

Safety Review Committee

June 18, 2007

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	
Blair, Steven A.	Facilities Division	X
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	X
Cork, Carl	Physical Biosciences Division	
Dubon, Oscar	Materials Sciences Division	
Francino Puget, Maria Pilar	Genomics Division	X
Kadel, Richard W.	Physics Division	X
Leitner, Daniela	Nuclear Science Division	X
Li, Derun	Accelerator & Fusion Research 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
Nakagawa, Seiji	Earth Sciences Division	*
Smith, Linda K.	Information Technology Division	*
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Review Committee Secretary	X
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	

Others Present: Richard DeBusk, *Tim Kneafsey (for Seiji Nakagawa), Tony Linard, *Tammy Welcome (for Linda Smith)

Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas

The committee welcomed two new members. Derun Li, the new representative for the Accelerator and Fusion Research Division (AFRD), does research on microwave structures and beam dynamics. Steve Blair, the new representative for Facilities, is a civil engineer who has been involved in the construction of many of the buildings on site.

2006 MESH: Recommendations on Scheduling of Next Reviews

- **Advanced Light Source – 3 years (2009)** The division is in transition. There will be an interim effectiveness review before the next MESH Review.
- **Chemical Sciences – 3 years (2009)** The division is making improvements. There are some institutional issues affecting the division.
- **Facilities – 2 years (2008)** Attitudes toward safety have improved and there were not too many issues; however, there have been quite a few accidents. There has been a change in leadership.

- **Materials Sciences – 2 years (2008)** The division took action to address ISM Plan and SAA issues. There are some issues regarding supervision and student safety that require follow-up.
- **Physics – 4 years (2010)** In general, the division is doing well. There were some concerns about ergonomics; however, there are few injuries. Attitudes toward safety were good. There is a new Safety Coordinator.

There are now 6 divisions proposed for review in 2008: AFRD, Computing Sciences, Earth Sciences, Facilities, Genomics, and Materials Sciences. The Committee will review the plan for 2008 at the end of this review year.

2007 MESH – Reviews have been scheduled for Nuclear Science (July 9-13), Engineering (July 17 – 20), and EH&S (July 23-27).

Discussion of Seismic Safety Subcommittee -- Fred Angliss

The Seismic Safety Subcommittee was eliminated when the Work Smart Standards were adopted. The subcommittee was originally formed to assist researchers. There is not as much need now because there are fewer projects requiring heavy shielding. Some Divisions come to Facilities for assistance in seismic bracing of equipment.

The seismic evaluations of buildings are about 97% complete. Only permanent occupied buildings are being evaluated. About 30-35% of the buildings are being rated poor or very poor. David McGraw and Howard Hatayama suggested that a Seismic Safety Subcommittee might be needed again. There is a large push for DOE to fund seismic rehabilitations. EH&S is addressing occupancy issues as described in PUB-3000, Chapter 23. There have been some changes in Chapter 23. When a building is rated very poor, EH&S, Facilities, and the Division Directors work together to develop an occupancy plan. David McGraw authorized the occupancy. This has been done in Buildings 73 and 71. There is more participation by the management of the occupants in developing the plan.

The UC campus has a strong committee to review new buildings for seismic safety. The Facilities group evaluates new buildings at LBNL. The campus has state funding for their buildings.

PUB-3000 says researchers will ensure their equipment is reviewed for seismic safety and properly anchored. Divisions can submit Work Requests to have Facilities personnel come and secure large equipment. The Facilities workers know how to do it. There was a question about vending machines. These can be anchored by submitting an institutional Work Request.

Discussion of Site Access/Training Guest Policies – Richard Kadel

There appears to be a conflict between site access rules and training rules regarding guest status at LBNL. EH&S Training and Human Resources allow “occasional guest” status

for people who will be at the lab for up to 30 days; however, Site Access has been requiring “Guest status for people needing access for more than 5 days. PUB-3000 requires people with appointments of more than 30 days to complete General Employee Radiation Training (GERT) and complete a Job Hazard Questionnaire (JHQ) within their first 30 days. People who will be at LBNL for 30 days or less complete GERT and on-the-job training and are required to work under supervision. GERT can be taken on line without an LBNL ID number. Human Resources (HR) does not like to do the paper work needed for Guest status for people who will only be at LBNL less than 30 days because it increases labor costs. HR likes to make Guest appointments effective for about a year so they don’t have to keep reprocessing people if they come back. These differences make it more difficult for Safety Coordinators to continuously track the divisions’ compliance status regarding JHQ and training completion. The statistics have to be adjusted at the end of each self-assessment year. Advanced Light source has a special system that allows completion of User training to be counted as completion of a JHQ. Other divisions with many Users and guests are having problems. Some users are able to take the JHQ before they arrive. Richard Kadel recommended that site access rules be brought into synchronization with EH&S rules. He suggested two options for doing this – either allow site access for occasional guests for up to 30 days without requiring “Guest” status, or allow site access for occasional guests to be renewed weekly for up to 4 weeks.

Don Lucas will contact Site Access to discuss the issue. He also asked that the head of Human Resources be asked to send a representative to SRC meetings because we have been encountering more safety issues that overlap with Human Resources policy.

ISM Corrective Action Plan Schedule – Jim Krupnick

This is the most important year of our contract. Our performance will determine whether the contract is renewed for up to 3 years or re-competed. We are not doing well on accident rates this year and we will miss the goals. There is a real risk of the contract being re-competed. Howard Hatayama is managing the ISM Corrective Action Plan with support from the Lab’s Project Management Office. There are 37 activities to be completed by the end of September. LBNL needs to complete at least 34 to get a B+. Some of these activities will require SRC involvement. UC and DOE are being briefed on the risks.

EH&S is working on a strategic change to the institutional ISM Plan. The size is being reduced and it will reference other documents. Elements excluded from the 10 CFR 851 Safety Plan will be included in the ISM Plan. There will be a draft available for comments soon. It will have about 40 pages of text and 60 pages of appendices, including a template for division ISM plans.

The Job Hazard Analysis process is expected to generate some controversy. It is undergoing a pilot test in a few divisions. SRC members asked that consideration of the JHA be moved up. PUB-3000, Chapter 32 will be revised after the pilot, so it may not be

possible to accelerate the schedule. SRC members asked for feedback on how the pilot test is going.

The ISM Plan and JHA status will be added to the July, August, and September SRC meeting agendas.

Discussion of Contractor Safety Policy – Richard DeBusk

The issue under discussion was how safety should be managed after service contracts are awarded. The proposed policy was that each division should specify how they will manage contractors in their division ISM Plan. For example, the Advanced Light Source has a work permit system. Not all divisions have resources to manage vendor activities like the ALS does. An SRC member said that there are still some problems with contract language. A recent contract did not allow the division to control safety for off-site work. Several committee members expressed concern about the transfer of risk to researchers who request service contractors. The researchers can maintain a safe environment and advise the contractor about risks posed by their experiment, but they are not always familiar with hazards posed by working on electrical equipment. Researchers are not always qualified to determine whether the contractor is working safely, and EH&S resources for assistance are limited and not always available when needed. Sometimes, there is only one vendor who is qualified to work on the equipment and is willing to work at LBNL. EH&S certifies that approved contractor Health and Safety Plan is in place. The proposed policy would formalize the existing policy of Line Management Responsibility.

SRC members asked what other laboratories do, particularly for work on energized equipment. At some labs, researchers are not allowed to work on their own equipment and must request the work from a central support group. LLNL funds a group to fix equipment and oversee contractors.

Committee members are concerned about the PIs' potential liability if contractors do not follow their safety plans. They are concerned that research could be shut down for a prolonged period if the contractor does something wrong. Richard DeBusk said that following some recent incidents, contract employees who violated their safety plans were fired, and the rules were reviewed with remaining employees. There was no major impact on research.

The Committee asked Richard DeBusk to look at what other Office of Science multipurpose labs (Argonne, Brookhaven, Fermilab) do and report back to the Committee next month.

General Discussion

Segway Policy

Several committee members expressed concerns about the sudden change in the policy regarding Segways following a recent accident. There have been accidents involving people using other street-legal vehicles, such as automobiles and bicycles, so there was a question about why Segways were treated differently. There was a question about whether the root cause of the accident was use of a Segway, or the debris on the sidewalk that the rider was trying to avoid. There was a concern that the Lab Director changed the policy without first discussing the change with the Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Subcommittee or the designated manager of the RPM section affected. There was a consensus vote by all committee members present requesting that the SRC Chair ask the Lab Director to have the policy reviewed by the Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Subcommittee.

Heater Tapes

There was a concern that the heater tape policy in PUB-3000, Chapter 8, Appendix U may be too restrictive. There was a question about whether the restrictions are based on electrical code requirements or LBNL policy. The questions are being referred to the Electrical Safety Subcommittee for discussion and review.

Training

There was a concern that the Basic Electrical Hazards course (ESH0260) is not offered frequently enough and is only available by attending a class. There was a question about whether it would be possible to offer the general training through an on-line course. There was also a question about whether more job-specific training is needed. It was recommended that the Electrical Safety Subcommittee review the training needs.

A broader question was raised as to how many courses are difficult to complete because they are not available. There was also a question about whether more skills-based training is needed. Committee members would like to see more on-line training for basic information. Don Lucas will discuss the training issues with Howard Hatayama and Jack Salazar.

Stop Work Authority Policy

There was a complaint from a former employee that their stop work authority was not being upheld because the division restarted work before all the concerns of the person who stopped the work had been satisfied. The current policy says, "Work that has been stopped by a stop work request shall not be resumed until the safety issue is resolved to the satisfaction of the individual who stopped the work." It is not clear as to who has the authority to restart work. There may be some situations where the person who stopped

the work has unreasonable expectations that cannot be satisfied. Committee members recommended that the policy be changed to require that work be stopped until the EH&S subject matter expert has investigated and deems that it is safe and the Line Management responsible for the work agrees that the work can resume. The issue will be referred to Richard DeBusk for consideration.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 AM

Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary