Safety Review Committee
May 18, 2007
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	*
Cork, Carl	Physical Biosciences Division	X
Dubon, Oscar	Materials Sciences Division	X
Fletcher, Kenneth A.	Facilities Department	
Francino Puget, Maria Pilar	Genomics Division	X
Kadel, Richard W.	Physics Division	X
Leitner, Daniela	Nuclear Science Division	X
Lucas, Donald	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	
Lukens Jr., Wayne W.	Chemical Sciences Division	X
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	X
Nakagawa, 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: Joel Ager, John Chernowski,*Richard DeBusk (for Paul Blodgett), Howard Hatayama, Ira Janowitz, Tony Linard, Florence Mon, Jim Siegrist, Marty White

Chairman's Comments – Scott Taylor

The committee welcomed Oscar Dubon, the new representative for Materials Sciences Division.

There was a request by Richard Kadel to Howard Hatayama to consider improving the Environment, Health and Safety (EH&S) Division website.

2007 MESH – The most recent Management of Environment, Safety and Health (MESH) review team roster was distributed. Daniela Leitner will be leading the EH&S Division MESH. The teams are working on scheduling their reviews with the divisions.

Job Hazards Questionnaire – Wayne Lukens

There are problems with implementing the current Job Hazards Questionnaire (JHQ) system for people who work on the University of California (UC) campus. Requiring on-campus people to take the JHQ violates the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with

campus and wastes time because some of the training is not applicable to campus work and UC offers different training. The JHQ results are expected to provide input to the Job Hazard Analysis process. Some LBNL classes (such as laser safety) are useful to campus workers.

To address these issues, the JHQ is being revised to start with a question about where the person works. The programming has been finished, and the change is expected to be installed within a month. The JHQ will recommend (not require) training for people who work on campus, to stimulate discussion between the supervisor and employee as to which courses are appropriate.

Howard Hatayama is discussing the issues with the divisions who have the most people on campus. Materials Sciences Division requires supervisors to attest that their people have completed all required training; however, there is no way to verify that the UC courses have been completed. This has been a big issue for the Laser Safety Subcommittee. The MOU with campus says that only the host organization can specify training requirements. We will soon have formal equivalency established for laser safety training.

It is not clear when work on campus is considered LBNL work. When there is an accident, it tends to be broadly interpreted. This is a serious issue that needs management input. It affects LBNL-paid graduate students and postdocs.

The Job Hazard Analysis requirement will not apply to people who only work on campus. The JHQ rule needs to be clarified. The question asking whether people work on site more than 30 days does not change the training requirements. These issues will need further discussion.

Physics Division MESH Response – Jim Siegrist

MESH team member Wayne Lukens commented that their general impression of the Physics Division was good. The high hazards were well managed. There were a lot of potential ergonomics issues that were being addressed.

Division Director Jim Siegrist said that Physics has clarified safety roles and responsibilities and communicated the changes at meetings. They have a new ES&H Coordinator, Marty White, who is being shared 50% with Nuclear Science Division. There are new responsibilities for Principle Investigators (PIs), including quarterly reporting. Maintaining databases requires significant resources. The allocation of duties is slightly different than the PUB-3000 model for safety coordinators. Action items from the previous MESH review have all been closed. The Division Safety Committee is providing additional oversight. The annual project review is a noteworthy practice.

An institutional issue that was discovered is that some personnel are not completing pre-employment medical reviews. This can be a problem if there is a pre-existing condition. It is hard to tell whether an ergonomics problem was caused by work at LBNL. More

people are arriving with existing ergonomics injuries. Physics Division is reducing risk of ergonomic injuries by increasing ergonomics reviews by 6 times, and adding an ergonomics advocate. They are making employees aware of laptop use aids.

They are reviewing who has access to the Microsystems Lab, their highest hazard area.

To improve training compliance, supervisors of guests are being notified that guest status will be revoked if JHQs and required training are not completed. They found that there were some people with Guest status who really should be visitors. They are cleaning up the data by removing Guests who have left LBNL. They are also reviewing and cleaning up inaccurate JHQ responses that indicated training that isn't needed. The training rate is now up to 91%, and will require continuing attention.

The Vertical Slice communications survey is a noteworthy practice. The survey identified problems with emergency notifications and understanding the Stop Work policy.

PIs are being held responsible for closing out corrective actions in Corrective Action Tracking System (CATS) database. PIs submit quarterly walkthrough reports to the division safety committee.

They noticed that no new "near misses" were being reported, so they are asking for examples of "poor safety practices" to be reported to supervisors.

A representative from the Microsystems Lab was added to the division safety committee.

There was some discussion of whether pre-placement medical exams for guests are good ideas. There seems to be an increasing frequency of incoming graduate students having ergonomics problems. Should there be a "grace period" when ergonomics injuries are assumed to be pre-existing?

Ergonomics Program Update – Ira Janowitz

PUB-3000 Chapter 17, Ergonomics, is being overhauled and may be ready for review next month. Ergonomics is important to LBNL because about 2/3 of our injuries are ergonomics-related. We continue to find people working in awkward positions, at equipment and workstations that are not ideal. The EH&S Division ergonomists would like to be more involved in equipment selection. An EH&S Division survey of employees revealed that 30% have recently worked with some ergonomics discomfort.

The previous recommendation that people maintain an "ideal" posture with their limbs bent at 90-degree angles is unrealistic and unnecessary. Most people either slump or lean. Keeping an open (>90 degree) elbow angle and providing arm support are more important. Work tasks have become more static, involving more mouse use with pauses rather than continuous intensive typing. Morenci boards can be used to provide more forearm support.

Studies show that ergonomics interventions work to prevent injuries, if they are done correctly and the solutions are adapted to the person and the way work is done. Several committee members commented that they are interested in hearing more about recent research studies, and that real research data should be highlighted in the ergonomics training courses, especially for supervisors. There was a request that Ira Janowitz provide a lunchtime talk on recent studies.

Several "1 minute 4 safety" presentations on ergonomics are available for supervisors to use to lead discussions.

LBNL now has 2 certified ergonomists on staff, and 2 consultants available from UC San Francisco. This is not enough to respond to all questions and requests. An Ergo Advocates program has been started to encourage employee participation. Division directors decide who should be in the program and how to allocate the costs. The recommendation is that there be at least 1 ergo advocate for every 100 employees. 36 people have received the 2 days of training, and one more series of classes is scheduled in June. The ergo evaluation database and product catalogue are also being upgraded. Keyboard shortcut bookmarks are being distributed.

For some divisions, lab work is a greater concern than computer use. Ira Janowitz's group is doing a sweep of Life Sciences labs to identify issues. They are developing a guide for selection and use of pipettes.

Other initiatives include piloting voice recognition software and on-line training software, improving the selection of furniture available, and looking at materials handling and issues for the Facilities trades (plumbers, electricians, etc.). They are also looking at making databases more "ergo-friendly", streamlining procurement of ergo equipment, and developing better leading indicators. They are recommending docking stations for laptops and looking at new products for laptop users.

The "Remedy Interactive" self-evaluation software is being pilot tested by the Information Technology division. It prioritizes the users' risk level (red, yellow, green) and provides recommendations for reducing risk.

Michael Gordon is providing assistance in selecting equipment through the Ergo Display Center.

Supervisors have indicated that they would like the training to be more interactive and provide more options for solving "real world" problems. Committee members suggested that Ira Janowitz give a presentation to the SRC on the new Ergonomics for Supervisors training when it is ready.

ES&H Technical Assurance Program – Howard Hatayama

As a result of the Integrated Safety Management (ISM) Peer Review, McCallum-Turner Review, DOE Order 226.1 and 10 CFR 851, the Integrated Functional Appraisal (IFA) program is being replaced by a new ES&H Technical Assurance Program. The program will check compliance with formal authorizations and regulations, program effectiveness, trending and analysis of corrective actions, and implementation of Lessons Learned. The program will be described in PUB-5344, the Self-Assessment Program Manual. The evaluations will take place on an ongoing basis. This will be a change in focus for subject matter experts. Observations will be reported quarterly and annually, and roll up to institutional level issues. It is hoped that the ongoing evaluations will be less disruptive to divisions than the IFA process. Divisions will receive regular feedback. Several programs and processes were selected for pilot assessments, which resulted in identification of some opportunities for improvement, such as low compliance with pre-placement health screening, updating of crane manager assignments, chemical hygiene practices, and Radiological Work Authorization (RWA) posting and labeling of work areas, and chain of custody procedures for controlled substances. The technical assurance program will be fully implemented in FiscalYear 2008.

Committee members commented that the subject matter experts will be self-assessing the effectiveness of their own programs, and suggested that periodic external or peer reviews would add value. There is a concern that researchers may be less willing to contact subject matter experts for advice if the experts have a stronger assessment and enforcement role. Findings of violations will be reported to the divisions for entry into CATS and tracking to completion. Howard Hatayama asked committee members to provide feedback on the program.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM
Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary