

Final Minutes of the Tier I Working Group Meeting FY 2011 Q4 held November 18, 2011
Safety and Health Services Division
Brookhaven National Laboratory


Attendees

C. Conrad, M. Cowell, M. Delph, N. Felock, D. Galligan, B. Heneveld, S. Kane, P. Martino, A. Moodenbaugh, E. Nowak, D. Passarello, M. Rankine, W. Reahl, R. Sabatini, F. Zanoni

Agenda

- 1 Year-end Wrap-up of FY 2011 Tier I Inspection Findings
- 2 Update on Tier I Database
- 3 Possibility of Developing FY 12 ESH Objective/Target Related to Improving Tier I inspection Program
- 4 Open Discussion (Issues & Good Practices)


Data Rollup of Tier I Findings by Fiscal Year



The following points were made by S. Kane:

- 1 For the last two years the number of findings from the Tier I inspections has been decreasing.
- 2 This may mean that either people are not looking as hard as they should be or IFM is making dramatic improvements from the facility side.

Data Rollup of FY 2011 Q4 Tier I Findings by Category




WEP	Working Environment: Plant	629
HK	Housekeeping	569
ESE	Electrical Safety: Equipment	553
WED	Working Environment: Department	514
ESD	Electrical Safety: Distribution	413
CG	Compressed Gas/Cryogenics	253
CSL	Chemical Safety: Labeling	246
FS	Fire Safety	226
CSS	Chemical Safety: Storage	219
OG	Outside and Grounds	205
ESP	Electrical Safety: Programmatic	193
WT	Waste	173
IH	Industrial Hygiene Issues	123
EM	Environmental	88
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment	74
OT	Other	66
CSU	Chemical Safety: Use	61
UP	Unsafe Practices	51
MH	Material Handling and Equipment Safety	43
MS	Machine Shop Safety	38
RS	Radiation Safety	36
BH	Biohazards	22
SEC	Security	9
GS	General Safety	0

The following points were made by S. Kane:

- 1 Working Environment: Plant (WEP) jumped way up in its number of findings because the Facility Complex people are doing their own Tier I inspections.
- 2 Housekeeping (HK) findings are way up which could be from both the Facility Complex and Science Directorates.
- 3 Electrical Safety: Equipment (ESE) is still way up there, followed by Working Environment: Department (WED) and Electrical Safety: Distribution (ESD).
- 4 As the number of findings from the remaining categories drop way down, WEP, HK, ESE, WED, and ESD can be considered one group.
- 5 A second group is Compressed Gas/Cryogenics (CG), Chemical Safety: Labeling (CSL), Fire Safety (FS), Chemical Safety: Storage, (CSS), Outside and Grounds (OG), Electrical Safety: Programmatic (ESP), and Waste (WT).
 - 5.1 CG being up there means that people are looking at compressed gas.
 - 5.2 FS being next may mean that J. Levesque has been looking at entrances and exits of his buildings, which is a good sign.
 - 5.3 FS findings may also be going up in numbers because the emergency exit lighting is checked with the remote sensors, and where the lighting does not work it is written up on the Tier I's.
- 6 Security findings were reported as follows: ITD – 1; Medical – 2; North Complex - 1; South Complex - 1; GARS – 1; NPP – 2, and Physics – 1.


Data Rollup of FY 2010 Q4 Tier I Findings by Directorate



The following points were made by S. Kane:

- 1 In FY 11 F&O had the most findings, but historically Photon Sciences (PS) had the most number of findings.
- 2 This year NPP changed positions with PS and these directorates with the second and third most findings makes a lot of sense as they are the largest directorates.
- 3 Environment and Life Sciences (ELS) was next, ahead of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) which had been #2 for the past few fiscal years.
- 4 Now the number of findings across the site is commensurate with the size of the spaces that each of the directorates is responsible for.
- 5 D. Passarelo asked which complex is reporting the most number of findings. That's a good question and it would be interesting to know that.
 - 5.1 The current database does not have a "Complex" field, but with the new database this information should be retrievable.

Data Rollup of Tier I Findings by Top 7 Categories by Fiscal Year



WEP	Working Environment: Plant	629
HK	Housekeeping	569
ESE	Electrical Safety: Equipment	553
WED	Working Environment: Department	514
ESD	Electrical Safety: Distribution	413
CG	Compressed Gas/Cryogenics	253
CSL	Chemical Safety: Labeling	246

There are 20 FY12 findings:
ESE-6; WEP-5; FS-3; ESP-2; UP-2; OT-1; EM-1

The following points were made by S. Kane:

- 1 In FY11, the categories with the most findings are: Work Environment – Plant (WEP), Housekeeping (HK), and Electrical Safety: Equipment (ESE).
- 2 Working Environment: Department (WED) is followed next by Electrical Safety: Distribution (ESD).
 - 2.1 The number of ESD findings is decreasing but there have been a lot of deficiencies from the safety standpoint not repaired.
 - 2.2 S. Kane investigated a lot of incidents last year caused by electrical safety: distribution items.
 - 2.3 Perhaps people are just not looking at these areas.
- 3 For future Tier I Top 7 Categories by Fiscal Year charts, FY 05 and FY 06 will be removed as there is not much data from these years. More tangible data begins around FY 07.

Update on Tier I Database

The following points were made by S. Kane:

- 1 For the last 2 years it has been reported at these Working Group meetings that the upgrade to Maximo was ongoing. However, the contractor had been nonresponsive.
- 2 ITD realized they needed professional help and awarded a two-phase contract to update the Tier I database to IBM, the strongest bidder with a vested interest as they bought the Maximo program from its previous owner. IBM also has experience with PeopleSoft.
- 3 In Phase 1 IBM identified and fixed problems in Maximo and reviewed the specification for the database.
 - 3.1 Phase 1 was completed in the late August/September timeframe.
- 4 In Phase 2, IBM will upgrade Maximo to version 7.5 in order to get the utility that is needed, i.e., mobile app for entering Tier I data, work order flow done automatically, and interface the program with PeopleSoft.
 - 4.1 To use the mobile app wi-fi is needed, but there are dead spots at BNL.
 - 4.2 There may be an app that will allow hand-held devices to automatically upload the data to a computer.
- 5 IBM expects to complete Phase 2 in 3 months, around February 2012.

- 6 Beta testing of the database needs to be done and the following people either volunteered or are being asked to do this: D. Passarello for C-AD; L. Bowerman and A. Emrick for Small Sciences, K. Klaus and B. Heneveld for PS, and G. Blanda for F&O (North Complex).
 - 6.1 The questions we want answered are: will the user- interface work and will the mobile app work on an I-pad?
 - 6.2 SHSD will not be providing I-pads.
- 7 S. Kane will hold a special meeting in the March-April 2012 timeframe to give training on how to use the new system.
- 8 An implementation period will follow, and the contract has a 6-month period from when IBM says the database is finished in which IBM will fix any bugs or problems that people are having with the database.
- 9 By the next Working Group meeting the Tier I database should be close to completion, if not completed, and there should be dramatic things to discuss.

Possibility of Developing FY 12 ESH Objective/Target Related to Improving Tier I Inspection Program

The following points were made by S. Kane:

1. P. Carr suggested this topic for discussion.
2. J. Selva included in the FY12 ESH Objectives/Targets an item to improve and evaluate the Tier 1 Inspection Program.

The following points were made by E. Nowak who is working with J. Selva on this:

1. This objective/target is based on feedback and dialogue that Tier I's are resource intensive and effort is being duplicated between what Science is doing and what F&O is doing. There is the perception that this whole process is inefficient.
 - 1.1 The question was asked if it is necessary to have a group of 12 people do a Tier I Inspection, and the group response was no.
 - 1.2 CFN has only 4 or 5 people going on their Tier I inspections.
2. One thing we will look at is if there are opportunities for efficiencies. We will re-evaluate who does what part of the process due to the ROCCO model and other organizational changes made at BNL.
3. There may be opportunities to enhance the Tier I inspection training.
4. After the new Tier I database is implemented, we will be able to tell by department, directorate, or complex who is reporting what type of findings.
5. It is important to see how many deficiencies are being found and closed within the agreed upon timeframe.

Open Discussion

1. C. Conrad asked if when a work order is placed for a Tier I finding and an email is received from Maximo indicating the work order has been completed, do they verify that the work was actually completed.
 - 1.1 S. Kane knows that GARS checks that the work has actually been completed and does not rely on the emails.
 - 1.2 That is why there are two statuses on closing work orders: 1-resolved and 2-closed.
 - 1.3 Only the Tier I administrator of the organization that wrote up the work order can close an item (verification part).
2. A new member of the Working Group asked if in addition to recording the finding is the finding assigned to a responsible person.
 - 2.1 S. Kane said that you record a finding, and assign an action owner and completion date.
 - 2.2 The system tracks the finding according to the completion date, emails the action owner when the finding is overdue; emails the Tier I Coordinator if the finding is more than 15 days overdue, and if it the finding is more than 30 days overdue the system sends an email to the Chairperson of the department.
3. The LS I access database was the most advanced tier I tracking system at the lab and the new database system had to accommodate all those requirements as well as the requirements of other departments.
 - 3.1 These requirements were put into the Requirements Document that is the basis for the IBM contract.