

Safety Review Committee

January 26, 2007

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Ager, Joel W.	Materials Sciences Division	X
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	X
Cork, Carl	Physical Biosciences Division	X
Fletcher, Kenneth A.	Facilities Department	
Franaszek, Stephen	Genomics Division	X
Kadel, Richard W.	Physics Division	
Leitner, Daniela	Nuclear Science Division	X
Lucas, Donald	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	X
Lukens Jr., Wayne W.	Chemical Sciences Division	X
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	X
Nakamura, Seiji	Earth Sciences Division	X
Seidl, Peter A.	Accelerator & Fusion Research Division	X
Smith, Linda K.	Information Technology Division	X
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	X
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Review Committee Secretary	X
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	X

Others Present: Richard DeBusk, Howard Hatayama, Carol Ingram, Matt Kotowski, Mike Kritscher, Peter Lichty, Tony Linard, Georgeanna Perdue

Minutes of January 19 Meeting – Two comments have been received.

Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas

Don Lucas thanked committee members for their participation in the special meeting. If anyone is having problems with their division because of the time commitment for these extra meetings, please let Don Lucas know.

Proposed Changes to PUB-3000

Chapters ready for Safety Review Committee review are posted in folder 6 on the PUB-3000 e-room. Some chapters of PUB-3000 will only have editorial changes and will not require a full committee review and vote. If you have questions about anything in the e-room, contact Georgeanna Perdue.

Chapter 32, Job Hazards Analysis, will be posted late on January 31st for review at the February 6 meeting. The Subcommittee chair and chapter owner will give the presentation.

Chapter 5 Material Handling has been split into two chapters, Chapter 27 Cranes, Hoisting and Rigging and Chapter 28 Forklifts and Other Powered Industrial Trucks.

Chapter 27 Cranes, Hoisting and Rigging – Matt Kotowski

Most of the changes to this chapter implement changes that were announced last year in a memo that responded to deficiencies identified during DOE and internal assessments.

Section 27.6 requires that a crane manager be identified for each crane or hoist. This has already been implemented for most cranes. Steve Wright in Facilities has a list of crane managers. The proposed chapter does not specify who designates the crane managers. Matt Kotowski suggested that the division director who owns the space should make the designation in writing to the crane and elevator operator. The Division Safety Coordinators should review the appointees with the Facilities Crane and Elevator Office to ensure qualified people are selected. The crane manager is the custodian responsible for controlling use of the crane. The chapter has been modified to allow the practice of using logbooks in lieu of inspection tags. The crane manager maintains any logbooks.

Section 27.7.1 requires locking the electrical controls or remote control unit of any crane that is not in use for an entire shift. This requirement does not apply to human-powered mechanical devices, such as skyhooks. LBNL requires different training for use of cranes and hoists with less than 2 tons capacity than for greater than 2 tons capacity. The OSHA forklift regulations exclude non-powered devices but the crane regulations do not distinguish between powered and non-powered cranes and hoists.

Section 27.7.3 requires hard hats to be worn by all personnel operating a crane or hoist, participating in the lift, or within 15 feet of the vertical plane of the load, where the undercarriage of the ridge is more than 12 feet from the ground. The language was developed as a compromise between EH&S and engineering. OSHA regulations do not define exactly when protective equipment is required. OSHA requires hard hats to be worn where they can reduce the risk of head injury. The previous policy allowed the crane operator to determine when hard hats were needed. Some other laboratories (Oak Ridge, Argonne) and industry work sites require anyone under a moving bridge to wear a hard hat. Other laboratories (SLAC, LLNL) and some industry work sites have policies more similar to ours. The McCallum/ Turner auditors observed crane use in Bldg. 77 and questioned why we did not require everyone to wear hard hats. The concern is that debris left on the rails could fall on people below. On construction sites, everyone wears hard hats. LBNL has some very large research areas with cranes such as the ALS floor where it would be difficult to have everyone wear hard hats.

The question was raised as to whether there was evidence that increasing the hardhat requirements would improve safety. Kevin Trigales (Facilities Rigging Supervisor) said

that any time you have moving parts, there is a potential for something to fall off. Paul Knopf said that he has had no experience with falling objects from the crane in Bldg. 77 in over 20 years. The bridges are inspected quarterly by the crane inspection contractor. The bridges are sometimes used for other purposes, such as changing overhead lights, and Matt Kotowski commented that he knows of several instances when materials were left behind. There was an incident at Hanford where an employee was struck by a wire that broke on a mobile crane. We could require inspection after any work over the crane. Howard Hatayama said that there is also a risk in having more frequent inspections. There is also some loss of visibility for the people wearing hard hats. We need to balance these risks. There should be a minimum requirement, as described in the proposed chapter; however, crane operators can adjust the boundary and require more people to wear hard hats depending on the risk of the work being done. The proposed 12 ft. bridge height comes from the size of our labs and the risk of damage or injury from items falling from that height.

Section 27.9 requires approval from the Crane and Elevator Office before purchasing hoists or cranes or listing equipment. There was a question as to how to control purchase of items that can be obtained through McMaster. They could be put on the restricted items list; however, there are some items such as wire ropes and shackles that may be used for other purposes, such as seismic restraints, and should not be restricted. If items have to be purchased through Procurement, they cost more. Steve Wright in the Crane and Elevator Office can order items for people. The crane and hoist operator training covers purchasing approval requirements. The annual inspections by the crane contractor look for tags on all lifting equipment.

There have been some rumors that there could be some limited lifting allowed over the rated capacity of the cranes. Matt Kotowski clarified that this is not allowed. He also cannot grant exceptions for use of mobile cranes without a license. He understands that the trainers are backlogged and it takes a while to get a license.

The proposed changes to Chapter 27 were approved by a vote of 9 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Chapter 28 Forklifts and Other Powered Industrial Trucks – Matt Kotowski

A Powered Industrial Truck is anything with a motor that is used to move along materials, such as pallet lifters, stackers, tow motors, and pushers. Manual, non-powered devices are not included.

The LBNL training courses were improved and forklift operators have been retrained to meet OSHA standards. Normally, the certification expires after 3 years; however, recertification may be required whenever a person is observed operating in an unsafe manner. A person can get a learners permit to receive on-the-job training for up to 90 days.

The daily inspection checklist must be completed for any shift when the forklift will be used. A maintenance contractor does quarterly vehicle inspections for forklifts. This is arranged through Shipping and Receiving.

Casual visitors are not allowed to operate forklifts or cranes. Chapters 27 and 28 apply to non-construction contractors. There are different requirements for earth-moving equipment than for forklifts and powered industrial trucks.

The proposed changes to Chapter 28 were approved by a vote of all SRC members present with no objectors.

Discussion

There was a question about the definition of “direct supervision”. This should be clarified to mean working within the line of sight of the supervisor.

There was a discussion as to whether the EHS027 safety walkaround training class should be required for everyone who does safety walkarounds, or whether the training required should be specified by each division’s Integrated Safety Management Plan. Opinions on the value of the class vary. It was suggested that the course content be streamlined and incorporated into the supervisor/work lead safety course. The first part of the course could be attended by both formal supervisors and work leads, with the additional requirements that only apply to formal supervisors being given at the end of the course.

Walkthrough classes are being tailored to the needs of each division, incorporating the requirements of the division ISM plan. The Advanced Light Source has been working with a contractor to provide customized training and they are applying for an equivalency determination. There is also a general class that is offered monthly. There was a concern that while the initial set of participants will attend the division-specific classes, most people in subsequent years may receive training that is not division-specific. Some divisions use checklists. Communicating with employees and showing concern for their safety is the most important aspect of walkarounds; however, checklist may also be used if they are useful to the people doing the walkarounds. The emphasis is on interaction. There is more emphasis on ISM Plan requirements in the self-assessment criteria this year. Divisions will need to communicate their specific requirements to people who take the generic class.

There was a question as to whether Job Hazard Analysis will supercede the need for walkarounds. There may be some redundancy, but they are conceptually distinct. Job Hazard Analyses identify hazards and controls, while walkarounds reinforce working to the identified controls. We need to be aware of the total time commitment we are expecting from supervisors.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM

Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary