

Safety Review Committee
 September 21, 2007
 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	
Bello, Madelyn	Human Resources Advisor	X
Blair, Steven A.	Facilities Division	
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	
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: Jack Bartley, Richard DeBusk, Michelle Flynn, Melanie Gravois, Peter Lichty, Florence Mou, Bill Wells.

Chairman's Comments—Don Lucas

The annual meeting with Dr. Chu is planned for January 25, 2008.

The end of Don Lucas' term as chairman of the committee is coming up in December. The next chairperson will be appointed by the Lab Director; however, volunteer or suggestions are welcome. It was suggested that the committee should also have a deputy chair who could help the chair and lead the meetings when the chair is on travel.

John Seabury was unavailable to attend the meeting today. Richard DeBusk said that the Job Hazards Analysis pilot is being completed on schedule. It is anticipated that EH&S will be ready to provide a demonstration in October, with a report on lessons learned from the pilot in November. The new program will be publicized after the changes resulting from the lessons learned are implemented.

LBNL is on target for meeting the Corrective Action Plan goals by the end of September.

MESH status:

- The EH&S Division MESH report has been sent to the division. We would like to have the presentation at the December meeting.
- The Nuclear Science Division MESH report has been completed. The presentation has been scheduled for the November meeting.
- The Life Sciences Division MESH report draft will be completed by the end of September. We would like to have the presentation at the December meeting.
- The Engineering Division MESH presentation has been proposed for the November meeting.
- The Directorate/Operations MESH review has been scheduled for October 22 – 26. The presentation will probably be at the January 25th meeting with Dr. Chu.

Policy Concurrence: Institutional ISM Plan – Bill Wells

Bill Wells thanked committee members for their comments. He is working on the 4th and final revision. Three appendices have been added since the September 14th version:

- Appendix A is the Division ISM Plan template that goes with Section 6.
- Appendix B describes the employee and staff safety performance appraisal process. It evolved from June focus group meetings. It applies to all staff. It was posted on the Human Resources website. It has been aligned with Chapter 1 requirements.
- Appendix C describes the Work Smart Standards update process, which has already been approved. Donna Spencer and Ross Fisher are the BSO/LBNL leads.

The following issues were identified from the comments received.

There were comments about how “facilities” are defined and managed at LBNL. Bill Wells reviewed PUB-541, which describes the responsibilities and functions of Building Managers. It is prepared by the EH&S Emergency Management group and is posted on their website. It describes the Building Managers roles in facility management, construction coordination, and emergency response. There is also a Building Emergency Team plan. Some of the information in PUB-541 appears to be outdated. There was a question about how the Emergency Management publications are coordinated with other documents, and whether PUB-541 should be included in PUB-3000. It was requested that Dan Lunsford be invited to the October SRC meeting. At LBNL, a “facility” may be a suite of labs in a building, rather than a separate building. The concept of “facility” will evolve to describe the way we do business. The draft ISM Plan has been revised to substitute “Division” for “Facility” or “Building Manager” where it more accurately describes how we control work.

There were comments about the ISM Plan revision process. Bill Wells has added a reference to PUB-3000, section 1.11, which describes how PUB-3000 is updated. It is a robust system that includes checks and balances. Anyone can request changes to PUB-3000 by filling out a form and submitting it to Bill Wells. The ISM Plan revision process will be the same, with the exception of the SRC “approving” PUB-3000 changes and “concurring” with ISM Plan changes. There was a question about whether BSO

involvement in the ISM update process has been described. Bill Wells agreed to include a statement to note BSO concurrence. There was another question about the appropriate hierarchy of documents. The revision process should be described in Section 8.4 of the ISM Plan, and referenced in PUB-3000. This change will have to be made later because of the Corrective Action Plan deadlines.

There is an overall problem that LBNL has no master document control system. For example, EH&S is establishing a document control system for safety documents, and Human Resources has a separate document control system for their documents. It is difficult to coordinate the documents when definitions or policies are changed in one function that affect another function.

The definition of Safety Line Manager has been revised to indicate that it includes managers, HEERA supervisors and Work Leads who have responsibility for safety. There was a discussion of how we define Work Leads. It was decided that "Work Lead" means anyone who oversees the work of people who are not his/her "supervisees" under the Human Resources system. The Work Lead may be a HEERA supervisor for other people, or may not be classified as a HEERA supervisor. An example would be a post-doc who is directing people helping with his/her experiment, but is not their HEERA supervisor. Madelyn Bello, our Human Resources advisor, will work with Bill Wells to come up with the correct words to describe this type of work relationship. There was a question about whether non-supervisors can authorize work. The official work authorization will occur through the Job Hazards Analysis process, which will be done by the HEERA supervisors, not the Work Leads.

There was a discussion about how to better describe the concept of "work commonly performed by the public". The phrase "by most adult individuals" was suggested but rejected as not being accurate. We are trying to distinguish between work that requires special training or experience to be conducted safely and work that generally does not require specialized knowledge or skills. Lawrence Livermore has a list of tasks that do not require formal work authorization that has evolved over 8 years of experience. It was suggested that this list be included as an appendix in PUB-3000, Chapter 6. The concept is evolving. For example, BP requires their workers to complete a driver-training course, and this may be required for people working on the BP/LBNL collaboration.

There were questions about notifications for purchasing hazardous materials in Section 12.4. This section is intended to generally describe how we do business now, without mandating the details of the process. There are no new requirements. A hazardous materials pre-purchase review system exists, although some of the review takes place behind the scenes and the people buying hazardous materials may not be aware of it. The system does not work perfectly.

The subcontractor review process will be in flux over the next year. It will be discussed at other meetings.

There were questions about for whom the ISM Plan is being written, and why it is being written. There are two main purposes for the Plan:

- The Plan describes how LBNL implements ISM, and
- The Plan provides uninformed readers with an overview of how LBNL safety systems work.

The LBNL organization and external factors will change with time.

There was a question about whether division ISM Plans can be eliminated when the institutional ISM Plan is adopted. Division ISM Plans will still be needed to describe specific ways divisions operate to implement the institutional ISM Plan, such as the division safety committee structure, documentation requirements, and how work authorizations are reviewed and kept current. Some facility-based authorizations are managed by divisions. Division plans can reference the institutional plan, and must be consistent with it. Division plans can be streamlined to not repeat what is in the institutional plan.

The Safety Review Committee members present indicated their concurrence with the proposed ISM Plan, with no objectors.

There was a question about how new requirements established by the institutional ISM Plan will be communicated to divisions. Do we need an ISMS Implementation Plan, or a pocket guide for Work Leads? There was a concern that additional documents might mandate additional requirements, and would have to be updated when the ISM Plan changes. A one-page summary of changes is being prepared for the LBNL and BSO management review of the ISM Plan. It was suggested that this be expanded into an executive summary that summarizes what is expected of divisions.

SRC members noted that there will be many expectations from divisions next year from all the Corrective Action Plan items that are being submitted, and requested a briefing on the expectations and their anticipated impact on funding and levels of effort.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 AM

Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary