

Safety Review Committee

July 20, 2007

10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	X
Blair, Steven A.	Facilities Division	*
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	X
Cork, Carl	Physical Biosciences Division	X
Dubon, Oscar	Materials Sciences Division	X
Francino Puget, Maria Pilar	Genomics Division	X
Kadel, Richard W.	Physics Division	*
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	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: *Larry Domansky (for Steve Blair), Keith Gershon, Peter Lichty, *Ron Madaras (for Richard Kadel), Michael Ruggieri, John Seabury.

Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas

Don Lucas has recently been appointed Environment, Health, and Safety (EH&S) Division Deputy. He is also continuing to do some research under Environmental Energy Technologies Division (EETD). He plans to continue as Safety Review Committee (SRC) chair until his appointment expires in December 2007. The SRC Chair is a 3-year term appointment by Dr. Chu. If anyone is interested in serving as chair or has suggestions, please contact Don Lucas.

One of the things Don Lucas hopes to accomplish as EH&S Division Deputy is improvements to the training program. He is asking the instructors to start offering classes on different days so that people with schedule conflicts have more opportunities to complete their training. He would like to see more compliance-based classes offered on-line, with more emphasis on skills-based training in the classroom sessions. Input is welcome.

2006 MESH -- The Committee's recommendations regarding the scheduling of the next Management of Environment, Safety, and Health (MESH) reviews for the divisions reviewed in 2006 were sent to Dr. Chu. He concurred with the recommendations.

2007 MESH –

- **Nuclear Science** (July 9-13) – The MESH Review team is working on the report.
- **Engineering** (July 17 – 20)—The team is wrapping up the review and starting to work on the report.
- **EH&S** MESH review is scheduled for July 23-27.
- The **Directorate/Operations** MESH review is in the process of being scheduled.

Don Lucas followed up with Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) management on last month's discussion of the Segway policy change. The sudden change in policy was due to the severity of the accident and resulting pressure from Department of Energy (DOE) in Washington. DOE was not amused by the CNN segment about wild turkeys following Segways at LBNL. Segways continue to be allowed on the UC campus.

Discussion of Draft ES&H Policy Statement – Mike Ruggieri

The draft ES&H policy statement for LBNL was the product of a joint effort by Mike Ruggieri and Jack Bartley, with input from EH&S and LBNL management. The statement was developed in response to Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) Corrective Action Plan item 2.2a. Existing policy statements and priorities communicated by Dr. Chu were considered in developing the statement. The policy statement is intended to go into the Regulations and Procedures Manual and the Laboratory ISM Plan. EH&S is asking for comments from the SRC at this time.

Comments from Committee Members included:

- Take out “that is commensurate with the Laboratory’s world-class research”;
- Take out “we”.
- LBNL should consider developing a Vision Statement of Core Values, including safety as one of the core values. Look at the Core Values statements of other DOE labs for examples.
- “Safety” is understood to include environmental protection and health.

The revised draft will be posted on the e-room for SRC vote.

Discussion of Job Hazards Analysis Status – John Seabury

The Job Hazards Analysis (JHA) will be a work authorization document that describes tasks, hazards, and controls. The Job Hazards Questionnaire (JHQ) will be the first step in designating tasks. JHAs will require authorization by work leads. There will be a requirement to review and update JHAs annually. See PUB-3000 for details. The JHA is

required by 10 CFR 851 and the findings of the McCallum/Turner and ISM reviews. It is also a good idea.

There is a pilot program underway that is to be completed by the end of the fiscal year. It is a compliance and contract performance milestone. By May 2008, 75% of active personnel must have JHAs. The pilot program has focused on work groups. JHAs are being developed for 3 Advanced Light Source (ALS) groups, Facilities carpenters and custodians, and 3 research groups. At least 25% of the pilot group JHAs must be completed by the end of July. The process is to develop group JHQs, group JHAs, and then individual JHAs.

The experiences of the pilot program have resulted in the following conclusions:

- The process is sound;
- The time commitments are reasonable (30-45 minutes to develop a group JHA);
- Work groups have been supportive.

Some challenges have been identified:

- There are 3 JHA facilitators now. More will be needed. The EH&S Liaisons will be asked to become JHA facilitators.
- There are many ES&H initiatives being implemented at the same time. This will be very challenging.
- Resources are limited, particularly EH&S and Information Technology (IT) staff. Delays in software development may be a problem in meeting deadlines.
- Work leads will need to be trained in how to implement the new requirements.

The Committee suggested that John Seabury keep Division Safety Coordinators and senior LBNL management updated on the plans for the program.

Committee members also asked if the schedule for the JHA implementation could be coordinated with the PRD schedule. If JHAs are required to be completed by May 2008, they will have to be done with the January mid-year reviews. LBNL would have to get BSO approval to change the May deadline.

Compliance with the requirement to update JHQs annually is low. The JHQs need to be up-to-date to provide current information to the JHA process.

There was a question about how the JHAs will affect Human Resources documents, such as job descriptions and medical records. The SRC has asked for an HR representative.

There was a concern that more requirements are being pushed onto Divisions to reduce overhead rates. It was asked whether the value added by the JHA would be worth the additional burden. One benefit of the JHA is that it forces communication between workers and supervisors. The JHQ only requires training. The JHA adds other types of hazard controls. Divisions will be able to modify the recommended hazard controls.

Committee members asked that the importance of the JHA implementation be communicated to LBNL management to ensure that it receives appropriate priority when allocating resources at the institutional level.

Discussion of Institutional ISM Plan Revision Status – Bill Wells

Bill Wells and Jack Bartley have been working on updating the ISM Plan. They are now on revision 6. The current plan needs revising because it doesn't adequately describe the "big picture" of how our safety systems function. The plan needs to describe roles and responsibilities (including Safety Coordinators and Liaisons), interfaces between organizations, and the hierarchy of documents. The revised plan will address the McCallum/Turner review comments.

Writing the ISM Plan is challenging because LBNL operates in a diverse, dynamic environment where most people play multiple roles. The ISM Plan drives PUB-3000 and division ISM Plan requirements, and EH&S implementation systems. The ISM Plan should graphically describe the organization structure, including coordination between divisions and work groups.

The review process for the ISM Plan will include stakeholders, budget/quality overview, LBNL leadership, and the SRC. The SRC will be asked for concurrence, rather than approval, because the ISM Plan authorizes the SRC charter. The schedule is to have another discussion at the August 17th SRC meeting, and concurrence at the September 21st meeting. It is possible an interim meeting will be needed.

The ISM Plan will contain a conceptual template for updating division ISM Plans. Committee members asked for more information about the process for reviewing division ISM Plans.

Discussion of Non-NRTL Equipment Approval Process – Keith Gershon

Keith Gershon distributed a white paper describing a proposed program to review and certify the safety of electrical equipment that has not been certified by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL). The regulatory drivers for the program are 10 CFR 851, NFPA 70E, and OSHA regulations. The program will include all electrical equipment that operates at 50 Volts or greater that has not been certified by an NRTL. This includes equipment that reduces utility voltage (120 volts or greater) to a value under 50 volts. It also includes equipment that was NRTL certified, but then was modified or is being used in a way the manufacturer did not intend. The exceptions are (1) equipment that is supplied by an NRTL-Listed Class 1 or Class 2 power supply and does not exceed the intended usage of that power supply, and (2) equipment that does not connect to a source of utility power (i.e. battery -powered) and is current-limited to .005 Amps. There will be a self-training program (download and read) for people doing the survey of equipment. Every division will be responsible for surveying its own equipment. We will have one year from the program start date to survey equipment and list items needing inspection in a database. We will have 4 years from the program start

date to get all the equipment inspected. There will be some type of sticker or bar code to indicate that the equipment has been inspected. There may also be a sticker to indicate equipment that is out of service. There are no new requirements to add more equipment to the property database or track the location of the equipment.

Most electrical equipment and consumer products will not be included in the inspection requirement. Inspectors will evaluate systems to determine what constitutes an assembly and when components must be certified separately. A sealed rack with dedicated components may be evaluated as one item.

Training will be developed for inspectors. The inspectors must be people with technical experience, and they will be required to go through about 40 hours of training. Divisions will have to provide resources for the inspections.

There is no grace period for new equipment. It must be NRTL approved, or undergo inspection before being used. Procurement is being brought into the process to advise people to consider purchasing NRTL equipment.

Implementation will be audited. Divisions don't have to maintain records to prove that all equipment has been surveyed. Auditors will be looking for evidence of non-NRTL equipment that has not been inspected.

The program is still at a conceptual stage and there are a lot of questions about details that have not been defined yet about exactly what off-site equipment, remotely controlled equipment, equipment from other labs, user equipment at LBNL will be included or excluded from the inspection requirements. Equipment on loan to other institutions will not be included.

There are two non-destructive, non-dangerous tests included in the inspection criteria: a 2-minute ground-bond test, and a current leakage test. About 80% of the equipment is expected to be 120-volt, cord-and-plug equipment that will typically require less than an hour to inspect. Equipment that is home built or greater than 120 volt will require a physical examination. Inspection time can be reduced by involving the inspectors while the equipment is being designed.

Modified equipment will be required to be re-inspected, unless it has been repaired by qualified persons by replacing parts like-for like.

At this time, Keith Gershon is asking SRC members to read the white paper and comment on the general principles proposed. It will be posted on the e-room. He will be developing a detailed policy statement. SRC members should help to educate their divisions about the plans for the program

The meeting was adjourned at 11:44 AM
Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary