

Safety Review Committee
 January 18, 2008
 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	
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	
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
Twohey, Daniel	Directorate/Operations	X
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	X

Others Present: Hattie Carwell, Richard DeBusk, Michelle Flynn, John Freeman, Marshall Granados, Mary Gross, Howard Hatayama, Julie Henderson, Carol Ingram, Mike Kritscher, Peter Lichty, Tony Linard, Florence Mou, Kem Robinson, Mike Ruggieri, John Seabury, Bill Wells

Chairman's Comments—Don Lucas

Minutes of December meeting were reviewed.

Don Lucas asked for input on issues to be discussed at the meeting with Dr. Chu. Committee members were reminded to submit any comments on the draft Annual Report to Pat Thomas.

There was a comment that different divisions have different standards for ensuring the safety of personnel doing off-site work. It was requested that the committee consider whether all divisions should have a common policy. This will be discussed at a future Safety Review Committee (SRC) meeting.

There was a request that future meetings be moved to a larger room.

An issue was raised about telephone communications during the power outage. The telephone operator did not have a hard copy of the directory available and could not route calls. There is a PDF version of the directory available. It is updated quarterly. The operator will start keeping a hard copy. There will be a Lessons Learned debriefing about the power outage for the Building Managers / Emergency Teams. There were also facility access problems that are being discussed.

MESH Presentation: Engineering Division – Kem Robinson

Engineering Division Director Kem Robinson began by thanking the Management of Environment, Safety, and Health (MESH) review team. The division is continuously looking for ways to improve and found the review helpful. The review was conducted in July 2007 and the report was issued in September. There were 5 observations, 2 concerns, 6 noteworthy practices, and some institutional opportunities for improvement.

The first observation was that some supervisors have a large number of direct reports. Engineering Division responded by reviewing their supervisor assignments and made some adjustments including redistributing some machine shop supervisor responsibilities.

There was an observation that documentation of On-the-Job Training could be improved. Engineering considers safe behavior a higher priority than documentation, but they are interested in learning about best practices used by other divisions.

There was an observation that a corrective action to improve the storage of sheet metal was not addressed in a timely manner. The corrective action was subsequently entered into the Corrective Action Tracking System (CATS) database and reminders of improved communications plus follow-up are being emphasized.

There was an observation that old first aid kits were mounted on the wall in Bldg. 77. They have been removed.

There was an observation and a concern about assigning roles and responsibilities for matrixed personnel. Engineering has been referencing the allocation of roles and responsibilities itemized in Regulations and Procedures Manual (RPM) section 7.01D. In responding to the observation, it was discovered that the RPM section has been modified and the matrixed employee table has been moved to PUB-3000. This raised an institutional concern that changes to the RPM are not being clearly communicated to LBNL personnel affected. Engineering Division recommends that the table of roles and responsibilities for matrixed personnel be the default condition (typical rather than negotiable) unless otherwise specified in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Engineering Division is concerned about unilateral assignments of responsibilities to matrixed personnel without the home division knowledge or approval. There are

examples of radiological work authorizations assigned to matrixed engineers rather than the research division for whom the work was being conducted.

Safety is a core value in Engineering Division. Their safety systems are based on 5 principles:

1. Management is responsible for establishing the safety culture. The “Safety Headlights” committee, composed of Engineering Division management, is an example of how this principle is implemented.
2. Safety is a culture, not a program.
3. Employees need to be trained and reinforced to see safety.
4. Injuries and incidents are preventable.
5. Safety is an ethical responsibility.

The division has a set of basic expectations for employees, including completing and updating their Job Hazards Questionnaires (JHQs) and completing required training. New employees and supervisors go through the JHQ together. There is a required on-line course that reviews the Engineering Division Integrated Safety Management (ISM) Plan. After looking at the root causes of some near misses, a required Electrical Hazards Awareness class was developed. They also researched and participated in the purchase of a site license for software for developing Lockout / Tagout (LOTO) procedures with a uniform format. The software has been adopted by the Advanced Light Source and 88” Cyclotron. Facilities has their own LOTO procedures for building electrical systems.

Engineering Division has 2 Safety Coordinators. One Safety Coordinator is planning to retire and the second is training to take his place. The Coordinators serve as resources for the division and both are trained in accident investigation and root cause analysis.

