The ES&H Sub Council conducted their first meeting on November 14, 2008 with the following Agenda:

1. Review purpose of ES&H sub council
2. Review ES&H indirect budget ups and downs for FY09
3. Review Alpine and Gate 17 options
4. Review new safety committee structure recommendation

The meeting started at 10:30 am and ended at 12:10 pm.

**Attendees:**

**Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SC member</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Present/Represented (P/R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Hettel, Chair</td>
<td>SSRL</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aina Cohen</td>
<td>SSRL</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Lindenberg</td>
<td>Photon Science</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank O’Neill</td>
<td>Particle Physics &amp; Astrophysics</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsten Hast</td>
<td>Particle Physics &amp; Astrophysics</td>
<td>R (Keith Jobe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard M. Boyce</td>
<td>LCLS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Erickson</td>
<td>LCLS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Holtemann</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technical Support</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Burkhart</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technical Support</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert S. (Steve) Jack</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-members:**

- Craig Ferguson, ES&H
- Brian Sherin, ES&H
- Erne Gomes, ES&H
- Madhu Swaminathan, ES&H
Meeting notes:

1) Bob reviewed and discussed sub council charter (based on the attached presentation). Bob suggested that at least one representative should be in attendance to have a quorum, rather than every member on the SC.

Craig stated that he looks forward to the advice from this council to help improve ES&H across the laboratory. There are many high level issues that this SC can help solve for the laboratory.

**Action:** Craig will check on "at least one person per ALD" idea with Sandy.

2) Craig reviewed high-level Lab budget and ES&H budget and discussed the overall process for how the indirect budget is being established for FY09. Craig discussed that this SC will be involved earlier in the process and be in a better position to assist with ES&H indirect budget development for FY10 as the lab learns how better to establish the process, cost model, etc.

For clarification, the work for others that ES&H conducts is to support EM funded environmental restoration.

3) Reviewed ES&H recommended ups and downs at a broad level

* Craig reviewed proposed ups and downs for FY09 baseline budget in accordance with the Operations model. As this was a high level review, Craig recommended that the priorities as presented are balanced with the overall Operations priorities and stated that the overall Ops budget will balance in accordance with the indirect rate and subsequent indirect funding established by the ALDs.

A discussion ensued about the recognized need for supervisory training on workplace observations, but can that be accomplished with in house resources and for less than $300k. Another discussion ensued about the fact that some supervisors might be requiring training for employees that is not required (with the notion that some of these costs can be avoided). This will be a topic for a future meeting.

**Action:** Bob and Craig will include this as a future meeting topic.

4) Alpine Gate recommendation

The security contract that starts December 1, 2008 does not include staffing the Alpine Gate. The scenarios presented to the SC are in the attached.
After significant discussion the consensus of the group was that the Alpine gate should be opened during commute hours in advance of work shift changes at 6 am and 3 pm so as to benefit those arriving at SLAC for those shifts. The recommended opening times for the next 3-month security guard contract are 5:45 am and 2:45 pm, with closing times 3 hours after each opening (8:45 am and 5:45 pm). The SC will revisit this scenario as needed in the future. The following questions were asked:

- Are there safety training issues associated with passing through gate 30 if Alpine Gate is used? Craig checked with Sayed subsequent to the meeting and confirmed that if a person has a SLAC badge they have been through general employee training and therefore can pass through the accelerator fenced area.

- Can contractors come through the Alpine Gate if they have a badge? No.

The SC discussed that the lab was promised the gate would be reopened when LCLS construction was completed. The SC thought the idea of remotely opened gates with video cameras (ALS has this feature) is worthwhile.

**Action:** Brian will get a cost estimate for this option, and evaluate the automated gate/camera option.

5) The new security contract has a baseline budget for Gate 17 being open M-F from 6:00 am to 5 pm (see attached). Based on the significant SSRL user traffic expected after 5 pm, and the fact that users will have to commute around the unlit PEP ring road to and from the Sector 30 gate if Gate 17 is closed, as well as to accommodate SSRL workers arriving for shifts beginning at 6 am, the SC has the following recommendation:

- Keep Gate 17 open M-F from 5:45 am until 10pm

- Provide signage and obvious markings to aid users commuting to and from the SPEAR facility from the Sector 30 gate via the PEP ring road. Consider naming SLAC roads in order to clarify driving instructions.

- Investigate automated entry (proximity card gate and turnstile) as an option similar to what most other labs do. This also spurred a discussion on badge access to buildings and that any new building should have this feature designed in from the start.

**Actions:**

a. Provide cost estimate for recommended gate hours and present both Alpine Gate and Gate 17 recommendation to ALDs – Craig
b. Get with Facilities to identify best method to establish lab markings to aid visitors/users to clarify route to exit. – Craig
c. Investigate gate 17 options to automate similar to other labs and provide back to SC for
6) A Safety Committee Proposal was introduced and handouts were provided. This topic requires additional time and will be on the agenda for the next meeting:

Actions:
   a. SC members to review the material and return in ~two weeks (next meeting) with ways to improve the proposal – ALL MEMBERS
   b. Consider thresholds “definition” that will initiate the process of safety reviews. ALL MEMBERS