

**Safety Review Committee
September 22, 2006
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM**

Minutes

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

Others Present: Robert Candelario, Richard DeBusk, *Paul Fallon (for Daniela Leitner), Michelle Flynn, Carol Ingram, Michael Kritscher, Eugene Lau, Larry McClellan, John Muhlestein, Rocky Saunders, John Seabury, Janice Sexson, Linda Smith, *Ken Woolfe (for Michael Martin), Patrick Wright

Introductions – The new Earth Sciences Division representative, Seiji Nakagawa, and the new EH&S Emergency Preparedness manager, Rocky Saunders, were introduced.

Minutes of August Meeting – The minutes were approved with some minor corrections.

Chairman's Comments – Don Lucas

E-mail addresses – The request that all badged personnel provide an e-mail address has been discussed with David McGraw. Chemical Sciences Division already has this requirement.

Policy change review process – EH&S (Richard DeBusk) has created a checklist of reviews any proposed change to PUB-3000 must go through before being submitted to the SRC for approval.

Line Management definitions – Don Lucas has been working on a Peer Review corrective action plan review team addressing the definition of “Line Management”. He distributed draft definitions the team has been developing, and asked for comments. The definitions will be brought up formally for approval in October. A key issue is the definition of Work Lead: *“A Work Lead is anyone who directs, trains, and/or oversees the work and activities of one or more workers. Work Leads provide instruction on working safely and the precautions necessary to use equipment and facilities safely and effectively. Work Leads need not be Line Managers, HEERA Designated Supervisors, or LBNL Employees.”* There may be a conflict with the definition of Supervisor under the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA): *“any individual, regardless of the job description or title, having authority in the interest of the employer to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them ...”* The proposed definition of Staff is *“anyone with an LBNL badge”*, which differs from the LBNL directory, which refers to employees as Staff and badged non-employees as Guests. Principal Investigator is a contract definition, not a job classification. Other important definitions include Faculty Scientist and Guest.

Proposed Subcommittee Name Change -- Janice Sexson

Janice Sexson proposed that the name of the Traffic Safety Subcommittee be changed to the Traffic and Pedestrian Safety Subcommittee. The change was approved unanimously by SRC members present. One of the Subcommittee’s recent activities has been preparing a reminder to everyone to wear sensible shoes when walking around the site and watch out for leaves, pine needles, and other debris that falls on the walkways whenever it is windy. The subcommittee also handles bicycle safety issues, which are included as a part of “traffic”. Ms. Sexson would like to give a presentation on the Subcommittee’s activities at the October meeting.

Proposed Change to PUB-3000, Chapter 6, Adding Temporary Work Authorizations – John Seabury

Chapter 16 of PUB-3000 allows the Laser Safety Officer to establish temporary laser authorizations. This is in conflict with Chapter 6, which requires an Activity Hazard Document (AHD) for all Class 3 and 4 laser use. AHDs are intended to cover on-going work. Examples of situations where temporary authorizations may be needed are vendor calibrations of equipment, or use of a toxic gas for a short period to determine whether it will work in an experiment. To obtain a temporary authorization, the EH&S technical person and program sponsor would meet and agree on hazard controls, and the Division Director would sign the authorization. In some cases, the Division Director may be the Principal Investigator. The Work Lead could be a non-LBNL person. There was a question about how LBNL can assure non-LBNL personnel have sufficient knowledge. Appropriate training would still be required. “Elevated hazards” would be the hazards that require a formal work authorization under PUB-3000, Chapter 6, Appendix B. The

requirements of Chapter 8 for Qualified Electrical Workers to do certain types of work would still apply. Temporary authorizations would be available unless formal authorizations are required by regulations. For example, a temporary authorization could not replace a Radiological Work Authorization or Burn Permit. EH&S concurrence would be by the Subject Matter Expert. It was asked whether the Division Safety Coordinator should be required to sign. John Seabury was concerned that the process may become too complex if too many signatures are required. It was suggested that the temporary authorization be limited to lasers, but there were examples of how it could be useful for other short duration situations. Some changes to the form and process may be needed after it is used for a while. For example, the Principal Investigator signature may be changed to the responsible Line Manager after the definitions are adopted. There is no provision for an extension of a Temporary Work Authorization. A new one would have to be issued or an AHD could be required if the work duration will exceed the time limit. It was suggested that a person in EH&S should monitor all the temporary authorizations. John Seabury said that the AHD Coordinator could keep track of them. In the future, they could be tracked on a database.

The proposed changes will be in PUB-3000, section 6.3.5. The Committee members asked for the following changes:

- Define “elevated hazard” as work requiring a formal authorization;
- Add a requirement to post the temporary authorization at the work location;
- Add a Work Leader signature block;
- Clarify that the EH&S approver is the Subject Matter Expert;
- Clarify that temporary authorizations are not intended for ongoing, day-to-day work.

Committee members present (with one person objecting) approved the proposal with the changes listed above.

John Seabury said that other major revisions to PUB-3000, Chapter 6 are anticipated over the next 6-8 months.

Electrical Equipment Acceptance Program – Robert Candelario

There is an existing OSHA requirement that electrical equipment with 1000 Watts or greater of potential energy must be either listed by a Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory (NRTL) or approved by the Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ). At Berkeley Lab, this authority rests in the Engineering Division with Director Kem Robinson. Robert Candelario has been working with Keith Gershon to develop an acceptance program for non-NRTL equipment. The program will require inspection of lab-built, one-of-a-kind, non-listed equipment. There will be a surveyor training program for Qualified Electrical Workers. They will be going through all labs and shops, compiling a list of equipment requiring evaluation. Robert Candelario and Steven Chow can evaluate equipment. They will bar code the equipment, document the evaluation, and record the information in a database. There will be a sticker indicating either that the equipment has been approved or that modification and re-evaluation are required. They

have been doing evaluations at the Molecular Foundry. Equipment that has been modified also needs to be evaluated. The evaluators will make the required changes right away at no cost to the equipment owner whenever possible. There are not enough resources to evaluate everything right away. There are tens of thousands of pieces of equipment that could require evaluation. Additional resources have been requested. A program document is being finalized. Some Committee members are concerned that work will be delayed if they have to wait for an evaluator to approve equipment after modification. The evaluators are setting priorities. It is not their intent to shut anyone down. The evaluators are concentrating on divisions where there is an Engineering Division presence, such as the Advanced Light Source. They are working with Procurement to require NRTL-listed equipment where possible, and to flag non-NRTL equipment for evaluation before delivery. There are international labs that qualify as NRTLs. The evaluators are looking at critical equipment coming into LBNL.

The equipment acceptance program has been initiated to comply with the OSHA requirement. There is no PUB-3000 policy at this time. It will continue as a pilot program at this time. Richard DeBusk will look into changes that need to be made to PUB-3000, Chapter 8 and bring the proposed changes to the Committee next month.

Incident Investigation Status – Richard DeBusk

Six people have now been trained in root cause analysis and three more will be trained in October. 15/16 Safety Coordinators and 14/15/ Liaisons have been trained in the new incident investigation procedure.

The automatic e-mail notification to a supervisor from the Supervisors' Accident Analysis Report (SAAR) database is being changed. The supervisor is determined from the Human Resources database. Richard DeBusk is working on a briefing for the Division Directors and a Today at Berkeley Lab article to appear in October. Injured employees are included in the incident investigation team. Training on the new procedure will be included in the supervisors' training course.

There was a question about a potential conflict between a Regulations and Procedures Manual policy about not disclosing employee information to outside companies and supervisors receiving telephone calls from a contractor (Octagon) that investigates Workers' Compensation cases. Richard DeBusk will check with Peter Lichty for an interpretation.

General Discussion

There was a question about the status of the recommendation that the Laser Safety Officer be able to visit laser systems on the UC campus where LBNL-sponsored work takes place. Howard Hatayama was going to discuss the issue with Mark Freiberg.

There was a question about whether Procurement could work with vendors to enter chemicals into the Chemical Management System when they are ordered. The requestor

could be listed as the owner. Some laboratories have a third party contractor that orders and labels chemicals. The potential problems with this approach are that there are some requestors who order chemicals for several people and it is difficult to determine who the real owners are, and that delivery of chemicals to the researcher takes too long.

There was a concern that there is a tendency to adopt safety policies that are more stringent than the regulatory requirements or technical standards, and that overly stringent policies may cause problems. The example given was that equipment over 6 amps is not allowed to be plugged into a surge protector. Power surges can damage expensive laboratory equipment.

There was a question about the status of measures to improve oversight of vendors. Scheduling EH&S personnel to train or oversee vendors is a problem. The process to pre-approve vendors is not in place yet. Don Lucas will check on the status.

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