

**Safety Review Committee**  
**April 21, 2006**  
**10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**

**Minutes**

<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present</b>
Ager, Joel W.	Materials Sciences Division	<b>X</b>
Banda, Michael J.	Computing Sciences Directorate	<b>X</b>
Blodgett, Paul M.	Environment, Health and Safety Division	*
Cork, Carl	Physical Biosciences Division	<b>X</b>
Fletcher, Kenneth A.	Facilities Department	
Garbis, Carla	Directorate/OCFO/Human Resources	<b>X</b>
Hugenholtz, Phil	Genomics Division	<b>X</b>
Kadel, Richard W.	Physics Division	<b>X</b>
Kennedy, Burton Mack	Earth Sciences Division	
Lucas, Donald	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	<b>X</b>
Lukens Jr., Wayne W.	Chemical Sciences Division	<b>X</b>
Macchiavelli, Augusto O.	Nuclear Science Division	
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	
Seidl, Peter A.	Accelerator & Fusion Research Division	<b>X</b>
Taylor, Scott E.	Life Sciences Division	<b>X</b>
Thomas, Patricia M.	Safety Review Committee Secretary	<b>X</b>
Wong, Weyland	Engineering Division	<b>X</b>

**Others Present:** Hattie Carwell, John Chernowski, \*Richard DeBusk (for Paul Blodgett), Michelle Flynn, Howard Hatayama, Eugene Lau, Janice Sexson

**Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas**

Don introduced Wayne Lukens, the new SRC Representative for Chemical Sciences Division, and John Chernowski and Michelle Flynn from the Office of Contract Assurance.

**Laser Safety**

Don Lucas recently returned from a visit to Idaho Falls to learn about their laser safety program. He will be having follow-up discussions with David McGraw. Idaho Falls' laser work authorizations (equivalent to our AHDs) are reviewed by a committee, whose efforts are paid for by Operations. Their procedures are generally thorough and clear; however, the approval process is slow and it takes them about 6 months to change a procedure. The designation of "Principle Investigator" seems to be loosely defined.

## **MESH**

### **Review interval recommendations**

Leaders of the 2005 MESH Review Teams recommended the following review intervals, which were agreed upon by the Committee by consensus:

- Life Sciences Division – 2 years (2007) to check status of findings;
- EH&S Division – 2 years (2007) because there is new management;
- Genomics Division – 3 years (2008) because of prompt response to correct findings;
- Computing Sciences Directorate – 3 years (2008) because there is a new Safety Coordinator;
- Directorate/Operations – 2 years (2007) because of reorganization.

Don Lucas will forward the recommendations to the ISM Panel for their consideration.

### **2006 MESH Guidelines**

John Chernowski and Michelle Flynn have been working with Don Lucas to develop a “MESH Review – Guidance and Overview” document, to be posted on the SRC website. The document explains the MESH Review process and the roles of the Office of Contract Assurance and DOE Berkeley Site Office. Committee members suggested that MESH Team Leaders give a presentation on the review findings before the Division Director presents the MESH response to the SRC.

This year, the Integrated Functional Appraisals will focus on compliance with formal work authorizations (AHDs, RWAs, etc.) and waste management requirements. For divisions that do not have very many formal authorizations, the EH&S liaison will designate other high-hazard activities to be reviewed.

MESH reviews should focus on evaluating management systems, including line management involvement (participation in walkthroughs, communications, safety committees, etc.), resolution of findings from past reviews (MESH, IFAs, Division Self-Assessments, etc.), allocation of resources, and effectiveness of communications. MESH site visits should focus on interviewing personnel. Rather than just checking compliance, review teams should ask why management systems allowed instances of non-compliance to occur. MESH teams should evaluate how well communication systems are working – are safety messages flowing consistently up and down through the division?

### **2006 MESH Teams**

Don Lucas announced the following review assignments:

- Physics Division – Mack Kennedy (leader), Ken Fletcher, Wayne Lukens;
- Chemical Sciences – Carla Garbis (leader), Don Lucas, Michael Martin;
- Material Sciences – Paul Blodgett (leader), Michael Banda, Richard Kadel;

- Facilities – Phil Hugenholtz (leader), Joel Ager, Augusto Macchiavelli.
- ALS – Peter Seidl (leader), Scott Taylor, Carl Cork.

### **Feedback from meeting with Dr. Chu**

There was a discussion of the safety training program. Some supervisors view the new supervisor training courses as LBNL passing liability to them. There was a concern about the possible overlap of courses, and questions about the process for determining training needs and developing new courses. EH&S develops courses based on regulatory requirements or feedback from management, Division Safety Coordinators, EH&S Liaisons, or SRC. There are potentially conflicting desires to have all supervisor training incorporated into one comprehensive course, but not have the course be too long. Don Lucas observed that Idaho Falls has almost 100% safety training compliance, and people receive cards every month with information about their training status. Don suggested that the SRC conduct a comprehensive review of safety training. Issues include: assessing the value of classes and whether the lessons are being implemented, improving trainer qualifications, ensuring courses are ready before they are rolled out, improving the quality of courses so people will be more willing to attend them, ensuring course evaluations result in improvements, scheduling classes at convenient times, and ensuring the Job Hazards Questionnaire asks the right questions.

There was a discussion of the process for setting up new safety committees. Sometimes informal teams convened to work on a particular issue evolve into committees. Do we have sufficient communications to top management? Does management have a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities of the various committees?

### **Strategy for rollout and implementation of EHS027 Performing an Effective Safety Walkaround – Richard DeBusk**

A new course has been developed on how to perform safety walkarounds. It was proposed that the course be recommended for managers, supervisors and PIs, and required for Safety Coordinators. Most of the Safety Coordinators have already taken the course during a pilot session. The course was developed because the Peer Review found that implementation of walkarounds is spotty, and that line managers sometimes delegate the task. The course emphasizes that management walkarounds should not just be physical inspections of workplaces, but should also be a communication activity for the manager/supervisor to talk to their employees about how they do their jobs and discuss safety concerns. The course includes information on how to organize and schedule walkaround activities, and how to communicate. The plan is to offer the course monthly. Divisions may request special sessions tailored to their needs. . Office inspections are applicable to everyone, but not everyone needs to inspect labs. Divisions may have different requirements for documenting walkarounds. A committee member suggested that what PIs really want is specific guidance on checklist development, and that specific data on the effectiveness of walkaround programs would improve credibility and buy-in. Deputy Division Directors have previewed the course materials. Top management leadership by example – Lab and Division Directors taking the course – would also

increase participation. The course could be integrated with EHS026 safety training for supervisors. One problem is that there are no clear definitions of who is a “line manager” or “supervisor”. The course would be recommended for anyone who answers “yes” to questions B1 or B2 on the JHQ. The course should also be available to anyone who can benefit from it. The course should be consistent with PUB-3000 and not establish any new requirements for walkarounds.

The Committee consensus was that EH&S can move forward on offering the course, if feedback is collected from attendees. The Committee requested a status report in 3 months.

### **MOUs for Matrixed Personnel – Richard DeBusk and Michael Banda**

It was proposed that RPM section 7.01 D Matrixed Employees and Responsibility for Safety be modified to assign health and safety responsibilities for matrixed employees to the host supervisor. The Committee discussed the difficulties of implementing this approach because matrixing relationships can be complex (e.g., matrixed employees working for several supervisors) and there is no clear definition or record of which employees are “matrixed” or who is their host supervisor. Human Resources does not track this information in their database. There may also be a conflict with the goal of emphasizing line management responsibility for safety. It was decided that this issue needs further discussion at a future meeting.

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