Safety Review Committee
March 20, 2009
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Minutes

Committee Member	Representing	Present
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	X
Bello, Madelyn	Human Resources Advisor	X
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	*
Dubon, Oscar	Materials Sciences Division	X
Kadel, Richard W.	Physics Division	
Kostecki, Robert	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	X
Leitner, Daniela	Nuclear Science Division	X
Li, Derun	Accelerator & Fusion Research Division	X
Lucas, Donald	Safety Review Committee Chair	
Lukens Jr., Wayne W.	Chemical Sciences Division	X
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	X
Nakagawa, Seiji	Earth Sciences Division	X
Ohearn, Jerry	Facilities Division	
Petzold, Christopher J.	Physical Biosciences Division	X
Pollard, Martin	Genomics Division	X
Sopher, Ted	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	**

Others Present: Paul Alivisatos, Susan Broadway (for Peter Lichty), Brandon DeFrancisci, ** Marshal Granados (for Weyland Wong), Julie Henderson, Mike Kritscher, Jim Krupnick, Florence Mou, *John Seabury (for Paul Blodgett)

Annual Meeting with LBNL Senior Leadership – Paul Alivisatos and Jim Krupnick

Committee members and other attendees introduced themselves. Wayne Lukens described the role of the Safety Review Committee (SRC) in reviewing and recommending changes in safety policy. He summarized the highlights of the SRC's 2008 Annual Report:

- 5 MESH reviews completed (with 19 Noteworthy Practices, 20 Observations, and 11 Concerns);
- 5 Subcommittees were active: Electrical Safety (Bob Mueller), Laser Safety (David Littlejohn), Mechanical Safety (Mike Kritscher), Safety Coordinators (Weyland Wong), Traffic and Pedestrian Safety (Janice Sexson);
- 6 chapters of PUB-3000 were reviewed.

Wayne Lukens noted that the future role of the SRC is uncertain and asked for input from Paul Alivisatos and Jim Krupnick.

Jim Krupnick said that it is important for the Lab to have a committee to review policies; however, he has a problem with the SRC acting as a decision maker. PUB-3000 (Section 1.3.2.2) says that the Associate Laboratory Director for Operations/Chief Operating Officer (Jim Krupnick) is responsible for "ES&H policy-making, implementation, and the daily operation of the ES&H program". PUB-3000 (Section 1.3.2.11.6) and the SRC Charter say that the SRC "performs research for and makes recommendations to the Laboratory Director on the development and implementation of Environment, Safety, & Health (ES&H) policy, guidelines, codes, and regulatory interpretation", and "conducts reviews of special safety problems and provides recommendations for possible solutions to the Laboratory Director and/or the ES&H Division".

Paul Alivisatos agreed that while it is important to get input from representatives of the Lab Divisions who will be implementing policies, Line Management should make policy decisions. Line Management wants to be more engaged in the policy-making process.

Jim Krupnick said that if the SRC doesn't like a policy, we should work with the author to help make it right, so policies could get done more quickly. He wants the Committee members to act as advisors, not just gatekeepers.

Paul Alivisatos noted that LBNL has recently been through a relatively intense period during the HSS audit. The results were extremely successful. He has noticed a real change in attitudes about safety. People are beginning to see safety as a significant value, and to understand that everyone is responsible. A lot of people at LBNL worked hard to get ready for the audit, and the challenge now is to take advantage of the momentum and keep it going. We have a lot of things to work on together. He is concerned about consolidating what was learned from the audit. Safety practices and culture improved in the divisions that were reviewed. Paul Alivisatos is working on creating a program that would ask the divisions that were reviewed to help the other divisions go through a peer review process similar to the HSS. The emphasis would be on observing work and how people are working. The goal is to improve safety in a friendly way that would help both the division being observed and the divisions doing the observing. He plans to initiate a pilot program. He wants LBNL people to understand that safety is a responsibility shared by all scientists.

Jim Krupnick said that there is work going on to address the 10 Findings from the HSS audit. LBNL will use the results of the HSS audit to figure out the right path forward for Self Assessments. Wayne Lukens asked how this would relate to Division Self-Assessments. Jim Krupnick responded that the Division Directors liked the ideas that were presented at the Division Directors' meeting the previous day. Divisions need to take responsibility for Self-Assessment. Paul Alivisatos commented that he is looking for insights from the people who went through the HSS review. Martin Pollard asked what LBNL Leadership saw as the SRC's role in improving Self-Assessment. Jim Krupnick responded that he hasn't thought about the role of SRC in Self-Assessment yet.

He would like the Committee to act in an advisory capacity on safety issues, and may change the name to "Safety Advisory Committee". Jim Krupnick plans to meet with the Committee quarterly, and Paul Alivisatos said that he would also be happy to come when he can.

Daniela Leitner described the Committee's role in advising the EH&S Division Director and noted that the Committee's monthly meetings are open, and LBNL Senior Leadership is always welcome to attend. She commented that LBNL needs to have a clear path for policy development. There are many committees (HSS Corrective Action Plan, Peer Review, etc.) and it is not always clear where new policies are coming from. For example, Bldg. 88 was recently classified as a legacy radiation area, and Nuclear Sciences didn't know where the decision came from. Scott Taylor agreed that their had not been good communication on the legacy radiation issue. Scott commented that there had also been changes to the Subcontractor Job Hazards Analysis program that had not been discussed.

Jim Krupnick said that EH&S should respond to SRC comments, but they may not always agree. He invited the Committee to give suggestions on how to improve communications. Scott Taylor commented that historically, the SRC used to have communications with all the safety subcommittees, but some have split off as separate committees. The Committees' role hasn't been to communicate new policies to the Divisions. The Committee members collectively have detailed knowledge of policies and are an important part of the process of getting policy right in the larger context.

Jim Krupnick asked whether there is a way of to make the policy development process go faster. He is anticipating changes to PUB-3000 as a result of the HSS audit. Daniela Leitner commented that the SRC does make suggestions about how to improve the language of proposed policies. Scott Taylor commented that EH&S Subject Matter Experts can't always evaluate the impact of proposed policies. Jim Krupnick agreed that LBNL needs a group of people that actually implement policies to suggest ways that can make policies work.

Pat Thomas asked whether any decision has been made regarding the selection of a new Committee Chair. Paul Alivisatos said he has not looked at this yet.

Chairman's Comments – Wayne Lukens (for Don Lucas)

Minor revisions to PUB-3000 – There will be minor changes to Construction Safety and Ergonomics. A proposed change to requirements for hand tools will be posted soon. A draft policy for transportation of research samples is being posted for comment.

Accelerator & Fusion Research Division (AFRD) MESH Response – Steve Gourlay

Division Director Steve Gourlay began by sharing two anecdotes about LBNL safety culture. He knew our safety culture was improving when he was walking down to Bldg. 50 and saw a flock of turkeys using the crosswalk to cross the road. Recently, when he was walking by Bldg. 46, he passed an AFRD employee who told him that she had almost been hit by a truck when crossing a street at LBNL. Steve Gourlay reported the incident through the "Our Safety" and was amazed by the immediate response of EH&S and Facilities personnel, who tracked down the offending driver (a heating and air conditioning contractor doing work on site) and warned him that his driving behavior was unacceptable if he wished to continue to do work at LBNL.

Steve Gourlay described AFRD's safety organization structure, including their system of asking scientists to serve as Program Safety Coordinators, then rotating them into the Deputy Division Safety Coordinator and Division Safety Coordinator position, to raise safety awareness. In addition, there is a full-time, on-going ES&H Administrator.

He thanked the MESH team members and the Division ES&H staff for their participation in the MESH review. He concurred with the review conclusions that the Division's overall safety program is robust, but there are opportunities for improvement in hazard awareness and communications.

The review found 4 Concerns, 6 Observations, and 3 Noteworthy Practices.

The Concerns and responses were:

- The use of AHDs needs improvement, particularly for construction, testing, and start-up of experiments – AFRD is implementing Task-Based JHAs for these types of activities. More guidance from EH&S will be needed as the work authorization requirements evolve.
- Emergency safety shower/eyewash stations are missing from some laboratories where chemicals are used, and a new lab was constructed without a safety shower / eyewash – AFRD plans to review all their labs with Facilities and Industrial Hygiene to develop a prioritized list of where safety showers / eyewashes are needed. Some labs in Old Town may be scheduled for demolition soon. The review of new facilities is an institutional issue.
- Required door signage was missing in many areas, and an outdated AHD was posted – AFRD Line Management has been asked to conduct a review of signage and postings in all their work areas.
- A grit blaster in Bldg. 16 was found to be past due for ventilation testing because EH&S had not been notified that it had been moved, so it was not on the ventilation database – The grit blaster was added to the ventilation database and a performance test was conducted. Industrial Hygiene is sampling the used grit to determine the hazards, and a Task-Based JHA will be developed to document the hazards and appropriate controls.

The Observations and responses were:

- The ISM Plan describes a 20% time commitment for the Division Safety Coordinator, which may not be adequate – AFRD will re-assess the level of support needed, based on the HSS audit feedback. The ISM Plan will be amended if necessary. AFRD is also increasing PI participation in walkthroughs, and making more use of the Deputy Division Safety Coordinator.
- The MESH Team was provided with an outdated MOU with Engineering Division and a more current one. – The outdated MOU has been replaced by the current one. In addition, the MOU with ALS is being updated.
- There was some confusion about who supervises people working in shops -- All personnel have a Home Division Supervisor, who has primary responsibility for their safety. The Shop Manager is a Work Lead responsibility that may be assigned to Engineering Division personnel, with Engineering Division approval in accordance with the MOU.
- Some aisle ways in the Bldg. 71 laser labs appeared to be too narrow and contained tripping hazards – Researchers must keep aisles clear of tripping hazards caused by their equipment. Some structural problems remain. AFRD will work with Facilities to avoid structural egress hazards in the design of new laser labs.
- Most of the exit signs are not self-illuminated, and the emergency lighting system may not be adequate in some areas – Testing of emergency lights is included in AFRD walkarounds. AFRD will work with Facilities to identify areas needing additional signs or lighting. This may be an Institutional issues in other areas of LBNL also.
- A soldering bench in Bldg. 16 had severe housekeeping issues – This soldering bench is very old and has many years of residue. It will be removed. This building and the rest of "Old Town" may be scheduled for demolition soon.
- The AFRD ES&H Administrator could not access the SAARS database – The database has been modified to allow each Division to designate a back-up person for their Safety Coordinator. This was an Institutional issue.

The Noteworthy Practices were:

- The commitment and involvement of AFRD senior management and supervisors to the safety program;
- Frequent communications between AFRD and Engineering Division Directors about safety;
- Identification of hazards and establishment of controls is well documented in the Bldg. 71 laser facility.

Wayne Lukens asked whether the MESH findings were entered into CATS. This had not been done yet because the corrective actions were still being determined.

Computing Sciences MESH Response – Horst Simon

Horst Simon thanked the MESH review team. The Computing Sciences Directorate organization has changed since the last MESH review in 2006. Information Technology has become a separate Division. ITSD, NERSC, and Computational Research share support services, including Safety staff. Betsy MacGowan was hired from EH&S as a full-time Safety Coordinator. Scott Robinson is the new EH&S Liaison. The personnel profile for Computing Sciences includes about 37% Computer Systems Engineers and 23% guests. They have a significant vendor staff. Their hazards include ergonomics, electrical safety, noise, and seismic risk.

The MESH review found 4 Noteworthy Practices, 2 Observations, and 1Institutional Observation.

The Noteworthy Practices were:

- Strong commitment from senior management – management walkthroughs set the tone and stress the importance of ES&H. They also pushed for on-line ergonomic training and offered tailored classes for Group Leads;
- An electronic communication tool, "In the Loop";
- Ergonomic safety as a high priority; and
- No budget constraints for ergonomic safety.

The Observations were entered into CATS and closed by March 15:

- Documentation and communication of walkthroughs, safety meetings should be improved – Documentation of walkthroughs was indeed in the ISM Plan. The frequency and participation in walkthroughs was also increased. They now have a walkthrough database. They are requiring a sign-in for all-hands meeting attendance and posting presentations on their website. They are considering a bar-code system to swipe badges to record meeting attendance. They have evaluated and documented the transmission of information through newsletters, e-mails, employee feedback, and Division Safety Committee minutes.
- Some staff members were unfamiliar with the ISM Plan or ISM concepts – Preparation for the HSS audit addressed this problem. In addition, the ISM Plan was updated, and questions about ISM are being added to walkthroughs.

The Institutional Observation was that guests pose a challenge in terms of JHAs and training compliance. Computing sciences is working with EH&S on this issue. They have some special cases of guests who have joint appointments at Universities, but don't work on the LBNL site, or only come about twice a year to visit.

Computing Sciences emphasizes ergonomics. They offer ergonomics classes in conjunction with division meetings. They developed a server lifter and a floor tile lifter. The core message is to encourage early reporting of ergonomic discomfort. Ergonomic assessments are important.

In addition to ergonomics, they also assessed PPE needs, fire risks, noise, work under floors, hazards of limited access areas, and tailored JHAs for these hazards.

Computing Sciences has not had a problem with getting their vendors to fill out workbooks for Subcontractor JHAs.

There was a question about whether people are expected to read the ISM Plan. Computing Sciences asks questions about the Plan during walkthroughs. Engineering Division created a course number for their ISM Plan and identified reading the plan as a training requirement. Computing Sciences is copying Engineering.

SRC Discussion

There were questions about how the HSS results will affect MESH. The HSS corrective action plan is still being developed. The consensus was that we should wait for the results before starting MESH reviews this year.

There was a request for an update on the status of the non-nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory electrical equipment inspection program. There are ergonomics issues involved when equipment greater than 50 lbs. needs to be moved to conduct the survey or inspection.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM
Respectfully submitted, Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary