to specifications certified by a professional engineer that include the measures to be taken to ensure all combustible dust is rendered inert.
- Any part of a roadway is cleaned as thoroughly as reasonably practicable of all combustible dust before that part is treated for the first time with incombustible dust.
- The floor, roof and sides of a roadway that is accessible to workers are treated with incombustible dust.

This section does not apply to the part of a roadway within 10 metres of the working face while coal cutting is in progress.

Change A:

To improve clarity, it is proposed to change “roadway” to “mine” in the application provision as the requirements apply outside 10 metres of the working face.

106. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 743 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 743 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 743 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 743 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 743 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To recognize that fire and explosion hazards may not be present in some underground mines, it is proposed to clarify the requirement for dusting with incombustible dust apply where a combustible dust may be present.

107. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 743 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 743 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 743 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 743 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 743 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Part 36 – Mining (Section 745)

Currently, section 745 requires an employer to develop an explosion prevention plan to specifications certified by a professional engineer that includes the measures to be taken for the design, erection, location and maintenance of an explosion barrier.

Section 745 also requires an employer to ensure that the condition and position of the explosion barriers are inspected by a competent person at reasonably practicable intervals.

Change A:

To clarify employer responsibilities, it is proposed to change “develop” to “ensure” at the beginning of the section as the employer does not develop the plan but rather ensures it is developed.

108. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 745 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 745 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change A to section 745 would create an error. *

Describe how Change A to section 745 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 745 (Change A)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change B:

To recognize that fire and explosion hazards may not be present in some underground mines, it is proposed to clarify the requirement for the explosion prevent plan applies where a fire or explosion hazard exists or may exist.

109. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 745 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 745 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change B to section 745 would create an error. *

Describe how Change B to section 745 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 745 (Change B)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change C:

To ensure the requirements in Part 3, Specifications and Certifications apply to the plan certified by the engineer and improve clarity, it is proposed to reword requirements for the professional engineer certification to match wording in Part 3. The details on what the plan must contain would be moved to a new stand-alone section.

110. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 745 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 745 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change C to section 745 would create an error. *

Describe how Change C to section 745 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 745 (Change C)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Change D:

To clarify worker responsibilities, it is proposed to change "person" to "worker," as it is a worker who must inspect the explosion barrier.

111. Do you agree with the proposed change to section 745 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Agree, as proposed
- Agree, with modifications
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree

Why are modifications necessary for the proposed changes to section 745 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes create a technical or editorial error
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Prefer a different approach (please specify)

Describe how Change D to section 745 would create an error. *

Describe how Change D to section 745 is not practicable for this industry or activity. *

Prefer a different approach (please specify)

What is the main reason you disagree with the proposed changes to section 745 (Change D)? (Select only one) *

- Changes are too prescriptive
- Changes are not prescriptive enough
- Changes reduce worker safety
- Changes introduce additional administrative burden
- Changes introduce additional costs
- Changes are not practical for this industry or activity
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Section 3: Conclusion

112. How was your experience sharing your feedback today? (Select only one) *

- Very poor
- Poor
- Acceptable
- Good
- Very good

Why was your experience very poor?

Why was your experience poor?

Why was your experience good?

Why was your experience very good?
