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Health and safety, it seems, means different things to different people.

To one particular school, it means asking the dinner ladies to reshape their flapjacks so they won’t cause injury if thrown.

To the ‘Futures Team’ at the Health and Safety Laboratory, health and safety means anticipating tomorrow’s world. A typical subject would be, for example, the safety implications of intelligent humanoid robots in the workplace.

To the managers of hundreds of construction sites who failed recent safety checks, health and safety means … not enough. If it meant more, then perhaps the 49 construction workers killed in 2011/12 would still be alive. Perhaps the 2884 who received major injuries on a construction site in that same 12-month period would not have been hurt.

To jobsworths and those fearful of being sued, health and safety means a convenient excuse for banning everything from beer glasses with handles to swimming goggles.

To us at HSE, it simply means doing all we can to keep people safe and healthy at work. So among our articles on myths and robots and construction site safety checks, you’ll also find tips and signposts to staying healthy and safe at work.

Oh and, for the record, when it comes to flapjack shapes, in the words of Rhett Butler, we don’t give a damn.

As ever, if you’ve any thoughts on the Newsletter, email me at Newsletter@hse.gsi.gov.uk

Colette Manning Editor
Making life simpler and clearer

Changes are coming to the way first-aid training is provided in the workplace. It’s all part of HSE’s ongoing work to make health and safety regulations simpler and clearer.

First-aid training at work can only currently be delivered by HSE-approved providers. But, in a move that will affect most businesses, the need for HSE approval is expected to be removed from 1 October.

HSE will retain a role in setting standards by controlling the syllabus content for the basic first aid at work qualifications.

Find out more about the impact of the proposed changes at http://www.hse.gov.uk/firstaid/proposed-changes-first-aid-regulations.htm

Disaster anniversary

Oil and Gas UK is holding a major offshore safety conference in Aberdeen on 18–20 June 2013 to mark the 25th anniversary of the Piper Alpha disaster. Keynote speaker Lord Cullen of Whitekirk will be reflecting on the disaster and HSE’s Chair Judith Hackitt will also be speaking.

Further details are available on the Oil and Gas UK website.

*A total of 167 people died in the Piper Alpha fire on 6 July 1988, making it the world’s worst offshore oil disaster.

Join HSE

HSE currently has job vacancies for experienced engineers in locations all over the UK.

Vacancies cover electrical and mechanical engineering, as well as offshore and onshore major hazards.

Find out more at http://www.hse.gov.uk/careers/jobprofiles.htm
Construction sites fail safety checks

Nearly one in five construction sites recently visited across Britain received enforcement action from HSE after failing safety checks.

In a month-long initiative, inspectors visited 2363 sites where refurbishment or repair work was taking place and saw 2976 contractors.

A total of 631 enforcement notices were served across 433 sites for poor practices that could put workers at risk, with 451 notices ordering that work stop immediately until the situation was put right.

FACT: During 2011/12 49 workers were killed while working in construction and 2884 major injuries were reported.

Philip White, HSE’s Chief Inspector of Construction, said: ‘This initiative has once again shown us that the majority of construction employers do take their responsibilities to their workers seriously.

‘However, our inspectors also encountered numerous examples of poor practice, from lack of edge protection on stairwells and scaffolding to unsafe storage of flammable materials and inadequate personal protective equipment. None of these are acceptable on a modern construction site.

‘HSE will not hesitate to use its enforcement powers against reckless employers. It is they who continue to make construction one of the most dangerous industries in which to work.’

Between 18 February and 15 March inspectors made unannounced visits to construction sites to ensure they were managing high-risk activity, such as working at height.

Checks were also carried out on whether there was general good order on site, whether PPE was being used effectively and if welfare facilities were adequate.

Find out more at: www.hse.gov.uk/construction

During inspections, HSE inspectors considered whether:

- jobs that involve working at height had been identified and properly planned to ensure that appropriate precautions are in place;
- equipment was correctly installed/ assembled, inspected and maintained and used properly;
- sites were well organised, to avoid trips and falls;
- walkways and stairs were free from obstructions;
- work areas were clear of unnecessary materials and waste;
- suitable PPE, including head protection, was provided and worn at all times.
Securing justice for victims

Three people talk about how HSE helped them get answers and justice.

Poisoned by mercury

Ryan Wilkes was exposed to dangerous levels of mercury while working at a recycling firm in Huddersfield in 2008.

He was only 23 when he started noticing the terrifying effects of mercury poisoning. HSE investigated his employer and brought a successful prosecution that resulted in a £145 000 fine.

‘At the height of my illness it was very distressing and it greatly affected my life. For that I can’t forgive the company for putting profits before my health.

‘HSE’s involvement was tremendously appreciated by all the staff. It had been going on for so long by then and it was great that HSE were taking it so seriously. Throughout the whole saga my employer was more interested in saving his own skin than helping with the investigation.’

Read more

Justice for Ashleigh

The family of Ashleigh Ewing was no different to many people whose only awareness of HSE was the occasional ‘elf and safety’ story in the tabloids. They had no real idea what HSE actually did, until tragedy struck the family in 2006.

Ashleigh, then 22, was an employee of Mental Health Matters Ltd (MHM), a Sunderland-based charity providing support to people with mental health problems in the community. The young care worker was attacked and murdered while visiting client Ronald Dixon at his home address in Newcastle in May of that year. Ashleigh had worked for MHM for just six months and was on the final day of her probationary period.

HSE prosecuted MHM and the charity was ordered to pay £50 000 after admitting to breaches of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 law by failing to properly protect the newly qualified support worker.

Read more

Answers needed about their dad’s death

Stuart Jordan, 50, died in 2004 after an argon gas leak at the manufacturing plant of Bodycote HIP Ltd metal refining company in Hereford.

Stuart, the firm’s works manager, was found collapsed alongside colleague Richard Clarkson on a stairwell into which argon gas had leaked from a large pressure vessel. On the day of the incident, the ventilation system and the oxygen alarm system were turned off.

Five years after the tragedy, in July 2009, the Bodycote HIP Ltd was fined over half a million pounds following the deaths of the two men. Both deaths were not only regrettable but entirely preventable.

Read more
A year of myth busting

Half-baked decision takes the biscuit

Heard the one about the school which banned triangular flapjacks because a pupil got hurt when one was thrown at him? Sadly, this isn’t a joke. But, far from getting into a flap about it, an HSE spokesman was quick to point out the real problem: ‘The issue isn’t what shape the flapjacks are, but the fact that pupils are throwing them at each other. That’s a matter of discipline and has nothing to do with health and safety as we know it. We’re happy to make clear that flapjacks of all shapes and sizes continue to have our full backing.’

Alas, this type of story is all too familiar to the health and safety myth buster’s panel. Set up just over a year ago, the panel has already reviewed more than 150 ‘health and safety’ excuses with the aim of helping the public fight back against jobsworths who use safety laws as a convenient ruse to ban activities.

Among recent crackpot cases exposed as myths by the panel were:

- toothpicks removed from the table of a restaurant;
- shredded paper banned from a school fete’s lucky-dip stall;
- a cot bed that could not be made up by a hotel chambermaid.

Evidence of the panel’s power emerges with another case study: after being told the experts had ruled that banning a bubbles machine from a birthday party was health and safety humbug, a venue backed down and let the bubbles blow.

Find out more

You can find out more about the myths above and all the cases considered by the panel at www.hse.gov.uk/myth/index.htm

The panel is led by HSE’s Chair Judith Hackitt. You can read her thoughts on the subject in her latest blog on page 17.
So, would it surprise you to know that these are among a host of subjects which have already been investigated by a group of people at the Health and Safety Laboratory known as the ‘Futures Team’?

Here the H&S Newsletter finds out a bit more about why the teams spends today anticipating tomorrow – or, to give it its proper name, horizon scanning.

What is ‘horizon scanning’?

Horizon scanning is just what it sounds like. It’s about looking to see what’s coming over the horizon. The team use various sources of information to try and identify emerging issues. These are used to help keep HSE aware of future developments and trends that could affect its ability to be an effective promoter and regulator of health and safety in Britain.

(The team that looks forward to the future continues on page 8)
The horizon-scanning unit (now known as the ‘Futures Team’) was put together in 2005.

**What are the benefits?**

There are many but the main one is the improvement of health and safety in the workplace by anticipating, identifying and preparing for new or changing risks. The information also helps in developing HSE policy and target setting.

**Can you give an example of a typical project?**

It’s difficult to describe a typical project because they are all different. The team carries out general horizon scanning all the time, but can also do studies on specified areas such as transport/distribution and occupational hygiene in waste and recycling. Other activities might include futures workshops on, for example, worker involvement. Bigger projects have included work on the emerging technologies programme and a major scenario building project on ‘Green Jobs’ for the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. Both of these have led to published reports. The team are currently producing a summary of scenarios relating to the electricity industry towards 2050, as part of a strategic exercise for the Office for Nuclear Regulation and its board.

**What’s the scope of horizon scanning and futures – is it just restricted to the workplace?**

Not at all. While the primary focus is, of course, looking at implications for health and safety at work, to do this it covers a wide arena, including developments in science and technology, the UK political agenda, the environment and public attitudes to health, safety and risk.

**How do I find out more?**

There’s lots more information, including scenarios for the world of health and safety in 2017 on the [futures website](http://www.hse.gov.uk).
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Accident case studies

Case study 1

Mr G had multiple sclerosis and was cared for by two workers. He had full use of his arms and hands but little strength in his legs and feet. He weighed 12 stone/75kg. The care workers would wash Mr G while he was in bed. One care worker would roll him towards her and the second would wash his back.

The holding task was uncomfortable for the worker and caused lower back pain.

The occupational therapist reviewed the risk assessment and identified the holding task as a manual handling risk.

**Solution**

To make best use of Mr G's arm strength, bed rails were screwed to the floor. This allowed Mr G to reach across with his opposite arm and use the rails to roll and support himself in that position. The cost of the bed rails was £70 and installation was £40.

This action reduced the manual handling risk to the care workers. Also, using the strength in his arms helped Mr G to maintain mobility and feel less dependent.

Find out more at: [http://www.hse.gov.uk/healthservices/](http://www.hse.gov.uk/healthservices/)

Case study 2

Warehouse staff had to manually load 1.5 metre-long rolls of soft, flexible product into containers for delivery to customers. The rolls were awkward to handle and some had to be lifted to a height of 3 metres to fill the container. Three staff loaded ten containers each day so the work was repetitive.

Workers began reporting neck and shoulder pain. A risk assessment identified loading the higher layers in the container as the main problem.

**Solution**

Managers and workers set up a focus group to consider solutions. It wasn’t possible to change the product or its packaging and, as the company was relatively small, it was not financially viable to bring in a height-adjustable conveyor.

So a stable temporary platform was formed within the container by placing boards on part of the bottom layer of rolls. A worker standing on this could load rolls up to roof height with much less effort than before.

Staff using the new method no longer suffered neck and shoulder pains. They also found it possible to load more rolls of product into each container, which gave the firm big savings in transport costs. The cost of the changes made to the new method was recovered in less than two months.

Find out more at: [http://www.hse.gov.uk/msd/information.htm](http://www.hse.gov.uk/msd/information.htm)

(*Accident case studies* continues on page 10)
My name’s Mark, and I’m a painter. I’ve worked on building sites for years and I’ve always been told about the big risks on sites such as falls from scaffolds, being run over by plant and the like.

I never gave much thought to something as simple as tripping up being a real problem. Let’s face it, we’ve all done it.

I tripped up ten months ago. I had to move some cans of paint from a pallet into a site cabin, only two or three metres away. The ground I was working on wasn’t level. As I turned, my foot caught on the large stones and I fell down. I tried to get back up again but the pain was just incredible.

I’d badly fractured two bones in my leg. I was in hospital for weeks, having operations to insert metal pins to keep the bones in line. Even when I got home I wasn’t allowed to put any weight on the leg for months.

All this from something as simple as a trip.

I lost my job, obviously couldn’t play sport any more, and I’ve not been able to do most of the things that I always took for granted. My doctor’s just told me that I can go back to work, ten months after the accident.

I found out the hard way just what a trip can mean.

Here are some simple things that you can do to reduce the risk of slip and trip accidents on your site:

- keep storage areas tidy;
- plan deliveries to minimise the amount of materials on site;
- ensure footpaths are safe to use: levelled if rutted, stoned if muddy, gritted when icy;
- make sure that all corridors, stairways, footpaths or other areas used by pedestrians are kept clear of obstructions at all times;
- tie up loose cables, particularly along corridors;
- make sure that steps into site cabins are properly constructed;
- make sure work areas are kept as tidy as possible while the work’s going on;
- put barriers around, or covers over, all holes and excavations into which people could fall;
- have a system in place to manage the waste created on the site;
- make sure that everyone knows what they have to do.
New online guidance has been launched by HSE to make it easier for employers to understand what they need to do to check and protect their workers’ health.

Aimed at protecting workers who could be exposed to harmful chemicals or other hazardous substances, this clear and simple guidance will make it easier for employers to decide whether their workers need health surveillance, how to go about it and how to use the results.

The guidance, which has been developed with industry, also makes it clearer when action is not needed, saving lower-risk businesses, such as those that are office-based, from wasting time and money.

Past exposure to harmful substances at work is responsible for an estimated 12 000 deaths each year.

The new online guidance replaces HSG61 Health surveillance at work. It can be found at http://www.hse.gov.uk/health-surveillance/index.htm

Here we look at the impact of not using health surveillance…

Health surveillance made easier

Case study 1 Solderer develops asthma

Summary

An employee developed occupational asthma after working for a large, multi-national company in Gloucester. He was employed between 1995 and 2004 as a solderer and was exposed to rosin-based colophony solder fume during his career.

His health starting deteriorating from 1999 and he started taking time off work due to breathing difficulties.

What happened

With inadequate control measures in place, the company failed to install fume extraction equipment to remove rosin-based fumes from the workroom air or from the breathing zones of its solderers.

The company did not substitute the rosin-based solder with rosin-free solder until December 2003, despite an assessment having identified the need to in 1999.

Employees, including the asthma sufferers were not placed under a health surveillance scheme at any time.

Effects

As a result of action taken by HSE, the company was fined £100 000 with £30 000 costs.

(‘Health surveillance made easier’ continues on page 12)
Case study 2  Recipe for ill health

**Summary**

A 46-year-old school cook developed breathing problems after working with flour in the school kitchen. The room was small with poor ventilation.

Her breathing problems became so severe that she could hardly walk. She had to sleep sitting up.

Her daily job included dough making in a large mixer. There were no controls for the flour dust.

**What happened**

The cook contacted her union, which supported her with a compensation claim on the basis that decent working conditions were not provided.

The council admitted that it had not taken sufficient action over the problem despite repeated complaints.

**Effects**

The cook became severely asthmatic. She had to retire early on health grounds and the courts eventually awarded her £200 000 in damages.

However, the money will not bring back her health. While she was able to move out of town, she rarely leaves the house and now faces a very restricted lifestyle.
Five workers from a large engineering manufacturer on the Isle of Wight have been left with permanent nerve damage because their employer failed to comply with health and safety regulations for at least six years.

Portsmouth Magistrates heard that the workers, all based at GKN Aerospace Services, have been left with long-term damage to their circulation and nerve systems after contracting hand-arm vibration syndrome (HAVS).

The employees, who have asked not to be named, developed advanced symptoms of the condition after prolonged use of vibrating hand tools, used as part of their work building engine casings.

Their hands now become white and dead in the cold, with extreme pain on warming. The nerve damage affects their ability to carry out finer tasks needing dexterity, meaning they lack grip and can often drop objects.

What went wrong
HSE found that the company had failed to comply with the Control of Vibration at Work Regulations since they became law in January 2006.

The court heard that a GKN health surveillance programme identified the five employees as suffering advanced debilitating problems in 2009. However, the company continued as before and still failed to assess the risks and put controls in place to protect the significant number of remaining workers.

GKN’s safety failings came to light after it fulfilled its statutory obligation to report the diagnoses to HSE. Following an investigation, an Improvement Notice was served on GKN giving the company a timeframe to make specified improvements.

What the court did
GKN Aerospace Services Ltd of Ferry Road, East Cowes, was fined a total of £26 800 and ordered to pay full costs of £8256 after admitting four breaches of the Control of Vibration at Work Regulations 2005 between July 2005 and December 2011. The company was fined £3400 for each of the two earlier offences and £10 000 for each of the later offences.

HSE’s view
After the hearing, Anne Bartlett (below right), HSE Specialist Inspector in Occupational Health, said: ‘Work-related health risks cannot be ignored or pushed down the agenda.

GKN Aerospace Services Ltd had the resources to protect its employees from the well-known effects of exposure to hand-arm vibration but failed to do so over an extended period.

‘The most efficient and effective way of controlling exposure to hand-arm vibration is to look for new or alternative work methods which eliminate or reduce exposure to vibration.’

Find out more
For information and guidance on hand-arm vibration, visit http://www.hse.gov.uk/vibration/hav/index.htm.

(In the dock) continues on page 14)
Falling steel bar causes multiple injuries

A 61-year-old worker suffered multiple injuries when he was hit by a 1.6-ton steel bar.

The man, who has asked not to be named, was working at Derbyshire foundry Padley & Venables Ltd when the 9 metre long bar, and the steel barrow it was travelling on, fell as it was being pushed from one part of the site to another by a tow truck.

He broke both legs and his pelvis, crushed his right foot and damaged his left knee in the incident on 12 April 2011. He had to have three operations during his ten-week hospital stay and has only recently returned to work at the company on a part-time basis.

What went wrong

An HSE investigation found the steel bar was not secured to the barrow, that the barrow had no brakes and that it was just being shunted by the truck rather than having a physical connection.

Derby Crown Court was told that the company had moved the location of the steel bars due to stock issues, which prevented them from using an overhead crane to transport them around the foundry.

The firm had designed and made its own barrows to move the steel around, but failed to monitor whether loads were strapped down or that the design of the barrows was sufficiently safe for moving this type of load.

What the court did

Padley & Venables Ltd, of Callywhite Lane, Dronfield, was fined £60 000 and ordered to pay £16 419 in costs after pleading guilty to breaching health and safety laws.

HSE’s view

After the hearing, HSE inspector Fiona Coffey said: ‘The company failed to consider the risks associated with this activity. The route being taken to bring long steel bars from the forge room to the saws meant passing in close proximity to employees working the saws. Reasonable precautions could and should have been taken to ensure their safe movement.

‘Instead, a man has suffered serious injuries that have had, and will continue to have, a significant impact on his quality of life.’

(‘In the dock’ continues on page 15)
Toddler injured by flagpole

Leeds City Council has been sentenced for its role in an incident in which a toddler was severely injured by a flagpole that fell onto her.

Two-year-old River Webster suffered a cracked skull, bleeding on the brain and a broken foot when the 18 ft pole toppled in a memorial garden in Otley, Leeds.

HSE prosecuted Leeds City Council and it admitted a breach of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974. It was fined £12,000 and ordered to pay £6,116 in costs.

Worker killed by runaway lorry

Two companies have been ordered to pay almost £800,000 in fines and costs after a driver was run over and killed by his own lorry.

Father-of-three Gary Walters was killed as he attempted to couple a trailer to his vehicle in October 2010.

Following a trial earlier this month, Larkins Logistics Ltd was found guilty of breaching health and safety laws and was fined £450,000 and ordered to pay costs of £23,317.

Kent-based Bison Manufacturing Ltd admitted the same charges and was fined £300,000 and ordered to pay costs of £21,341.

Lift engineer electrocuted

A lift company was fined £100,000 for safety failings uncovered following the death of an engineer at Pentonville prison in North London.

Steven Loake, 53, was electrocuted while fixing a fault on a lift in the prison chapel in October 2010.

HSE investigations found the lift had not been isolated from the mains and that Mr Loake’s multimeter, an electrical test instrument, had exposed test probes, which can lead to ‘flashovers’ or arcing.

As well as the fine, ThyssenKrupp Elevator UK (TKE) Ltd was ordered to pay full costs of £25,748.

Read about more HSE court cases at: http://www.hse.gov.uk/press/press.htm
Can a person be left alone at their place of work?

There are no absolute restrictions on working alone – it will depend on the findings of a risk assessment.

Although there is no general legal prohibition on working alone, health and safety regulations require that potential work hazards are identified, risks assessed and then avoided or controlled.

Control measures may include instruction, training, supervision and/or use of protective equipment. Employers should check that control measures are used and that risk assessments are periodically reviewed.

When a risk assessment shows that it is not possible for the work to be done safely by a lone worker, arrangements for providing help or back-up should be put in place. Where a lone worker is working at another employer’s workplace, that employer should inform the lone worker’s employer of any risks and the control measures that should be taken. This helps the lone worker’s employer to assess the risks.

Risk assessment should help decide the right level of supervision. There are some high-risk activities where at least one other person may need to be present.

Examples include some electrical work or high-risk confined space working where a supervisor may need to be present, as well as someone dedicated to the rescue role.

Lone workers should not be at more risk than other employees. This may require extra risk-control measures. Precautions should take account of normal work and foreseeable emergencies, e.g. fire, equipment failure, illness and accidents. Employers should identify situations where people work alone and ask questions such as:

- Does the workplace present a special risk to the lone worker?
- Is there a safe way in and a way out for one person?
- Can any temporary access equipment which is necessary, such as portable ladders or trestles, be safely handled by one person?
- Is there a risk of violence?
- Are women and young workers especially at risk if they work alone?
- Is the person medically fit and suitable to work alone?
- What happens if the person becomes ill or has an accident?

More information

Find out more in HSE’s free leaflet: *Working alone*

You can read more FAQs on a range of workplace health and safety matters at: [http://www.hse.gov.uk/contact/faqs/index.htm](http://www.hse.gov.uk/contact/faqs/index.htm)
Blog from HSE’s Chair

HSE Chair Judith Hackitt regularly looks at developments in the world of health and safety in a series of blogs on HSE’s website. You can read this in full, and others, via the link at the foot of the page.

A year of myth busting

The first case we dealt with involved an allotment owner being wrongly told to remove a children’s swing on health and safety grounds. But for much of the year it has felt like we were on a roundabout – the same underlying issues coming back into focus, time and again.

We analysed the first 100 cases, and found that 38 were poor customer service or people simply making an excuse for an unpopular decision. Fear of civil litigation and the need to do things to get insurance coverage crop up regularly too. Almost a quarter involved disproportionate, over the top interpretation of the regulations. It’s also clear that there is a good deal of confusion between health and safety and other legislation such as food, hygiene and fire regulations.

Basic communication failures when explaining the reasons for a decision often lead to confusion – is it really too much to expect people to explain the reasons for their decision rather than just saying ‘Elf ’n’ safety innit, guv’?

I suppose it’s easy to understand why poor customer service keeps cropping up – if the real motives were properly explained many more of us would be likely to take our custom elsewhere. I love the fact that a friend of the chap who was refused a toothpick in a restaurant on ‘elf ’n’ safety’ grounds bought the place – there’s one restaurant where he won’t be getting dodgy excuses in future!

Read more

It’s 12 months now since the launch of the Myth Busters Challenge Panel, which has been a real success. It has probably done more than any other initiative to get behind the headlines and set the record straight about health and safety. It’s far from job done but we are making good progress.

We’ve uncovered and exposed abuses and misuses of health and safety right across Britain, and seen ‘health and safety’ trotted out to justify all sorts of ridiculous decisions.
Rider-operated lift trucks

Operator training and safe use. Approved Code of Practice and guidance

This revised guidance is aimed at employers and those responsible for the safe operation of lift trucks, as well as those in control of worksites, the self-employed, managers and supervisors. It includes an outline of the main legal requirements relating to lift trucks, the Approved Code of Practice text (unchanged from the previous edition) and guidance on operator training for stacking rider-operated lift trucks.

It also includes some of the guidance from HSG6 Safety in working with lift trucks (and replaces HSG6), for example, information about lift-truck features, guidance on the safe use of lift trucks and how to protect pedestrians, and guidance on the maintenance and thorough examination of lift trucks.

Date of publication: 2013
ISBN: 978 0 7176 64412
Series code: L117
Price: £15.00

Download a free copy  Buy this product

('What's new from HSE' continues on page 19)
Lift-truck training
Advice for employers

Lift trucks are widely used for moving materials and goods, but they are involved in about a quarter of all workplace transport accidents. The deaths and injuries caused can ruin lives and businesses. Even when an incident does not cause injury, it can still mean costly damage to lift trucks, buildings, fittings and goods.

This leaflet is aimed at employers and those responsible for the safe operation of lift trucks, as well as those in control of worksites, the self-employed, managers and supervisors. Employees and their safety representatives may also find it useful.

As an employer you are required to provide basic training and testing for all lift-truck operators you employ (both new and existing). Properly trained operators can reduce the risk of lift-truck accidents in your workplace.

An ‘operator’ in this leaflet is anyone who operates a lift truck, even as a secondary or occasional part of their job, not only those whose job title is lift-truck operator.

Date of publication: 2013
ISBN: 978 0 7176 6549 5
Series code: INDG462
Priced packs: £5
Call HSE Books to order: 01787 881165

Download a free copy

Use lift trucks safely
Advice for operators

Lift trucks can be dangerous machines. If you don’t use them properly, they can kill and injure people. HSE has published new advice to help you and those you work with stay safe.

This pocket card is aimed at lift truck operators. It aims to help operators and those they work with to stay safe while working with lift trucks. It covers operating, people, loads and slopes.

Date of publication: 2013
ISBN: 978 0 7176 6548 8
Series code: INDG457
Price packs: £5
Call HSE Books to order: 01787 881165

Download a free copy

Find out more

http://www.hse.gov.uk/workplacetransport/index.htm