Kem Robinson keeps the Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS) manual on his desk. It is his policy to “own” any Occurrence involving Engineering Division personnel. This helps to ensure a uniform approach to incident investigations and reassures the employees that they will not be punished for reporting incidents.

They are looking at the need for annual emergency preparedness refresher training for all employees. This may be an institutional need.

Kem Robinson is concerned about hazards in areas where matrixed personnel are assigned. He recommends that the division that owns the space assign a home division responsible person for each lab and shop to identify hazards and ensure that the hazards are communicated and controlled. For example, a technician fell through an inadequate work platform. He suggests a Location Hazard Questionnaire and door posting of hazards and responsible persons in each area. Housekeeping can be a problem in areas shared by multiple groups or divisions, such as storage and staging areas. John Seabury commented that the new Hazards Management System (HMS) can be used to assign responsibilities and inventory hazards. The HMS can produce a postable summary sheet.

Kem Robinson also has a concern about the difficulty of finding requirements in PUB-3000. For example, some high value / high consequence lifts may not be identified. Don Lucas and Bill Wells are working on developing a “PUB-3000 Light” and will be looking for comments soon. It was suggested that the draft be posted on the PUB-3000 e-room. Some committee members are concerned that an additional document may get out of synchronization with PUB-3000. There are remaining questions about how to map RPM changes and how to communicate changes in one policy document that may affect other documents.

MESH Presentation: Environment, Health and Safety Division – Howard Hatayama

Environment, Health and Safety (EHS) Division Director Howard Hatayama said that he recognizes that they have a special responsibility to “walk the talk” when it comes to safety to set an example for the other divisions. It is sometimes difficult to focus on safety concerns within their division and separate them from lab-wide concerns. Howard Hatayama chairs the division safety committee meetings to help focus the discussions. He can also be more effective by assigning action items directly. He welcomes that feedback from the MESH review. The review identified 3 noteworthy practices, 2 divisional concerns, 1 institutional concern, and four observations.

There were two concerns that goals for completion of JHQs and training are not being met. The Safety Coordinator is going to provide monthly reports to each group. They are looking at short-term visitor issues. This is a problem for other divisions also.

There was a concern about having two Division Safety Coordinators, each with 30% assignment to safety responsibilities. Howard Hatayama will follow up with them to ensure responsibilities are defined and coordinated.

Ergonomics continues to be a problem. A new Ergo Advocate will be added, bring the number to 3 for the division. They are tracking leading performance indicators monthly, including time between request and evaluation, and time to close evaluations. Howard Hatayama asks the managers to follow up when the time starts lagging.

There was a question about whether LBNL’s ergonomic injury rates are improving as a result of the additional efforts being expended. Don Lucas said that there are statistics available that indicate that the efforts are helping to reduce injuries. The committee requested a report at a future meeting.

There have been 3 Occurrences related to hazardous waste management violations. Satellite Accumulation Area (SAA) training was provided to people doing supervisor walkarounds.

There were some Radiological Work Authorization /Permit compliance problems noted in their self-assessment. The Radiation Protection Group was reorganized to improve performance.

A corrective action plan has been developed to address both the MESH and Self-Assessment findings. The corrective actions are being tracked on CATS. The division ISM Plan is being revised.

Howard Hatayama thanked the MESH team.

There was a question about whether EHS people are being spread over too many demands. Howard Hatayama responded that he has requested additional resources. A recharge system will allow the use of contractors, particularly where there are peak demand periods or specific projects requiring support. For example, 2 contractors were hired to support the JGI safety stand-down.

There was a question about whether resource needs for new facilities are being identified and planned. Howard Hatayama responded that EHS is getting involved at the design/review phase of the new Joint Bio-Energy Institute project in Emeryville (without federal funds). Resources have been identified in the proposal. HELIOS will be owned by the University of California; however, the interface with LBNL will require security and safety support. The Advanced Light Source hostel presents a new challenge because this is the first time people will be living on site. Some hostel guests may bring their families.

Status of Welding Safety Chapter – John Seabury

The group working on developing the welding safety chapter had a meeting. They expect the chapter to be ready for the February SRC meeting. They are also working on a welding safety training class. The welding safety lead person is the EHS subject matter expert.

Status of Subcontractor Safety Initiatives – Mike Ruggieri

Subcontractor and vendor safety issues were identified from several Occurrence Reports and audit findings. The problem is that some subcontractors and vendors, regardless of their source of funding, are performing work at LBNL using their own safety processes, but their work is not in compliance with LBNL policies or state/national requirements. A process improvement team of about 20 people with broad LBNL representation was formed in October to develop recommendations.

They determined root causes of incidents, extent of condition, and ISM systems in need of improvement. The extent of condition study found that subcontractor/vendor safety issues affect all LBNL organizations. Non-construction subcontractor work requires improvements to all five ISM core functions. Definitions of scope of work, communication of LBNL requirements, identification and control of work hazards, and

oversight are all less than adequate. Construction subcontractor work needs improvements to hazard identification and controls.

They benchmarked subcontractor safety practices with 8 Office of Science labs and downloaded policies and related documents for those Labs. They also looked at the processes that were in place, but didn't work, at SLAC during the PVC pipe explosion incident. The benchmarking study found that a graded approach is commonly used. Job Hazards Analysis is frequently used to screen work hazards. Most Office of Science labs provide a safety orientation to subcontractors/vendors. The service requestor or their agent is usually the point of contact and EHS staff members are in a supporting role.

The proposed new requirements for LBNL include:

- Job Hazards Analysis (JHA) for all hands-on work performed on site by subcontractors and vendors. The vendor would complete the JHA with input from the requestor.
- Face-to-face meeting between requesting division representatives and subcontractor/vendor to review JHA and safety orientation before work is performed. Each division would define who would carry out this responsibility. It would most likely be the requestor and/or the Division Safety Coordinator.
- Work permit process based on graded approach using the JHA to categorize work as high or low hazard. High hazard may be defined as work requiring a formal work authorization.
- Graded oversight of subcontractor/vendor work by Division and EHS. This would include confirmation that the work is being performed as permitted. Documentation may be required for high hazard work.

The requirements will be incorporated in a new PUB-3000, Chapter 31. Divisions will have some flexibility in how to implement the requirements. A draft for a pilot program will be presented to the SRC in February. The pilot program with Materials Science Division and Life Sciences Division is scheduled for February – March 2008. The final chapter would be presented in April.

The Computing Sciences representative reported that they are already having trouble getting maintenance done on Uninterruptible Power Supplies and batteries because a safety plan is required, and the plan submitted by the service vendor does not meet NFPA 70E requirements. Compliance with NFPA 70E is required by the California electrical safety order; however, it is not enforced in most places. Computing Sciences has been waiting 2-3 months to get the work done. Service delays can cause additional safety problems. LBNL needs to be able to provide a template to vendors that will help them complete their safety plans.

New contracts will have the requirements in their Requests for Proposals/Quotes, but there are a lot of existing vendor contracts that do not have the requirements. Service personnel typically don't see their contracts.

An on-line safety orientation will need to be developed.

There was a comment that we need to be able to provide expedited reviews for urgent/critical needs. There was a question about the anticipated workload. Pacific Northwest Nuclear Lab (PNNL) has been doing about 100 vendor safety reviews/week. There is a question about whether LBNL has sufficient EHS resources. Vendor safety is a Line Management Responsibility. Training and tools need to be provided to Division Safety Coordinators and other Division staff who will be expected to implement the new requirements. Division personnel can contact EHS subject matter experts for assistance, but the subject matter experts may not be available on short notice.

There was a question about who would issue the work permits. Generally, it would be the person requesting the work. There may be a different type of permit for vendors that work for multiple divisions.

Committee members recommended that the anticipated resource demands be discussed with Division management. The subcontractor/vendor safety initiative was discussed at the Division Directors' Meeting. SRC members should keep their Division Directors informed about the cumulative impact of all the new requirements that are being developed.

CLOSED SESSION conclusions

The recommendations of MESH review intervals for divisions reviewed in 2007 are:

- Engineering Division: 3-4 years
- Nuclear Science Division: 3 years
- Life Sciences Division: 3 years
- Environment, Health, and Safety Division: 3 years

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 AM

Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary