

**Safety Review Committee
March 22, 2006
10:00 AM – 11:30 AM**

Minutes

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

Others Present: Steven Chu, Richard DeBusk, Michelle Flynn, Howard Hatayama, Michael Kritscher, David McGraw, Robert Mueller, *Larry Phair (for Augusto Macchiavelli), Betsy Reyes, Aundra Richards, Robert Schoenlein, Janice Sexson, Linda Smith

Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas

The minutes of the February meeting were accepted.

Richard Kadel requested an update on the Peer Review Report and LBNL's response

Richard DeBusk has been developing a training session on how to conduct walkthroughs. A pilot session will be conducted with the Division Safety Coordinators before offering the course to senior management.

We will have the final 2005 MESH report response today. The next step will be to make recommendations to the ISM Board regarding the scheduling of the next MESH reviews

for the divisions that were reviewed in 2005. The ISM Board will be Graham Fleming, Howard Hatayama, and either David McGraw or Steven Chu. 2006 MESH team assignments will be discussed at our next meeting.

Committee members and guests were introduced.

Feedback from DOE – Aundra Richards

Berkeley Site Office Director Aundra Richards said she is pleased at the efforts made by LBNL since October 1 and the progress made in responding to the Peer Review report. She reminded us that there are some challenges ahead. Our safety program didn't do as well as we would like in 2005, but so far we seem to be back on track for 2006. Aundra acknowledged that the leadership of Steve Chu and Howard Hatayama are critical to our success. She expects significant improvement this year. She wants to continue to work with us in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect, and is here to listen to our ideas.

Feedback from LBNL Management – Dr. Chu

Dr. Chu remains concerned that not all Principle Investigators and supervisors have bought into the safety program. He has been considering adding a 360-degree safety review to the annual performance review (PRD) process. People would be asked to rate their immediate supervisor and one level above on their involvement in safety. There would also be a test of some basic safety knowledge, such as emergency contact phone numbers. If knowledge gaps are found, the JHQ and training courses could be improved. The goal would be to measure communications one level up and down. Not everyone has a PRD, including faculty and students, but they would be included in the safety rating process. The responses would be confidential. They would be part of the supervisors' performance rating, not just a survey. The feedback should be multiple choice, not open to comments. Some faculty members don't directly supervise their labs. If they delegate some day-to-day safety responsibilities, we need to determine whether the delegation is done effectively. Dr. Chu emphasized that the supervisor has the responsibility to ensure safety. He doesn't consider postdocs to be "supervisors". Don Lucas said that we would like to have a faculty member on the Safety Review Committee to provide input on these types of issues. Identifying supervisors is not always easy. Dr. Chu asked the Safety Review Committee to show initiative in developing ways to increase PI and supervisor involvement in safety.

Safety Review Committee Presentation – Don Lucas

The Safety Review Committee members are not intended to be EH&S experts. They represent the LBNL research community and support operations. The members have a mix of backgrounds. One of the primary functions of the SRC is to conduct Management of Environment, Safety, and Health (MESH) reviews of each division. The Berkeley Site Office is invited to attend the divisions' MESH response presentations on a case-by-case basis. The MESH review teams can interview anyone in the divisions and visit workplaces. The teams prepare a report and submit it to the division for factual accuracy

review. The division director presents a response to the SRC. When all the reviews for the year are complete, the SRC recommends the interval before the next review to the ISM Board. Today, we will be hearing the response to the Directorate/Operations MESH Review.

Directorate/Operations MESH Response – David McGraw

The Directorate did not do well in previous MESH Reviews so they were pleased to see that they did much better this time. The MESH is one part of LBNL's 4-part self-assessment program. The Directorate and Operations organization structure has changed. CSEE students are included. The March 2006 reorganization placed the Office of the CFO in Operations and also moved Information Technology from Computing Sciences to Operations. EH&S and Facilities safety programs are reviewed separately.

Ergonomics is the biggest challenge. Slips, trips, and falls have been increasing. A safety stand-down is scheduled in 2 weeks. They want to do root cause analyses of non-ergonomic first aid cases. The increase doesn't appear to be related to organizational changes.

There were Noteworthy Practices in ergonomics, tracking of findings, and workplace conditions / practices / safety knowledge. Opportunities for improvement include defining roles and responsibilities for matrixed staff, strengthening the ISM Plan, and consistent implementation of the Plan. The ISM Plan has been strengthened by clarifying line management responsibilities at all levels and evaluations. They are working on a scoring matrix and performance measurement system. The ISM Plan will be "refreshed" and submitted to the ISM Board.

They have identified their matrixed staff and are preparing MOUs with host divisions. The MOU could be used as a template for other divisions. It includes who pays for ergonomics equipment.

Communications improvements include a monthly level 1 safety message and a virtual suggestion box.

Ergonomic evaluations are done every 2 years, either by trained division evaluators or EH&S.

The safety committee is being reorganized. They are planning to have one safety committee, composed of senior people from each group that will meet at least 4 times per year. A charter is being drafted. SRC members suggested that the committee include a mix of people from all levels. They decided to have one committee because the missions of the groups are related and the hazards are similar.

Discussion: How can we learn from first-aid cases?

The EH&S Occupational Safety and Health group tracks trends in types of first aid cases. We need to make visiting Health Services a more pleasant experience to encourage people to report minor injuries. One step is to ensure first aid care is given before collecting information about the accident. We need to go beyond analyzing trends and develop action items from the lessons learned. There are institutional findings that need Lab Management attention. David McGraw will bring this up at the next senior management meeting. Whenever there is an accident, there should be information in “Today at Berkeley Lab”. There should be at least one safety story per week. John Chernowski and Ron Kolb are working on improving the Lessons Learned program. More people are being trained in Root Cause Analysis.

The Path Forward

Dr. Chu expressed his appreciation of the SRC’s efforts. He is concerned that some problems he observed in visiting laser labs were not found in the division self-assessment. He asked the SRC to look for ways of improving the self-assessment process. Reviews of work and people should go beyond checklists. It is not good to get a good self-assessment score if there are problems that were missed. The score should emphasize what was found and fixed. Sometimes it helps to put “problem” PIs on the self-assessment team.

Aundra Richards added that BSO need to find ways to make people feel safe to report Lessons Learned in ORPS. BSO must be able to investigate incidents and communicate the status of corrective actions.

Dr. Chu said we must make sure PIs understand they must work safely to continue to work at LBNL. We don’t want people to be afraid to report incidents.

David McGraw shared some good news. The Berkeley City Council issued a proclamation recognizing Berkeley Lab for leadership in waste minimization. This action reflects an improvement in our relationship with the City of Berkeley.

Don Lucas thanked the committee for their efforts over the past year.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 AM

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia M. Thomas, SRC Secretary