

**Safety Review Committee  
February 17, 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	<b>X</b>
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	
Kadel, Richard W.	Physics Division	
Kennedy, Burton Mack	Earth Sciences Division	<b>X</b>
Lucas, Donald	Environmental Energy Technologies Division	<b>X</b>
Macchiavelli, Augusto O.	Nuclear Science Division	*
Martin, Michael C.	Advanced Light Source Division	
Rao, Linfeng	Chemical Sciences Division	<b>X</b>
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	*

**Others Present:** \*John Bercovitz (for Mike Kritscher and Weyland Wong), Richard DeBusk, Michelle Flynn, John Hutchings, Carol Ingram, Eugene Lau, Betsy MacGowan, Bob Mueller, \*Larry Phair (for Augusto Macchiavelli), Horst Simon

**Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas**

The minutes of the December meeting were accepted.

**Meeting with Dr. Chu**

Dr. Chu has a scheduling conflict with our March 17 meeting. March 22 was proposed as the new meeting date.

**MESH Status**

- Life Sciences, EH&S, Genomics, and Computing Sciences reports and presentations are complete.
- Directorate report is complete. Presentation scheduled for March meeting.

- Don Lucas passed around a sign-up sheet and requested volunteers to serve on the 2006 MESH review teams. Committee members who do not volunteer will be assigned to a review team.
- Don is working with Michelle Flynn to write new guidelines for MESH reviews. The guidelines will emphasize that MESH is a management review, which distinguishes it from the other types of self-assessments.

## **Subcommittees**

Under the revised SRC Charter, Subcommittee chairpersons will not be SRC Members (unless they are also Division representatives). Subcommittee chairs will continue to be invited to attend SRC meetings. The SRC website now has sections for each Subcommittee to post their meeting minutes and other information.

## **Computing Sciences Directorate MESH Response – Horst Simon**

Computing Sciences is a Directorate consisting of 3 Divisions: Information Technologies and Services (ITSD), Computational Research, and the National Energy Research Scientific Computing (NERSC) Center. Horst Simon is the Associate Laboratory Director for Computing Sciences. Michael Banda is his Deputy, and the safety committee chair. John Hutchings is the Safety Coordinator and Facilities Manager. Elizabeth MacGowan is the EH&S Liaison. 48% of Computing Sciences' personnel are Computational Systems Engineers (CSEs). Ergonomics is the greatest safety concern. The people are found in 7 different locations, including 4 locations on site, 2 in Oakland/Berkeley, and some in Livermore.

The injury rates declined steadily from 2001 through 2005, but have increased this year. There have been 3 recordable accidents and 8 first aids so far this reporting year.

The MESH review found 9 noteworthy practices, 9 observations, and 2 concerns.

One of the Noteworthy Practices for Work Planning was the voluntary relocation of employees from the seismically very poor Bldg. 50D to the Oakland computing center. Computing Sciences would rather have these employees on site, but there was no suitable space available.

Two Work Planning Observations were discussed. The Computational Research Division was performing ergonomic evaluations at a lower rate than the other two divisions. The rate has been improved, with a goal of evaluating all workstations. There has been a greater risk of ergonomic injuries as a result of employees regularly working overtime. Some groups do a lot of proposal and procurement work, and overtime is often necessary. People who work long hours are being encouraged to take breaks, exercise, and report any discomfort early. There was an ergonomic injury in January 2006 that was not reported early. The employee went to his/her own doctor first. This has become a recordable injury.

The Work Planning Concern was that the emergency rescue box for Bldg. 943 was not fully stocked at the time of the MESH review. The box has now been restocked.

The Noteworthy Practice for Hazard Identification was finding a noise hazard at the Bldg. 943 Linux cluster. Since the review, Computing Sciences has identified another noise hazard at 50B-1275. Signage has been posted and PPE provided in both locations.

It was observed that the safety checklists on the website were confusing. The checklists have been combined and the website updated.

One of the Noteworthy Practices for controlling hazards was installation of new earthquake securing pendulum technology (ISOBASE) at Bldg. 943 to prevent computers from toppling over and protect them from damage.

There was an Observation that contractor and subcontractor work was not being adequately controlled at Bldg. 943. Vendors are being required to fill out JHQs and attend training. LOTO equipment is being provided. Contractor safety plans are submitted through Procurement and reviewed by EH&S.

The MESH team also encouraged implementation of move smart/lift smart type training. Employees are being encouraged to take appropriate training.

The MESH team noted that ergonomic equipment in Bldg. 943 offices was outstanding. Computing Sciences is now working on installing similar adjustable desks in the Bldg. 50 complex.

There was an unsecured cabinet blocking an exit door at Bldg. 943. The cabinet has been relocated and secured.

The position description for the Safety Coordinator has been updated to reflect the amount of time actually being spent on safety work (about 40%). The website was also updated to provide current information about safety personnel and ergonomics.

The composition of the safety committee will be adjusted to ensure there is representation from all areas and major organizational units. There was a concern that the Associate Lab Director and Division/Department heads were not attending at least one safety committee meeting per year, and some representatives were not attending regularly. A new Computational Research representative has been appointed. The ALD is making an effort to attend more meetings.

### **Peer Review Report – Eugene Lau**

The Peer Review was initiated in response to a letter Aundra Richards wrote to the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) expressing concern about LBNL's safety program. The review team included safety experts from other research laboratories and universities. There were 3 DOE observers.

The report includes 54 suggestions divided into 4 categories, and 7 positive observations (including 8 more suggestions). The areas of concern were administrative and engineering controls at the Advanced Light Source, the laser safety program, leadership of EH&S, and the effectiveness of PIs/first line supervisors.

The next step is to do an extent of condition review to find out how broadly similar problems are occurring. Howard Hatayama is taking the lead. EH&S will review key reports (ALS radiation safety report, Bldg. 58 electrical safety incident investigation, other recent electrical safety incidents, RY 05 Division Self-Assessment reports, etc.) A root cause analysis will be done to look for common themes. Jack Bartley, the Office of Contract Assurance staff, Don Lucas, and some ES&H Coordinators will be involved. SRC members suggested that PI representatives and the SRC subcommittee chairs be involved in the discussions of root causes and in developing corrective actions. The schedule is to identify common themes by February 24 and develop a corrective action plan by March 3.

### **Ergonomics Assessment – Richard DeBusk**

Ergonomic injuries (computer use, lab work, material handling) account for about 2/3 of LBNL's recordable injuries. An ergonomics expert, Scott Smith of EORM, was invited to perform an assessment of our ergonomics program. He conducted interviews, reviewed records, observed workplace activities and looked at our training materials. The formal report will be submitted March 1. Scott concluded that our current program could be improved. We may not be focusing on the people at highest risk. The division of roles and responsibilities in the ergonomic assessment process is confusing and follow-up is inconsistent. Our ergonomic assessors are typically only receiving 3 hours of training, while 8 hours is the industry norm. (The ergonomic assessors provide advice in setting up workstations. They do not provide medical advice on specific symptoms.) The Joint Genome Institute supervisors have received 8 hours of training. When looking at material handling, the consultant found people doing lifting without fully understanding the risk.

SRC members asked whether ergonomic considerations are being integrated into the move planning process. Whenever an office move request is submitted through Facilities, an ergonomic evaluation request is automatically triggered. It was suggested that ergonomics experts be involved in office design so we can avoid problems rather than fixing workstations after they have been set up. Other movement hazards should also be considered. Ergonomics experts should be involved in planning new labs.

The consultant is going to provide information on some web-based self-assessment programs used in industry.

It was suggested that we specify ergo-friendly design features for equipment purchases, such as only buying adjustable monitors.

## **10 CFR 851– Richard DeBusk**

The new DOE safety regulations were published in the February 9, 2006 Federal Register and will become enforceable on February 10, 2007. There is no need to panic. Most of the regulations and standards referenced in the new regulations are already in our Work Smart Standards. The difference is that these requirements will be enforceable by fines. The potential fine amounts are higher than typical OSHA fines. We will be required to develop a Worker Safety and Health Plan, which must be approved by DOE. We will have to be careful about what we put in the plan because it will also be enforceable, similar to our Radiation Protection Plan. The primary defense against enforcement actions is timely self-identification, reporting, and correction of incidents of non-compliance. There are many aspects of how the regulations will be implemented that have not been defined yet. We are asking for a workshop for DOE representatives and contractors to work out the details. The requirements for the plan contents, the internal logging of violations and corrections, and which code requirements apply to old facilities are among the issues we need to discuss. We think the regulations will only apply at DOE owned or leased facilities, not to work on campus.

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