



**Announcer:**

It's time for the *IHSA Safety Podcast*.

Ken Rayner:

Welcome to the *IHSA Safety Podcast*. I'm your host, Ken Rayner.

On this episode of the podcast, we're very happy to welcome back IHSA's Manager of Strategic Programs, Maren Gamble. Today we're going to get into the ABC's of hazards, risks, assessment and controls. Maren, with your background in implementing an occupational health and safety management system at a general contractor and getting it COR<sup>®</sup> certified, and your work at IHSA as both a COR<sup>®</sup> consultant and a COR<sup>®</sup> auditor, and now the manager overseeing our Health and Safety Excellence program (HSEp), boy, you are a terrific resource to guide us on this discussion.

Maren, this podcast today: hazards, risks, assessment and controls. Where do you want to start?

**Maren Gamble:**

That's always the question with these topics, Ken. Thank you for having me in to be able to talk about them today because really hazards, risks, assessment and controls, these are truly the heart of an occupational health and safety management system.

Fundamentally, we're just looking for things that can cause harm in the workplace and then also trying to prevent that harm from actually happening in our workplace. This is a big topic though. I mean there's four words to encompass describing it here that we've been listing off. Honestly, this can be incredibly overwhelming to someone who's getting started in building a system, even someone who's more advanced in building a system when you're looking at a new topic that you've never explored before. What we really want to accomplish with our conversation today is to look at it a little bit more step-by- step, break it down a little more, and work through how to approach this part of a system systematically.

In order to really have a good conversation about it though, Ken, I think that we need to outline for our listeners what we're not talking about today.

**Ken Rayner:**

Okay.

**Maren Gamble:**

What we're not talking about today is stuff that falls into the category of, say, workplace inspection or hazard reporting. What the distinction there is when we're talking about inspecting a workplace, we're talking about an active workplace. Work is already going. Things are already in play, and it's a live, organic environment. At that point if we identify something that can harm us, it's a reactive response that we're taking. We're definitely going to react to it and work to control that as well, but it's after the fact. This is a reactive response because the hazard is already in play affecting an active worksite.

Same thing with hazard reporting. If someone spots a hazard outside of an active inspection, it's still a reactive response to those hazards in the workplace. What you and I are planning to chat about today when we say hazards, risks, assessment, and controls, are actually the proactive piece of the puzzle here. What can we do in the theatre of the mind, if you will, ahead of the job actually starting?

Instead of the work being live and there being real people doing the work, what can we predict and foresee being the risks that are out there and plan for ahead of time?

**Ken Rayner:**

Okay, and Maren, I know in terms of what we're going to talk about with say hazards and risks and controls and assessment, this part is the proactive piece, and it's the start of the process. If we don't get this part right, regardless of our system or anything else we have, it's really not going to give us the impact and the effect we want. It's like if I was to bake something today and I didn't use the right ingredients, regardless of anything else, the equipment I have or how great of an oven I have or any of those type of things, the mixers, it's not going to make a difference because it's not going to turn out the way we want. Is that fair?

**Maren Gamble:**

That's totally fair, Ken. I feel like you and I talk about baking a lot when we do these podcasts. It always leaves me feeling a little bit peckish. I think it's great. I do compare systems to baking a lot of the time because I think it's a good example.

Another example that we could talk about today, Ken, in terms of discussing the difference between that reactive and proactive side of things, I think of this a lot like baby-proofing a house. If you have an infant come into your household, right about the time that they're starting to move around on their own, crawling, pulling up on things, walking around your house, it really becomes a crunch time to try and figure out what are the things that could hurt that little person and actually put things in play to prevent them from getting harmed in the household.

For those that don't identify with baby-proofing, Ken, I think it's very similar if you get a new pet, puppy-proofing, kitten-proofing, any of those things. You're really taking on the perspective of this individual in your household, or animal, and thinking how could they get hurt?

In the baby proofing example, we might even crawl. I know some of the baby books say you crawl around the house at their level to see what they're going to see. Is there furniture that can tip over? Are there outlets they could stick their fingers in? Is there a cupboard where you keep your chemicals that they could get into? Any of those things that can come up, you're actually just going through that

thought experiment to say how can I prevent this young life from engaging with those things, rather than having them experience the harm and then reacting to it.

**Ken Rayner:**

Okay. Okay, we've talked about what is in scope for this episode of the podcast and what we're not going to talk about. We're really talking about the proactive piece, right?

**Maren Gamble:**

Yeah.

**Ken Rayner:**

Okay, so now we're talking about the proactive piece, Maren. What do you want to talk about next?

**Maren Gamble:**

The first thing I have to acknowledge is when we talk about hazards, risks, assessment and controls, when you hear these day-to-day in the health and safety world, certainly out of the health and safety world, they're used a lot interchangeably. They're not really used with a ton of distinction between what each of them is.

I think of it in terms of even the stuff that you'll see through participation in various IHSA programs. You'll see a lot of these words. Say in the COR<sup>®</sup> program, there's an element "hazard and risk assessment and control". There's another one that's controls. In the Health and Safety Excellence program, you've got hazard identification, risk assessment. You've got workplace inspections. You've got control of hazards. You can hear a lot of these words that our podcast is about appearing. Even in the field, if you hear the terms that are being used, you might have a field-level risk assessment, you might have a field-level hazard assessment.

We're using a lot of those words interchangeably because they are so closely linked. But when we're actually building the system, the specific definitions of each of those things actually do give us an extra set of tools to work with when we're actually developing these documents, these tools, these things that we're going to work with, if we dig into what is the distinction between a hazard and risk, what is an assessment fundamentally, what is a control?

I think that's really what I'd like to talk about with you first today, Ken, if I can.

**Ken Rayner:**

All right.

**Maren Gamble:**

What are they and how are they different?

The logical place to start is with hazards. Fundamentally, the way that I view it, is the hazard is the thing that can cause harm. The risk on the other hand is what sort of harm it can cause. The hazard itself is an

object, a condition that could cause harm but isn't actively an action or a result in itself. That's what the risk is.

There can be more than one risk for a single hazard. If you have a condition or a situation that is a hazard in your workplace, there might be more than one sort of harm that it can cause to the workers who are present. The thing is when we think about dangers in the workplace, our minds do really go to the risk first because it's what could happen. That's not a bad starting place, but it's always important that once we do that, that we also ask ourselves what was the hazard that existed to cause that risk for us? Because that way we can actually go to the root cause, if you will, to identify other risks that might be associated with the same hazard.

**Ken Rayner:**

Okay, so Maren, what about some examples we could use, and maybe could you give some examples maybe based on activities that take place in our membership? Then maybe also can you maybe just expand a little bit on, you said there can be more than one risk posed per hazard. Maybe can we just elaborate on that as well?

**Maren Gamble:**

Sure. I think an example would be really good here, Ken, because I know this can be, I mean the point of this podcast is the fact that these can be hard to distinguish. Let's think about a backing vehicle. I think that's a common hazard that we would experience across all industries.

**Ken Rayner:**

Of our industries, yeah, all of the industries, for sure. Yeah, great example.

**Maren Gamble:**

The backing vehicle in itself is a thing that could cause harm. If I said, "There's a backing vehicle, Ken," what's the first thing that comes to mind in terms of what could happen?

**Ken Rayner:**

Someone walking behind, or a person that doesn't see or hear the vehicle backing up. To me, that's the most likely one, right?

**Maren Gamble:**

I think you're absolutely right there. Right there we had an example of a hazard being a backing vehicle. A risk of that is that a person may be struck by that backing vehicle, but if I were to dig a little further and you and I were to brainstorm, if there's a backing vehicle, we can ask ourselves, is there anything else that could happen from that hazard?

**Ken Rayner:**

Right, is the bucket up on the backing vehicle?

**Maren Gamble:**

Interesting, very good question.

**Ken Rayner:**

Hmm.

**Maren Gamble:**

You might see that bucket striking property. We see that sometimes on roadways has happened. Maybe there's even a risk of injury to the driver if they were to collide with something within the vehicle. I think if we just talked about it for, I don't know, I wasn't checking the time, but 10 seconds. We came up with a list of three risks that are associated with one hazard of the backing vehicle.

This is where, just to summarize that so far, by looking at that hazard as the thing that can cause harm as that root cause and going from there into thinking about all the risks, we're taking a very systematic approach using those definitions to really make sure we're covering everything. If we'd started with the risk, which our mind might go to first that someone could be hit by something and never identified what the hazard was, we may not have picked up on those other items.

Should we do another one?

**Ken Rayner:**

Sure, yeah, let's do it.

**Maren Gamble:**

One that comes up a lot in different types of construction is use of scaffolds. Scaffold use can be a hazard that's going on in the workplace. Again, Ken, what's the first thing that comes to mind with scaffold use?

**Ken Rayner:**

Either somebody falling or an object falling from the scaffold props.

**Maren Gamble:**

Absolutely, and that could even be considered two different risks right off the top is scaffold use. We're thinking about something being at a level that is above ground level. Obviously, gravity exists out there and so it is associated with major risks that we talk about. But can we talk about other risks? I'd say there's a risk of collapse. Sometimes there's a risk of contact with electrical lines. Are we exploring all the risks? It's easier to do that once we know which hazard we're actually starting with.

One extra thing I want to talk about with you today, Ken, is the fact that sometimes the risks in a workplace can actually lead to additional hazards, which sounds a little bit complicated, but bear with me. What I'm talking about here is talking about impacts to our mental health in the workplace. Some of these risks that we were just talking about associated with a backing vehicle, associated with scaffold

use, associated with many of the other hazards that we see across our high-risk membership industries, there is the potential for serious incidents to happen, for serious injuries, fatalities, and various critical incidents. When these do happen, they introduce another hazard that we'd be remiss if we didn't mention and didn't consider. That hazard is the exposure to trauma in the workplace.

I think, I know there's some other amazing podcasts that you've done, Ken, with Kathy Martin, I believe, from IHSA that talk about the impacts of trauma in the workplace. I know she delves into the extensive risks that can be faced when there is exposure to trauma in the workplace. There are those secondary levels of consideration that we can get into too when we're exploring that.

**Ken Rayner:**

Hey, Maren, thank you so much for bringing that up. It was an enlightening podcast from Kathy. It was episode 70. It was entitled, "Trauma Management in the Workplace". For me, I can just speak personally, I know I, after doing that podcast with Kathy, I think about it differently now in terms of if there was something to happen, yes, that's the primary, but what's the secondary. Then what's the impact on those that possibly witnessed it, not only today but tomorrow, a week from now, a month from now? You've constantly got to be checking in. I would encourage anyone to go back and if you haven't listened to that podcast, episode 70, please give it a listen because there's some great guidance on that from Kathy Martin.

**Maren Gamble:**

I definitely echo that sentiment, Ken. That's a good one.

There's some examples where I am hoping it's a little bit more clear now the difference between a hazard and a risk. Again, that hazard is the what, what can cause us harm? Then from there, we can consider, what are the possible types of harm that can come, also known as the risk? By approaching it that way, identifying that root-cause hazard and moving through the risks systematically, we're really making sure we identify all the concerns we can come up with.

I really encourage firms that when you're trying to document this in your hazard assessment, risk assessment, hazard and risk assessment, again there's all these different words, is to consider actually showing them that way. There could be a hazard column associated with a risk column to actually be able to move through it that way. I find that a lot of us, when we think about what is a hazard and risk assessment, we found a really nice template. There's so many really nice templates out there, but they don't necessarily make this distinction. That doesn't mean they're wrong, but I do find that when you're really looking at a systematic approach, making this distinction can be a huge value add to help you do it more consistently, efficiently, and take away some of that overwhelm with the process.

**Ken Rayner:**

I appreciate that, Maren. Also, just again, going back to I guess when you're putting those two columns together, just reminding our listeners that as you have that hazard listed as a backing vehicle on a project or on a roadway or wherever it is, there can be multiple risks associated with it. Don't just look at one and say you're done.

Okay great, Maren, now it looks like we've identified and compiled a thorough list of hazards and the risks associated with them, what do we do next?

**Maren Gamble:**

I mean, I think anyone listening will recognize that it's not enough to just have identified the hazards and risks involved here. We have to do something with that list in order to make it meaningful in terms of our occupational health and safety system. That's why this podcast has two more words in it. We've talked about hazard and we talked about risk. The next word that we mentioned was assessment. That's really the next thing that I'd really like to talk about because once you've compiled this list of hazards and risks, you're going to be able to assess them.

What I mean by that in this context is rating the risks. Determining a risk priority that's going to allow you to decide what do I have to deal with first? Because it's a really significant risk to my organization and my staff and what is a little bit further down the list based on that prioritization? Because again, it can be really overwhelming to look at a list that might have a lot of risks listed on it, but by going through this assessment, this rating, this prioritization, we can give ourselves an ordered list to work through and help ourselves out a little bit.

Something to note here though, if we think about it, Ken, risks are "rateable". How bad is this risk? We'll talk about some of the pieces of that in just a second. Because hazards themselves are just a thing. A backing vehicle in itself is not rateable, but the risks associated with it are. If we're doing a rating, once we have our list of hazards and risks, it's the risks that we want to assess rather than the hazards themselves. The risks will have varying priorities associated with them.

Rating, what does that look like? It can be a little bit tough and honestly there's some degree of subjectivity to it as well. It's really something where, again, we've mentioned it in previous podcasts together, Ken, it's always good to engage a team when you do these things because then you can really discuss the different perspectives and understand the different views on where things land. Certainly even when we were making our list of hazards and risks, we should have a team together to do it. Most of this-

**Ken Rayner:**

Just in terms of that, let's just say we were doing that, we were talking about backing of vehicles, who would you want on that team, just in terms of just a broad example? Who would be able to contribute to provide different perspectives maybe to that, Maren?

**Maren Gamble:**

Yeah, so basically we always want to do different cross sections of our organization whenever we can. Depending on, again, how big or small the organization is, the things I'm about to list might actually-- multiple titles might be one person in their job description or they might be different individuals, but these are the kind of roles that you'd want in the room.

We'd want people from management in the room. We'd want supervisors in the room. We'd want project managers in the room. We'd want health and safety in the room. We'd want joint health and safety committee maybe in the room because we definitely want the workers performing the work in

the room. There might even be external experts that you want to consult. Whether they're in the room or not there's a whole other thing, but in some cases if we're talking about fire safety in a building, we may want to contact our local fire department for some input. You really can look at what cross section makes the most sense.

In some cases, the scope of knowledge that some of those roles will have will be duplicated. You may not need each tier of management in the room. There might be someone who can represent all of that, but you really want to take a look at what's the most appropriate cross section and always, always, always include someone who does the work.

**Ken Rayner:**

Okay, thanks for that.

**Maren Gamble:**

No worries. When we are rating, Ken, there's as many templates as there are out there for hazard assessment, risk assessment, hazard and risk assessment. You'll find probably just about as many different rating systems that people are going to use. But what generally is common amongst these rating systems is looking at both the probability of the risk happening and the severity of that risk.

That would be your typical two-factor rating system. A lot of companies also use a three-factor system, which introduces the idea of frequency as well. There's just honestly a lot of those rating systems that you can use. It really comes down to which one feels the most comfortable and meaningful for your organization as long as you are covering off those fundamental concepts of probability, severity, and possibly frequency as well.

**Ken Rayner:**

Okay, Maren, I appreciate that there's different ones out there. You probably are leaning towards one more than the other, but if you're not counting in the frequency, are you missing something potentially?

**Maren Gamble:**

You could be, and again, that's an organizational decision because there's always a trade-off when we're talking about something between including all the possible details and making it user-friendly. There really is a balance there in terms of who is using this rating system and the complexity that we're introducing versus the usability. I don't really lean towards one over the other as long as it's clearly defined and it is used consistently.

**Ken Rayner:**

Okay.



**Maren Gamble:**

Talking about these three things, Ken, I just rattled off probability, severity, and frequency. I think possibly our listeners are going, well, how does that lead to a rating?

**Ken Rayner:**

And what do each of those mean?

**Maren Gamble:**

I mean, that's probably what I would be thinking. Let's talk about it briefly. The probability, when I say that, it's really how likely is the risk to result from being exposed to the hazard, so how likely is being struck by that backing vehicle when the vehicle is backing, how likely is that to happen? This is usually set up depending on your, again, whichever rating scale you used, this would be attributed to a numerical scale a lot of the time. Sometimes it's an alphabetical scale to say very unlikely, somewhat likely, very likely. I left out a few things here, but you get it, scales from one end of the spectrum to the other. Based on which category you think it fits in, you'd be able to attribute either a number or a letter or sometimes even a colour to that, based on the rating system.

Severity is how bad the harm could be that comes from the risk. If we're comparing the risk from various different things, some are definitely possible very severe outcomes compared to others that might be more minor. Sometimes it's just a contusion, a bruise that would result. That's going to be a lot more minor than something that's going to result in a critical injury type scenario. Again, you'd be attributing that kind of scale to it from not severe at all to extremely severe and attributing numbers, letters, colors, whatever the case may be.

Finally, frequency. It's how often do I face the risk? Is this a once-a-year risk or an all-day, everyday risk? Depending on your answer there, that will probably impact how quickly you need to address it. If this is an all-day, everyday risk, that's going to move up your prioritization compared to one that you see once a year and maybe you know won't see for eight months. That's where that can factor in. Again, you attribute a number, a letter.

There's different ways of doing this. Combining these things, sometimes it's an addition equation, sometimes it's a multiplication equation, sometimes it's a matrix. There's all these beautiful things out there. Some of them are visible in some of our IHSA resources. If you were to do a general internet search, you'd find even more. There's a lot of opportunity to explore what fits your organization best.

If you want to hear more about that specifically, the best advice I could actually give our listeners is to take IHSA's Intro to Hazard and Risk Management Program. We offer it in person as well as e-learning. It really delves into the hazard and risk assessment piece a little deeper. There's lots of examples in that program.

**Ken Rayner:**

Okay, so Maren, how then does a business in one of the industries that we support, the electric utilities, transportation, or construction, now apply all these findings that you've gone through in terms of you've got this, you've identified the hazard, now you've understood now what's the probability, severity,

frequency, you've got these findings, how do we apply them to either eliminate the risk or at least reduce it?

**Maren Gamble:**

Absolutely. There's obviously still a gap. We've got a list of things in the order we should address them. We've also got one word left on our podcast, Ken, so it works out perfectly. That word is controls. Controls, quite fundamentally, is how do we best reduce or eliminate that risk now that we have explored it. This is introducing things into our work scenario that are going to impact the severity, probability, and frequency in a way that reduces the risk.

You notice I said best. I didn't just say reduce or eliminate. That was on purpose, in this case. That's because there is a hierarchy of controls that applies to this kind of thing. Fundamentally, some types of controls are actually better than others. That hierarchy, it starts with elimination.

If you can get rid of a hazard altogether, if there is no backing vehicle, that's best. If there's an opportunity for substitution, sometimes we can switch a chemical for a less hazardous chemical. Engineering: sometimes we can actually put something into place, we can engineer a solution that's going to correct some of those risk situations. Administration could be training, could be procedures, things around that nature. Then finally, protecting ourselves using personal protective equipment would be at the end of the hierarchy.

This is another topic that warrants more explanation, more than I just gave you here. That was just the very brief overview. Exciting enough, we fairly recently introduced a hierarchy of controls video I believe, Ken, on our YouTube.

**Ken Rayner:**

We did. Yes, we did with Scott Laing. I highly encourage anyone that's wanting to get a better understanding of what the hierarchy of controls are to check that out.

**Maren Gamble:**

Awesome. Because again, the hierarchy of controls gives you another systematic approach to this. Now that we know what the risk is, let's go through that hierarchy. Let's discuss elimination before we discuss substitution, engineering, administration, and PPE, so we know that not only are we introducing a control, but we're introducing the best control, or controls, that will apply to the situation.

Let's talk baby-proofing again, Ken, if we could go back to my earlier example. Let's think about the example I think I listed earlier. There's the possibility that our baby now is cruising around and starting to pull up on things and there's a dresser that can tip if the toddlers starts pulling themselves up on it. This is something we've identified as a hazard. The hazard is the dresser. The risk is that this dresser is going to fall over and injure our baby.

The first question, remember the hierarchy of control, elimination. The first question I would actually ask myself with this dresser is do I even need it or can I just get rid of this thing? Is it serving me any

purpose or could it be removed from the situation altogether? If not, if we need this dresser, which we very well might to store all of the baby things, the next question could be can we find a style of dresser that it is not as likely to tip? Something that's going to be long and low is going to be far less likely to tip than something that's narrow and tall. We could explore substituting with something that is a reduced risk.

But one of the more common ways that people deal with this, because you've already got this dresser in the room, is to introduce an engineering control. I looked at elimination. I looked at substitution. Maybe they weren't totally viable. The next one I'm looking at engineering controls. Honestly, they make anti-tip devices. Simple enough, we can go out and get an anti-tip device, install it according to the instructions that come with it, and we'll have this engineered solution to make sure that this dresser isn't going to tip on this toddler as they're wandering around.

Admittedly, administration and PPE are not going to work for babies. The training and procedures piece and training your baby to not touch that dresser, not what I would go with in this case, but you can see how the example, we can work through it and see that in this case, the engineering control might be our best-case scenario.

**Ken Rayner:**

I love it. You know what? You didn't jump right to bubble wrapping the baby. It was a systematic approach to how do we actually ensure that this doesn't happen and really solidify something that I think everybody could agree would be, yeah, that's a good solution. Right?

**Maren Gamble:**

Yeah.

**Ken Rayner:**

The dresser. Can we look at a dresser for that room where the baby's in that's low and long and doesn't have the propensity to tip over? That's a terrific alternative. Okay, so Maren, last time I checked, and I know you're pretty good about ensuring that we've covered off all the words in this podcast, we've gone through hazards, we've gone through risks, we've gone through assessment, we've gone through controls, is that it or is there still work to do?

**Maren Gamble:**

There's still a little bit of work to do, Ken. There's a bit of a repeat here that I want to encourage everyone to do. We did the assessment piece to rate the risk, to determine which ones needed controls the most, but there's also another step of rating that we really should do once the controls have been introduced. We did do that rating prior to controls. Now I want to do the rating again considering the controls being in place so that we can actually see if those controls resulted in a new risk rating that's actually okay for us.

If we introduced controls, and maybe they were the best controls we could come up with, but if we introduced them and our risk rating didn't actually go down on a high-risk item, then we really can't proceed with the work until we've had some further conversation about that. We have to make sure

that the controls we put in place are effective and they're enough to make us comfortable with the work proceeding.

**Ken Rayner:**

Right on. Going back to the baby example, we've got a dresser that has the, again, the chance that it would tip over. We switch it out with another dresser that is low and long and has essentially no chance of tipping over, not with a toddler pulling at it, and we're going to reassess again. We were hoping that that goes from a high or a major hazard down to a low or essentially a non-existent hazard. Is that fair?

**Maren Gamble:**

That's absolutely fair. In the case of the baby-proofing, Ken, maybe we also want to add the anti-tip because we want it to go from low risk to nil risk, right?

**Ken Rayner:**

Ah, right.

**Maren Gamble:**

There's no reason we can't layer controls that are going to work together to just make it even more secure.

**Ken Rayner:**

Love it. Thank you for that. That was perfect. Okay, anything else to add, Maren?

**Maren Gamble:**

Yeah, I guess there's one caveat because I talked about making sure that a process like this is to make sure that we can reduce that sense of overwhelming lists of things to tackle and approach them systematically. In this case, I did start with hazards, admittedly. They led us to exploring risks and we prioritized them and controlled them and then check the risks again. It's essentially what we did today. If you're actually completing this for an organization and you want to complete a comprehensive hazard and risk assessment and control document, you probably also want to start by focusing in on just one position, one role, one job, one task, and looking at all the hazards for that first. Because if I start trying to jump around, say on a construction project between risks associated with the painting, pouring the foundations and doing the roofing, again it becomes a little bit more difficult to really approach systematic. It can become overwhelming. We also do run the risk of missing things that way.

We started with hazards today, but if I was doing this in a real-life scenario, I would probably want to say, okay, let's start with all the hazards associated with the painter first, and we'd maybe work through their scope of work and then tackle what the roofer is dealing with and so on and so forth.

**Ken Rayner:**

Gotcha. Would you start with the work that you would deem, without going through the process, but the ones just from regular knowledge, that you would deem to be the most hazardous? Would you start there or would you start somewhere else?

**Maren Gamble:**

I would because even if you end up risk-grading and you found out you misjudged it slightly, you're doing your best to tackle the things that you think will have those greatest risks. Usually, even subjectively, we have a sense of this is more risks than that, so why not make sure you're tackling the highest risk first.

**Ken Rayner:**

Perfect, okay. A couple extra resources, I know Maren, you touched on a few of them. I mentioned a couple during the podcast. We'll have some links up on this podcast episode, but we've got a couple of eLearning courses from IHSA, so at [ihsa.ca](http://ihsa.ca) under the eLearning tab. There's one on hazard identification and control awareness and construction. Maren, you mentioned the one associated with our COR<sup>®</sup> program, the Intro to Hazard and Risk Management.

I want to again mention the hierarchy of controls, which can be found on IHSA's YouTube channel. You can get that right from IHSA's website, [ihsa.ca](http://ihsa.ca), along the banner at the top, on the top right-hand corner. Also, in episode six of the *COR<sup>®</sup> Podcast*, which you can also find at the *IHSA Safety Podcast* site, yourself and Stacey Blea talking about hazard assessment, analysis, and control. Lastly, we talked about it again, the Kathy Martin podcast, number 70, on trauma management in the workplace. In the event something traumatic happens, it's not just about the incident that happened to the person or the property or the likes, it's like, what about everybody else that saw it, and how does that impact them? And just making sure that's fully understood.

Hey Maren, thank you so much. You did a great, great job of breaking down hazard, risk, assessment and controls and those ABCs and making it very explanatory. I really hope that small businesses and the industries we support, that this is very helpful to them because this is the intent. This is why we're doing these podcasts, to get this information out there so it's clear and concise and people understand what it is we're talking about, right?

**Maren Gamble:**

Thank you, Ken.

**Ken Rayner:**

Amazing job. Thank you so much, Maren.

**Maren Gamble:**

Thanks, Ken. I actually, I think I'll throw one more thing in there. If there's questions that people have at the conclusion of this, if I raised more questions than answers for you today, please reach out to IHSA. We can connect you with a number of consultants, many in your area, wherever you are in the province, to be able to talk with you and assist you in figuring this out. Occupational health and safety

management systems can be complex. You are certainly not alone. We're just a phone call or an email away. Don't hesitate to reach out to us.

**Ken Rayner:**

Amazing. Thank you, Maren. Thanks very much to the listeners for listening to the *IHSA Safety Podcast* and our episode on hazards, risks, assessments, and control. Be sure to subscribe and “like” us on your podcast channel and visit us at [ihsa.ca](http://ihsa.ca) for a wealth of health and safety resources and information.

**Announcer:**

The *IHSA Safety Podcast*, for more episodes, tips and all things safety, go to [ihsasafetypodcast.ca](http://ihsasafetypodcast.ca). Thanks for listening.