

Safety Review Committee
 September 7, 2007
 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	
Bello, Madelyn	Human Resources Advisor	
Blair, Steven A.	Facilities Division	X
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	X
Leitner, Daniela	Nuclear Science Division	
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	
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	X
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Review Committee Secretary	X
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	X

Others Present: Richard DeBusk, Michelle Flynn, Melanie Gravois, John Seabury, Bill Wells.

Policy Decision: PUB-3000, Section 1.3.2.5 Responsibilities of Managers, Supervisors, and Work Leads

There were questions about the term “Safety Line Manager”. A definition was requested. Definitions should be used consistently in different policy documents (PUB-3000, Integrated Safety Management Plans, Regulations and Procedures Manual). Richard DeBusk said that divisions have to be able to identify who is in their safety line management in their division Integrated Safety Management (ISM) plans. The ISM Plans should show who needs line management training. The Job Hazards Questionnaire (JHQ) may identify Work Leads. This is a work in progress.

Weyland Wong asked whether the home division will know if a matrixed person is assigned “work lead” responsibilities. There was a concern that machinists and technicians are not safety professionals and may not be trained for the responsibilities being assigned to them. This needs to be covered in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the home a matrix divisions.

The proposed PUB-3000, Section 1.3.2.5 was approved by a vote of Safety Review Committee members present, with none opposed.

Discussion: New Training Requirements

The Office of Contract Assurance (OCA) proposed adding three courses on issues management to the JHQ as recommended training for Safety Coordinators. The Correction Action Plan is expected result in more training courses being developed over the next year. There is nothing in the RPM about who approves training requirements. Human Resources (HR), OCA, and EH&S training are not coordinated. For example, EH&S and HR provide separate supervisor training courses. HR and OCA are not under PUB-3000. Melanie Gravois said that OCA's intent is to offer Division Safety Coordinators the opportunity to take the issues management courses because they have large responsibilities in issues management. People who manage non-safety issues will also need to take the courses. There was a question about whether the JHQ should be used to require or recommend non-EH&S courses. The consensus was that the JHQ should be used to specify training essential to performing safety duties. If training is to be included on the JHQ, it should go through the development and justification process in PUB-3000, Chapter 24.

Policy Concurrence: Institutional ISM Plan – Bill Wells

The third revision of the institutional Integrated Management System Plan is in process. Most of the comments received have been accepted.

The philosophy that “all accidents are preventable” has been retained. A statement has been added that changes in science drive changes in requirements.

There was a discussion of the need to clarify the various types, levels, and definitions of supervision. The Work Lead definition needs to be inserted. The Work Lead's responsibilities should be limited to the defined activity. Safety Line Manager needs to be defined. It is used differently throughout the document. The term Payroll Supervisor is being changed to Home Supervisor. It is important to clarify which supervisor is responsible for fixing which types of problems. The terms used in the RPM are inconsistent and outdated. Matrix supervisor responsibilities need to be reconciled between the RPM and PUB-3000. MOUs may establish a different system than the default system. The situation of non-science matrixed people paid by matrix divisions (such as HR Centers) needs to be specifically addressed. These issues need to be revisited in the October SRC meeting.

There was a discussion about work authorization. There were questions about a statement in Section 6 that the authorized scope of work would be based on the level of experience of a person. There continue to be questions about what is meant by work commonly performed by the public. The concept was borrowed from LLNL and cannot be fully defined. There are tasks people might perform at home that they would not be

authorized to do at LBNL without training. It should be clarified that people are authorized to do “work commonly performed by the public” unless restricted by other LBNL policies. A graded approach to authorization is being established through the Job Hazards Analysis (JHA) process. A more skilled person could have a wider range of authorized tasks than a less skilled person. There could be additional controls for the less skilled person under a group JHA. There could be different groups for different levels of workers. This process needs to be discussed further. Supervisors make judgments about what their workers should be authorized to do and adjust plans. The JHQ and JHA authorize the work; however, there may still be questions during an accident investigation about whether the authorizations were appropriate. There will be additional JHQ questions to address tasks that need to be analyzed.

There was a correction that the issues management system is under the LBNL Assurance Plan.

There have been requests for an appendix with a model for a division ISM plan. It should contain an outline of mandated elements. It is scheduled for development with the next revision of the ISM Plan. There was a question about how division ISM Plans are reviewed. The ISM Review Board is reviewing the plans after MESH reviews. The SRC hasn't been getting feedback from the ISM Review Board reviews.

There was a request that the plan include a process for feedback and modification.

There was a comment that the Building Manager role in 4.1.1 may be too broadly defined. Division Directors or Associate Laboratory Directors make decisions about the use of space in a facility. Building Managers inform the directors about potential conflicts.

There was a request to strike the first philosophical statement under section 4.3.

There was a question about whether section 6.2.1.2 is consistent with HR policy. It will be referred to our HR advisor (Madelyn Bello) for comment.

Under section 6.2.2, there was a question about whether a person requisition work through the Work Request Center should be held responsible for the safety of the work. For example, a person requesting electrical work may not be knowledgeable about Lockout/Tagout procedures. This could also be a problem in PUB-3000, Chapter 18. The work should be authorized by the JHA of the craft worker, not the Work Request.

Section 6.2.2.2 requires identification of the management chain. There was a question about whether this needs to be done for each job, or in general through the division ISM plan.

The schedule is to address the comments by September 14, and review again at the September 21 meeting. This meeting will be extended until 1 PM and include a working lunch. There is a September 30 deadline for completing the plan.

Presentation: Job Hazard Analysis Status Update – John Seabury

Substantial progress is being made in the JHA pilot project. It is expected to be 90% complete by the September 14. There are remaining questions about who will be required to take the JHQ – guests, offsite workers, users, etc. The software development is on target for a mid-October delivery. Modules are being tested. The roll-out of the JHA requirements to the Lab needs to be planned. The concept needs to be communicated. This may require sitting down with supervisors and work leads to explain how the process works. The discussion meeting between work groups and their supervisors to develop the group JHA is a valuable part of the process.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 AM

Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary