



**Ministry of Health and
Long-Term Care**

**Inspection Report under
the Long-Term Care
Homes Act, 2007**

**Ministère de la Santé et des
Soins de longue durée**

**Rapport d'inspection sous la
Loi de 2007 sur les foyers de
soins de longue durée**

**Health System Accountability and
Performance Division
Performance Improvement and
Compliance Branch**

**Division de la responsabilisation et de la
performance du système de santé
Direction de l'amélioration de la
performance et de la conformité**

Ottawa Service Area Office
347 Preston St Suite 420
OTTAWA ON K1S 3J4
Telephone: (613) 569-5602
Facsimile: (613) 569-9670

Bureau régional de services d'Ottawa
347 rue Preston bureau 420
OTTAWA ON K1S 3J4
Téléphone: (613) 569-5602
Télécopieur: (613) 569-9670

Public Copy/Copie du public

Report Date(s) / Date(s) du apport	Inspection No / No de l'inspection	Log # / Registre no	Type of Inspection / Genre d'inspection
Mar 14, 2016	2016_346133_0011	032855-15	Complaint

Licensee/Titulaire de permis

EXTENDICARE (CANADA) INC.
3000 STEELES AVENUE EAST SUITE 700 MARKHAM ON L3R 9W2

Long-Term Care Home/Foyer de soins de longue durée

EXTENDICARE LAURIER MANOR
1715 MONTREAL ROAD GLOUCESTER ON K1J 6N4

Name of Inspector(s)/Nom de l'inspecteur ou des inspecteurs

JESSICA LAPENSEE (133)

Inspection Summary/Résumé de l'inspection



**Ministry of Health and
Long-Term Care**

**Ministère de la Santé et des
Soins de longue durée**

**Inspection Report under
the Long-Term Care
Homes Act, 2007**

**Rapport d'inspection sous la
Loi de 2007 sur les foyers de
soins de longue durée**

The purpose of this inspection was to conduct a Complaint inspection.

**This inspection was conducted on the following date(s): March 1st and 3rd, 2016
(onsite)**

**This complaint inspection was related to complaints regarding pest control. A
finding of non compliance was issued, related to pest control program
documentation.**

**During the course of the inspection, the inspector(s) spoke with the Administrator,
the Support Services Manager, the home's pest control technician, residents, and
dietary aids.**

**The inspector observed insect monitors in some resident bedrooms and in unit
kitchenettes. The inspector reviewed pest control program records.**

**The following Inspection Protocols were used during this inspection:
Accommodation Services - Housekeeping**

During the course of this inspection, Non-Compliances were issued.

1 WN(s)

0 VPC(s)

0 CO(s)

0 DR(s)

0 WAO(s)

NON-COMPLIANCE / NON - RESPECT DES EXIGENCES

Legend WN – Written Notification VPC – Voluntary Plan of Correction DR – Director Referral CO – Compliance Order WAO – Work and Activity Order	Legendé WN – Avis écrit VPC – Plan de redressement volontaire DR – Aiguillage au directeur CO – Ordre de conformité WAO – Ordres : travaux et activités
<p>Non-compliance with requirements under the Long-Term Care Homes Act, 2007 (LTCHA) was found. (a requirement under the LTCHA includes the requirements contained in the items listed in the definition of "requirement under this Act" in subsection 2(1) of the LTCHA).</p> <p>The following constitutes written notification of non-compliance under paragraph 1 of section 152 of the LTCHA.</p>	<p>Le non-respect des exigences de la Loi de 2007 sur les foyers de soins de longue durée (LFSLD) a été constaté. (une exigence de la loi comprend les exigences qui font partie des éléments énumérés dans la définition de « exigence prévue par la présente loi », au paragraphe 2(1) de la LFSLD.</p> <p>Ce qui suit constitue un avis écrit de non-respect aux termes du paragraphe 1 de l'article 152 de la LFSLD.</p>

**WN #1: The Licensee has failed to comply with O.Reg 79/10, s. 88. Pest control
Specifically failed to comply with the following:**

s. 88. (1) As part of organized programs of housekeeping and maintenance services under clauses 15 (1) (a) and (c) of the Act, every licensee of a long-term care home shall ensure that an organized preventive pest control program using the services of a licensed pest controller is in place at the home, including records indicating the dates of visits and actions taken. O. Reg. 79/10, s. 88 (1).

Findings/Faits saillants :

1. The licensee has failed to comply with O. Reg. 79/10, s. 88 in that the licensee has



failed to ensure that the organized preventative pest control program using the services of a licensed pest controller that is in place at the home includes records indicating actions taken.

On March 3rd, 2016, the Inspector reviewed the records provided to the home by the licensed pest controller that oversees that pest control program, Orkin Canada. The Orkin records are formally known as “service exception reports” and are produced by the pest control technician from a handheld device at the time of the service delivery using the “Smartsan” system. The Inspector focused on service records from May 2015 to March 2016, related to the control of a specific type of pest.

On March 3rd, 2016, at approximately 1400 hrs, in the company of the home’s Support Services Manager (SSM), the home’s Orkin pest control technician met briefly with the Inspector. The pest control (PC) technician explained, in part, how to interpret the service exception reports. The PC technician proceeded, in the company of the SSM, to conduct a service, which included treatment for an identified pest, in nine bedrooms and in the east dining room on the fifth floor. The SSM indicated that he accompanies the PC technician on all of his service visits, to all areas.

In the service summary area of each service exception report, the number of traps/monitors serviced is noted, the number of traps/monitors serviced with detail recorded is noted, and the total number of such devices is noted. The PC technician explained that if he observes an area and there is no pest activity and he does not have to do anything to the device(s), there is no detail recorded. The PC technician explained that if a tracked device in an area is serviced, and there are no other actions taken in the area, there is no detail recorded. If details are required, they are captured within the “service detail” section of the service record. The PC technician indicated that he observes all devices, during every service visit. There were no floor plans illustrating the location of devices throughout the home. Based on the service exception report, in the absence of additional supporting information, it could not be ascertained where the PC technician goes during each service visit. As well, it could not be determined where serviced devices, without detail recorded, were located.

Based on the information provided in the “service detail” section of the service exception reports, in the absence of additional supporting information, the Inspector was unable to determine the location of pest control actions taken. In the service details section, codes are used to indicate locations, with a letter to represent the type of pest activity monitor or device in the area and a number that represents the actual location. The PC technician



explained, for example, that “M” represents an insect monitor (glue board), that “G” represents a trapper monitor, and that “T” represents a Tin Cat trap. There was no corresponding legend for the codes, to clarify the actual location. For example, on the November 2015 service report, under the section that represents the pest control service (vs fly control) under the heading of “INTERIOR”, then “KITCHEN”, there is reference to the following devices – G1,G2,G5,G6,M2,M2,M3,M3 and T2. It was ascertained that codes that fall under the heading of “KITCHEN” do not necessarily refer to devices in the home’s kitchen. For example, related to the insect monitors, two codes were used, M2 and M3, under the heading “KITCHEN”. The PC technician explained that a section with a heading of M2 could represent the kitchenette on the fifth or the third floor. He explained that M3 could represent the kitchenette on fourth floor or on the second floor. The PC technician explained that he would also make specific reference to bedrooms he inspected within an “M” section, as there was nowhere else for him to document the bedroom locations or related actions taken. When bedroom locations were listed within an “M” section, it was possible to surmise which floor was being referenced. The PC technician also explained that a nurses station would also be captured within an “M” section, although without specific reference to the floor, there was no way to discern the nursing station being referenced (i.e. January 2015 service report: M3.0 Serviced, Visual Inspection, Insect Activity, Dusted Nursing Station). Furthermore, the Inspector later noted that an “M” code was not always used when an insect monitor was in place. For example, in the service detail section of the February 2015 service exception report, the code T2 is used, yet an insect monitor (glue board) is referenced. The information was presented as follows: “T2.0 Serviced – Device Maintenance – Replaced Glue Board”. The letter “T” represents a Tin Cat trap. Coding with “T” or “G”, with reference to glue boards, was seen on all reports, from May 2015 to March 2016.

Related to pest control actions in resident bedrooms, the service records did not always provide a clear picture of what had occurred. For example, the service report issued to the home on March 3rd, 2016, included the two following sections within the service detail section: “M2.0 Missed, Visual Inspection, Insect Activity,...”, with reference to two identified bedrooms, and “M2.0 Serviced, Visual Inspection, Insect Activity,....”, with reference to seven identified bedrooms and a common area. The SSM indicated that he was not aware what it meant when the PC technician indicated “missed” on the service reports, and there was no corresponding legend. The SSM confirmed that although it is not stated on the March 3rd, 2016 service report, all identified bedrooms and the common area were treated for an identified pest. The SSM indicated that if there was observed pest activity in a bedroom at the time of a service visit in the past, it would have almost certainly been treated. The SSM confirmed that he had not maintained his own



**Ministry of Health and
Long-Term Care**

**Ministère de la Santé et des
Soins de longue durée**

**Inspection Report under
the Long-Term Care
Homes Act, 2007**

**Rapport d'inspection sous la
Loi de 2007 sur les foyers de
soins de longue durée**

records of what bedrooms had been treated, as he was always with the PC technician and therefore he always knew that the bedrooms that needed to be treated were treated. The May 2015 service report also referenced bedrooms that were inspected, indicating that pest activity was observed, yet there was no reference to pest treatment. The December, September and June 2015 service reports referenced bedrooms that were inspected, with no indication if pest activity was found or not. The September 2015 service report also references bedrooms that were inspected, with no indication of observed pest activity, yet referenced a pest control product under the bedroom numbers. The June 2015 also referenced bedrooms that were inspected and it was specified that no activity was found. Related to other devices/locations referenced with code (i.e "G" or "T" and a number), from May 2015 - March 2016, without exception, where there was reference to a visual inspection, there was notation of "No Activity found. All good" . [s. 88. (1)]

Issued on this 14th day of March, 2016

Signature of Inspector(s)/Signature de l'inspecteur ou des inspecteurs

Original report signed by the inspector.