

Safety Review Committee
April 20, 2007
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Ager, Joel W.	Materials Sciences Division	
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	X
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	X
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	*
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	X
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Review Committee Secretary (for Peter Seidl)	X
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	X

Others Present: Hattie Carwell, John Chernowski, Richard DeBusk, Michelle Flynn, Pilar Francino, Mary Gross, Tony Linard, Georgeanna Perdue, Janice Sexson, John Speros, *Ann Tomaselli (for Linda Smith), Bill Wells

Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas

The Committee welcomed Pilar Francino, who has been nominated to replace Stephen Franaszek as the Genomics Division Representative. Pilar has been doing genomics research at LBNL for 5 years. She will be working on the Life Sciences Division MESH team.

2007 MESH – Michelle Flynn

Michelle Flynn has been working with Don Lucas on some proposed changes to the MESH Review process. An effectiveness review found inconsistent identification of systemic problems. To facilitate open communication of issues, the MESH teams should request that the division management not be present during staff interviews.

There should be a greater focus on evaluating the effectiveness of communication. A new question was proposed to be added to Question 1.4 of the SRC MESH

Questionnaire: *How does the Division measure effectiveness? What is the current level of staff awareness of ES&H policies/procedures at the institutional and divisional level? Absent an established process, please provide results of a “vertical slice” survey. Example questions and report attached.* The Physics Division does a vertical slice survey as part of their self-assessment that could be used as a model for other divisions. The survey would not be required if divisions can demonstrate that they have another process in place to evaluate communications. Some committee members expressed concern that there is no existing requirement for divisions to formally measure the effectiveness of their communications systems as part of their self-assessment, so this would be a new requirement. They recommended that the change be discussed with the Division Safety Coordinators Subcommittee before being adopted. Division safety coordinators have not been trained in how to do surveys or evaluate the results to determine whether they are statistically significant. They would need training or guidance from the Office of Contract Assurance. There was a concern that it would take too long for divisions to perform the survey as part of the MESH process. A Human Use approval is not required for surveys unless the results are formally published. It was suggested that the words “please provide” be removed and the vertical slice survey be described as an example.

There should be less emphasis at the opening meeting on the Division Director’s presentation. Instead, briefly explain the MESH process and ask if they have any questions. The Division Director should be interviewed at the end of the MESH review. Ask for the Division Director’s input on what does / does not work in the Division’s ISM system.

The new question 5.3 asks, *“What corrective actions did the Division take to address concerns identified in its last MESH Review (list attached)? How effective were those actions in the near and long-term?”* Institutional findings that have not been resolved should be referred to David McGraw. The status of open institutional findings should be reviewed annually.

The SRC MESH webpage information is also being revised. There was a question about section 4 Roles, paragraph B DOE/Berkeley Site Office Observation. It says that the DOE Berkeley Site Office (BSO) may review a draft version of the final report, and that the MESH Team and subject Division will address BSO questions and concerns resulting from the review of the draft final report. There was a concern that requiring a response to BSO input may compromise the independence of the review team. BSO acts as an observer during most of the review, but may become involved by providing input at the end. There was a question about at which point in the review BSO would receive the draft. The division being reviewed should see the draft first for factual accuracy review before it is sent to BSO. It was clarified that the review teams are not required to accept the BSO opinion, only to respond to it. John Chernowski and Hattie Carwell said that the BSO role was negotiated between LBNL and the site office two or three years ago, and it has not been causing any problems during the reviews. Any changes would require negotiation between LBNL and BSO management. Hattie said that BSO personnel would like to be informed of the scope of the review and the findings, so that they can

compare their perspective of divisions, gained through Operational Awareness activities, and reconcile them with the perspective of the MESH team. Their comments have mostly been questions about points needing clarification. As a component of LBNL's self assessment, BSO must be able to evaluate the effectiveness and robustness of the MESH process.

The divisions' ISM Plans should be updated annually, as one of the division self-assessment criteria. The divisions should provide an up-to-date copy of their ISM Plan to the MESH review team.

Proposed Changes to PUB-3000

Richard DeBusk asked for approval of a proposed change to PUB-3000, Chapter 1, Section 1.3.7.1 Subcontractor Flow-down of Safety and Health Requirements. The issue of subcontractor safety has been divided into two elements: ongoing management of subcontractor work, and coordination of safety plans during contracting. The issue to be discussed at this meeting is the coordination of safety plans.

