Safety Review Committee
November 21, 2003
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Members Present
Joel Ager, Michael Banda, Dennis Collins, Sharon Doyle (by David Keys), Ben Feinberg (Chair), Richard Kadel, Ed Lampo (Secretary), Peter Lichty, Don Lucas, Steve Lundgren, Augusto Macchiavelli, Othon Monteiro, Linfeng Rao, Linda Smith, Scott Taylor, Linda Wuy, Hisao Yokota

Members Absent
Ken Fletcher, Mack Kennedy, Weyland Wong

Others Present
John Chernowski, Ross Fisher, Kathie Hardy, Jim Seigrist, Robin Wendt, Otis Wong

Previous Minutes

The October meeting minutes were distributed and discussed. A question was raised as to Laser Safety and "enclosure" vis-à-vis "interlock" requirements. No change was made to minutes, but this matter will be discussed in the future. The minutes were accepted as submitted.

Comments from the Chair

Ergo Pilot Sub-committee is assessing results in their Divisions.

Legacy Waste (avoidance) will be discussed at next SRC meeting.

Physics Division: MESH Response

Joel Ager, MESH Team Leader for the Physics review, stated that their walk-thru of Physics' space found great awareness of safety. However, there were several instances of missing documentation. Overall, Physics has an excellent safety record. Joel introduced Jim Seigrist, Physics Division Director. Jim's response to the MESH review follows.

In the Physics Division, ES&H resources are provided at the project level. The division employs 170 people and there are another 140 guests. General safety roles and responsibilities were presented. The Division Director approves ISM plan, participates in self-assessment activities, meets weekly with Safety Coordinator, and includes ES&H topics in staff meetings. Group leaders & lab managers incorporate ES&H in experiment planning, provide training & "hazard communication", establish administrative & engineering controls, communicate lessons learned, and participate in self-assessment activities. The ES&H Coordinator develops& administers ISM plan, develops policies & procedures, manages self-assessment process, develops ES&H budget, provides training, and is the chair of ES&H Committee. The ES&H Committee has a significant role; i.e., the members are experienced, they review ES&H needs in policy, procedure, equipment & training, perform project reviews, participate in self-assessment activities & root cause analysis, communicate ES&H issues, and provide ES&H advice.
The ES&H roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority are identified and clarified via:

- written job descriptions
- annual, mandatory All-Hands meetings
- project leader meetings
- meetings with technical staff
- performance appraisals.

Overall, Physics has maintained a safe working environment. There have been no occurrences for over 15 years. Their accident rate is quite low and has been so for several years. They have well-established work planning & hazard review processes. They actively collaborate with EH&S specialists. The MESH verifies Physics' high level of individual awareness of ES&H program.

MESH Concerns and Corrective Actions

1) Concern: Lack of formality and rigor in hazard review of existing projects.
Corrective Action: Reinstate annual written sign-off. Confirm reviews in ES&H Committee minutes.

2) Concern: Relatively low completion of required training.
Corrective Action:

- Institute on-line customized training
- Improve access to training records for supervisors
- Re-institute Attachment-C (training) to personnel appraisals

3) Concern: Lack of timeliness in data processing & documentation records.
Corrective Action:

- Re-institute inspection sheet sign-off
- ES&H Committee review corrective action completions
- Quarterly review of training statistics by EH&S Committee

4) Concern: Low rate of ergonomic evaluations.
Corrective Action:

- Schedule targeted EHS-60 class in 2004
- Perform 10 ergo evaluations per month until all employees covered
- Establish more rigorous tracking system to ensure recommendations followed

5) Concern: Microsystems Lab manager is not on ES&H Committee.
Corrective Action: He has been asked to serve a 3-year term.

In summary, the overall concerns of the MESH review are:

- Need rigorous hazard review for on-going work
- Documentation is not comprehensive
- Low training rates
- Inadequate follow-up for Corrective Actions

In general, these concerns will be addressed by returning to established protocols & procedures and assuring that documentation is accomplished and filed in a timely manner.

Discussion of MESH Frequencies

The SRC has been requested to schedule future MESH reviews for those Divisions reviewed this year. The next reviews can be in either two, three or four years. Final determinations are based upon the findings this year and subsequent ISM board review. The findings, concerns, and noteworthy practices of this year were discussed. Tentatively, ALS, EETD, and PBD will have four years until their next MESH; the Directorate and Physics will be reviewed in two years.

AHD Training Improvement Recommendation

In Appendix F of the FY03 UC/DOE contract for Berkeley Lab there is a recommendation for, "hands-on competency demonstration by workers". The competency referred to is in the area of Activity Hazard Document (AHD) processes. For FY04 LBNL has set as a goal to, *"develop a training competency "show me" format applicable to Activity Hazard Documents and will incorporate the format into the training requirements for an AHD as set forth in PUB 3000, Chapter 6, Appendix E."* The current AHD template lists nine items to be addressed:

1. General Information
2. Description of Activity
3. Identification of Hazards
4. Mitigation of Hazards
5. Hazardous Material Handling
6. Hazardous Waste
7. Emergency Procedures
8. Maintenance
9. Authorized Users and Training

Ross Fisher proposed changing the ninth and adding a tenth, to be:

9. Authorized Users and Required LBNL Training Matrix
10. Activity Hazard Document Training Effectiveness

    Provide details of how AHD-specific training will be accomplished and documented. Identify what assessment tool or process will be used to evaluate training effectiveness. Provide a mechanism for trainer and trainee signature. Define the AHD training and assessment interval requirements (initial, periodic refreshers, significant change).

    Examples include but are not limited to the following: (List examples of training effectiveness assessment tools)

Discussion ensued with a suggestion that #9 remain as original and #10 only be "Verify Training Effectiveness". At the next SRC meeting, new simplified proposed change to PUB3000 will be presented. Ben mentioned that Larry McLouth is the new AHD Coordinator, and will be central contact for AHD matters. Larry and Robin are willing to meet with the SRC concerning AHD database.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:47 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward J. Lampo
SRC Secretary