

**Safety Review Committee**  
February 6, 2007  
10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

**Minutes**

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

**Others Present:** \*Richard DeBusk (for Paul Blodgett), Paul Fallon,\*Jim Floyd (for Michael Martin), Howard Hatayama, Carol Ingram, \*Tony Linard (for Scott Taylor), Florence Mou, Georgeanna Perdue, Janice Sexson, Aaron Zude

**Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas**

David McGraw has requested referral of measures receiving less than 2/3 majority approval to him for resolution. Don Lucas plans to refer measures with more than one Division dissenting, and to record which Divisions dissented so that David may contact the Division SRC representatives to discuss.

**Proposed Changes to PUB-3000**

**Chapter 32 Job Hazard Analysis – Howard Hatayama and John Seabury**

Don Lucas and Howard Hatayama thanked Job Hazard Analysis subcommittee chair Paul Fallon and others who participated in developing and reviewing the proposed chapter. Don Lucas asked that committee members direct their attention to the policy change under consideration. Implementation details may be revised later.

Howard Hatayama began with a presentation on why the Job Hazard Analysis (JHA) chapter was developed. The regulatory driver is 10 CFR 851. The Peer Review found that LBNL has no lab-wide work control program for routine maintenance and project work. The McCallum/Turner reviewers had similar concerns that LBNL's thresholds for formal hazard analysis are too high. Most DOE facilities have a JHA process similar to the one being proposed. DOE reviewers will be familiar with other sites and compare our systems with theirs. There is also a business case for having JHA. It should help to reduce the risk of adverse incidents by creating a venue for discussion of hazards and controls in a more consistent and formal way. It gives work leads and workers a tool for communicating and understanding the hazards and controls. It should improve efficiency by avoiding stop work and rework due to better planning. The goal is to ensure all work is analyzed for hazards, the hazards are controlled, and the work is authorized. At LLNL, each JHA requires a 3-10 page form, and there is an average of 10 tasks per person. LBNL would like to accomplish the goal more efficiently.

John Seabury answered questions about the details of the JHA process. The SRC members' comments indicated some confusion about baseline and task JHAs. Everyone will have a baseline JHA that covers his or her regular, routine duties. The task-based JHA is a supplement that covers special or unexpected duties. Divisions can use their own processes for task-based JHAs if approved by the EH&S Division Director as equivalent. A baseline JHA can be done for a group. The JHQ provides information that is incorporated in the draft baseline JHA. A look-up table will be added to the JHQ. The facilitator and supervisor meet with the worker and revise the draft, removing non-applicable hazards, expanding controls, adding unique hazards. The JHA can reference other applicable formal authorizations, such as AHDs and RWAs.

There were questions about why JHAs are needed when we already have AHDs. Typically, AHDs don't include all tasks. AHDs require more signatures and are more difficult to change than JHAs. Some people work under more than one AHD. We are trying to avoid duplication of information between AHDs and JHA, but the implementation details and system of how to do this have not all been worked out. The JHA system was designed around the JHQ, but there are other ways to define hazards. Some divisions can do JHAs for groups, with multiple employees signing a group JHA.

There will be a pilot study with representative groups. The Advanced Light Source wants to participate, and other volunteers are needed. The pilot study is expected to last until the end of the fiscal year. After the pilot study, revisions will be brought back to the SRC for approval. Full implementation is required by May 2008. EH&S is asking for approval of the pilot project at this meeting. This is a new direction for the Lab – a major change in the way we do business. The Worker Health and Safety Plan can be modified if the system does not work.

There were questions about how the JHA process will work for Facilities and contractor work. There is an equivalent existing system on Maximo for JHA on work requests. Subcontractors will submit more detailed safety plans. For service vendors, the contract

language is being revised to require more analysis. Facilities will pre-analyze routine tasks. The pilot test will look at parallel systems.

The JHA information will need to be readily retrievable. The intent is to develop an electronic information collection/storage/signature system. It could also send out update reminders.

There was a discussion of how the group JHAs would interface with individual baseline JHAs. Many people do several different things with different work groups. The JHA process should facilitate discussion of which groups people may belong to. For example, some mechanical technicians are also vacuum technicians. A person's JHA would be the sum of all the different groups that person belongs to. The group JHA is a template for the individual JHAs. Divisions will need the flexibility to do JHAs by group.

There was a discussion of the role of supervisors and work leads. The concept was that the supervisor would extend the current JHQ discussion process with the employee to create a baseline JHA. Work leads could act as supervisors in helping to complete the JHA. Guests and users present some special issues. Foreign nationals cannot be AHERA supervisors, and yet they are often important parts of our line management chain. Some of the solutions will have to be division-specific. The rules for who needs to complete a baseline JHA would be the same as who needs to complete a JHQ— people who will be working at least 30 continuous days on site. This includes LBNL space on the UC campus (Donner and Calvin). People who do not have a JHA would have to have line-of-site supervision and/or user training. Cyberguests who don't come on site would not be included. Contractors are required to have a safety plan if hazards are above a negligible level. More guidance is needed on when an exposure assessment is required. EH&S Division intends to put together an implementation manual.

Don Lucas called for a vote. The proposed changes to Chapter 32 were approved by a vote of all SRC members present with no objectors. The chapter was approved with the following provisions:

- The SRC approved the concept of Job Hazard Analysis as described;
- The approval is for a pilot program applicable to work groups who volunteer for the pilot;
- The timeline should be defined (duration of pilot until end of FY07, final implementation May 08);
- At the end of the pilot, revisions will be proposed to the SRC for approval;
- There should be explicit language added to allow divisions to develop equivalent systems and apply for EH&S Director approval.
- Scope of work: the document applies to Work Groups that are part of the pilot (replace the word "Divisions");
- Authorization is by Work Lead, not Supervisor (global Search and Replace).

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 AM

Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary