



Building 902a
P.O. Box 5000
Upton, NY 11973-5000
Phone 516 344-5754
Fax 516 344-2190
hhocker@bnl.gov

Managed by Brookhaven Science Associates
for the U.S. Department of Energy

Memo

date: January 26, 2001
to: Distribution
from: Henry Hocker
subject: Minutes - SMD Self-Assessment - November 21, 2000

Meeting Notice ([See Attachment](#))

Meeting Agenda ([See Attachment](#))

Attendees ([See Attachment](#)) - Attendees are SMD unless otherwise noted

T. Kirk (High Energy & Nuclear Physics Directorate), M. Harrison, M. Anerella, C. Porretto, G. Schroeder (ES), L. Welcome, R. Thomas, G. Ganetis, O. White (SHS), D. Ports (ESH&Q Directorate), P. Joshi, P. Wanderer, J. Durnan (RP), F. Skidmore, M. Gaffney (SHSP), T. Dilgen, D. Oldham, R. Ceruti, R. Jackimowicz, H. Hocker, P. Ribaldo, S. Musolino (RCD),

Meeting Purpose

A self-assessment review was held on November 21, 2000 as part of the Superconducting Magnet Divisions Integrated Safety Management Program & the Divisions Self-Assessment Program. The format of the meeting was a series of presentations given by division members. Each presentation was structured as a review and critique of an individual element of the program as it is implemented within Superconducting Magnet Division. This feedback of good points and areas for improvement is an integral part of the Continuous Improvement cycle.

Topics Discussed

- ⇒ Division Update & Self-Assessment
- ⇒ Formal ES&H FY00
- ⇒ Integrated Safety Management - Engineering Safety Committee
- ⇒ Integrated Safety Management - Engineering Safety
- ⇒ Work Controls
- ⇒ OPM's & MAP's
- ⇒ Building Manager
- ⇒ Training /R2A2's
- ⇒ Training Critique
- ⇒ R2A2 Critique
- ⇒ Conclusions

Individual Presentations and Discussions

Additional Comments by Presenters are bulleted. At-large comments are italicized.

◆ **Division Update & Self-Assessment - Mike Harrison**

Division Update & Self Assessment Presentation

- R2A2's: Went from being very generic to being a more meaningful document.
- Facility Use Agreement: Do they serve a useful purpose? Are they used regularly?

Regarding procedures, the act of writing them helps to establish the procedure, they don't need to be referred to regularly.

- SBMS: Has grown to be large - they need to be made smaller and more concise and more focused.

A retreat was scheduled to look at areas needing improvement in SBMS - "Kill or Cure", or areas needing to be deleted.

◆ **Formal ES&H FY00 - Mike Gaffney**

Environmental Safety Self-Assessment Presentation

- Since we are a new division, our systems are start-up, there are no "last-years notes".
- Attendance of TIER 1 inspections was good. A wide background of attendees was generally present.
- Housekeeping - A significant improvement has been seen. Some housekeeping does need to be improved - See slide.
- There are some issues in Chemical Management - See slide. Perhaps what is needed are "Chemical Clean-up" days.
- Lockout - Tagout:

Are the issues with LOTO systematic? It was agreed that the issues are somewhat systematic.

Is there a procedure to undue LOTO done by people no longer working here? Yes, there is a procedure. There is a LOTO log. An audit of the log should catch these items. An audit of the log is scheduled for 12/00.

➤ Environmental:

Is secondary containment complete? There are no known violations.

- Facility Use Agreement (FUA) - They use a set format which does not lend itself to highlighting hazardous areas within the building. The links give you a hit on the entire document. They don't allow you to find particular sections (i.e. safety). They need to be true electrical documentation, not web-based paper copies.

Is there a feedback loop for FUA? Part of the call for the retreat is to have an open forum for suggestions.

Do FUA's get re-reviewed? Yes, they do.

What forces a re-review? Re-reviews are triggered by "other level" reviews.

Further discussions resulted in the conclusion that this was an area needing review and update due to feedback.

- Occupational Injuries - All of our injuries for the past year have been in the parking lot. All of the injuries have been persons falling. Of these, 2 were ice-related.

Plant Engineering has not done a good job with snow and ice removal.

◆ **Integrated Safety Management - Engineering Safety Committee - Richard Thomas**

[Safety in Design & Operation Presentation](#)

On the Reducing Risk slide - Should we always use all 3 analysis methods to deduce risks?

Is the "Dealing with Hazards" slide used as our formal procedure? It is a "back of the head" approach. This may need to be a formal checklist.

Is there a timeout clause in system approval? No, but not everything needs to be re-reviewed regularly. There is no specific policy on when to re-review old systems.

How can we avoid situations where a number of simple faults combine to create a hazardous condition? A lessons learned approach is used by studying available information (DOE, internet, etc.)

Agreed that the presentation is an indicator that the Engineering Safety Committee system basically works.

As a reminder, procedures must be followed.

◆ **Integrated Safety Management - Engineering Safety - Piyush Joshi**

[Electrical Safety Practice Presentation](#)

Is re-training being done on hypot and impulse? Yes, it is.

- Job specific training is not well documented. No real mechanism for removing outdated information exists. References to people or organizations are sometimes outdated.
- On-the-spot modifications to procedures are not well documented.
- Many electrical system drawings are not baselined.

There is not sufficient budget for drafters.

- Some OPM's are not on the web. Only hard copies with markups are kept by equipment.

Records of interlock testing are not kept in a central location.

- There is no committee to obtain "working hot" permits.

This should not be a problem since SMD does not have critical systems which would create a requirement for working hot.

There is somewhat of an issue with documentation for legacy issues.

Technicians are generally good at following written procedures.

◆ **Work Controls - Tom Dilgen**

[Work Control Presentation](#)

- Would prefer that in cases where there is no MAP (Magnet Assembly Procedure), that the engineer would take the initiative to start the work permit process.
- Work Permits and Plant Engineering:

How is the need for work permits initiated? It is a group effort. When Tom Dilgen calls a building maintenance issue in, they ask if a work permit is needed. There was a comment made during the work permit audit that permits are being requested every time Plant Engineering comes in.

- A suggestion that the Work Permit form be computerized.

- Would prefer that Safety Engineering sign all work permits, even the low level risk ones. As an aside, Tom Dilgen has not received Work Control Coordinator training.

◆ **Work Controls** - Paul Ribaudo

[Work Control Electrical System Presentation](#)

Would Paul ever need work permits? Not for the near term.

- LOTO is not tracked in the work control log.

A suggestion was made that a "LOTO USED" column should be added to the work control log. This would be difficult - it's use can't be anticipated.

◆ **OPM's & MAPS** - Ray Ceruti

[OPM-MAP Presentation 1](#)

- MAP documents should be more detailed and include a glossary for specifications (torque specifications, etc.).
- There should be an easier and quicker way to incorporate feedback into MAP documents.

◆ **OPM's & MAPS** - Larry Welcome

[OPM-MAP Presentation 2](#)

- MAP documents are covering too much at once. They should be broken into smaller, more specific documents based on technical groupings. *Authors note: these comments were directed towards a specific procedure being used on the helical magnet program. It is the authors belief that this should be considered an isolated case.*
- Not all MAP documents are standardized as far as requirements, materials and equipment. Perhaps need to be more towards a standard format.
- Weights should be added to those sections of MAP documents which describe lifting.
- Procedure for changing MAP documents needs to be expedited.
- MAP documents should contain alternate methods or materials.
- Can weld inspections be done by internal personnel?
- Need a review of OPM's for appropriateness.

◆ **Building Manager** - Tom Dilgen

[Building Manager Presentation](#)

- Need more money to renovate older buildings.
- Division should receive notification when MMC completes a job.
- Need better Preventative Maintenance.

◆ **Training /R2A2** - Chris Porretto

[Training & R2A2 Presentation](#)

- JTA's have been updated to better reflect work performed.
- Need to re-establish SMD training for working hot & hypot.
- Review need for "working hot" training.
- Need training for impulse testing.

◆ **Training Critique** - Bob Hoade

[Training Critique Presentation 1](#)

- Web Training: Some course do not lend themselves to being web-based. They are better taught in a classroom environment. Challenge exams for re-qualification could be moved to the web.
- Need to have more computers available on floor for training. Technicians need e-mail access.
- Practicals for some courses should be reviewed.

◆ **Training Critique** - Dan Oldham

[Training Critique Presentation 2](#)

- Attitudes and perception about training could be improved. There has been an improvement in these attitudes, though there is still room for improvement.

◆ **R2A2's - Mike Anerella**

[R2A2 Presentation](#)

- R2's should be subdivided into general and specific categories. Non-applicable R2's should be deleted.
- We do better on "R's" than "A's".
- There should be a tie in with performance appraisals for common areas.

◆ **Conclusions**

Thanks to all participants for useful and constructive comments.

The goal of seeking broad-based input from all areas of the Division has been achieved.

In the future, we should be rolling EMS Management Review into this review.

* * *

Cc:
R. McNair
Attendees