At the previous meeting, the Safety Review Committee raised concerns that the person requesting the procurement may not always be able to judge the hazard of the work. The issue is being addressed by a Procurement policy. The hazard will be decided by EH&S Division.

The requestor will be asked whether the work will take place on site or off site. There is no requirement for a safety plan to be submitted for off-site work. The Safety Coordinators commented at their committee meeting that the terms "on site" and "off site" need to be defined because some campus buildings are considered "on site" and the requestor might not know how to interpret the question. SRC members recommended that the question be changed to ask whether the work will take place at any of these locations, with a pull-down menu to indicate on-site buildings.

The safety plan requirement only applies to service contracts. There is a list of designated services that have been pre-determined to be non-hazardous. Repairs of electrical equipment are not on the list. EH&S Division will screen electrical repair work using PUB-3000 criteria to determine the hazard level. Under PUB-3000, some testing and troubleshooting of energized equipment is allowed, but repair work requires Lockout/Tagout of energy sources. SRC members asked that the Procurement buyers, rather than the requestors, make the determination as to whether the requested work is on the designated services list.

For work requiring a safety plan, EH&S Division will send a questionnaire to the vendor, similar to the construction contract questionnaire. Vendors usually respond promptly. There was a concern from some SRC members that their experience has been that it takes some vendors a long time to respond to questions. Richard DeBusk acknowledged that there might be problems with some vendors who do not consider LBNL a high-priority customer. EH&S Division personnel have been doing some pilot reviews using the new

process. The EH&S part of the review can usually be completed in 3 days or less. The time taken to process a procurement will be tracked. It was suggested that the process be tested on three types of service contracts. Reviewing safety plans in advance should help prevent delays from having to stop work that is not being done safely.

Most of the safety review process should be invisible to the person requesting the procurement. The subject matter expert and division safety coordinator will be informed that the work will take place. Supervision of the work by the PI is not required by the Procurement procedure. Following the safety plan will be a contract requirement. The issue of subcontractor oversight is not part of the policy decision requested today. The issue of supervision will be discussed separately at another meeting. There are general statements about line management responsibility under Integrated Safety Management in PUB-3000. There is an expectation that Principal Investigators will provide a safe work environment, but it is unclear exactly how much oversight is expected.

Installation of new equipment, “plug-and play”, is generally exempted if it does not require a penetration permit or construction work.

SRC members asked for the following changes:

- The proposed PUB-3000 section points to the procurement procedure; however, the wording of the section doesn't specifically mention the procurement document. The procurement procedure isn't readily accessible on the web. SRC members recommended that the procurement procedure be linked with PUB-3000.
- The section should specify that it is only applicable to service contracts.
- The e-buy form should provide a pull-down list of on-site buildings rather than asking if the work is on or off site.
- The decision about whether the work falls under a designated service contract list category should be made by the buyer, not the requestor.

Don Lucas asked for a vote on approving the proposed PUB-3000, Chapter 1, Section 1.3.7.1, with the changes requested above. The measure was approved by a vote of 12 divisions in favor and 1 (Life Sciences) opposed. The measure will be referred to David McGraw to consider the dissenting the division's objections.

Discussion: Feedback on Supervisor Ergonomics Visits

Most Divisions provided feedback to Dr. Chu on the supervisor ergonomics visits. The division reports have been sent to EH&S Division. The ergonomics program manager, Ira Janowitz, is at a UC ergonomics conference and has not had time to analyze the reports yet. He will provide a summary at the next SRC meeting.

Some supervisors were confused about what was expected of them because they have not been trained in ergonomic evaluation and the instructions on what to do did not come out until after the memo from Dr. Chu. The general impression was that the effort was worthwhile because it resulted in identification of some problems and several requests for

evaluations; however, better initial coordination could have made the process go more smoothly. (EH&S Division received a request at 9:30 AM to draft a “Today at Berkeley Lab” article on ergonomics by 2:00 PM, then at 4:30 PM a notice was sent to Business Managers that a memo would be sent out to supervisors the next day, which was followed by the memo being sent to supervisors a half-hour later at 5 PM. This caused some initial confusion.) The Safety Review Committee would like to offer their assistance to LBNL senior management in coordinating similar initiatives in the future.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM

Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary