

**ES&H Sub Council**  
**meeting notes - 12/12/08**

**Attendees:** R. Boyce, C. Burkhart, A. Cohen, R. Erickson, C. Hast, R. Hettel, S. Jack, K. Jobe, F. O'Neill, C. Ferguson, B. Sherin, F. Topper

**Absent:** K. Holtemann, A. Lindenberg

**A. Impressions of first SC meeting**

1. Right topics addressed, but uncomfortable discussing detailed budget. On the other hand, cost is a factor and need to be considered when establishing project priorities.
2. Concern that the SC can lose focus and not reach desired meeting goal.

**Action:** Meeting goals to be specifically stated in agenda (e.g. "Are there any safety concerns with remotely controlled gates?"; or "Comment on such-and-such proposal", or "This presentation is informational only, no action required", etc.)

3. The criterion for a meeting quorum needs to be established (e.g., is one representative per directorate required, sufficient, etc.?).

**Action:** Discuss this topic meeting of SC chairs with Merola (Hettel).

**B. Gates 17 and 30 options**

1. Sherin presented proposal for remote-controlled gates for Gate 17 and Sector 30 that can be operated by the front entrance guard when they are not themselves manned by a guard. Gate traffic flow is being monitored to help determine what the manned hours should be for each gate.

2. Observations:

- a. No safety issues were identified for either gate or guard options.
- b. Gates must be able to handle large vehicles and have sufficient turn-around areas.
- c. Must accommodate unbadged visitors when gates not manned.
- d. Sector 30 Gate has alarm panels.
- e. Proposal has no impact on the number of roving guards.
- f. The need for automatic gates might be eliminated if the requisite buildings inside gates were equipped with a card reader entry system.
- g. The decision for Gate 17 hours should not be based on traffic level alone, but also the need to accommodate and provide services for outside users.
- h. Alpine Gate hours of 6-10 am and 3-6pm are good.

3. Recommendations and actions:

- a. The proposal to provide manned coverage of the Sector 30 Gate during peak user hours, as determined by the traffic flow study now underway, sounds

reasonable subject to input from maintenance groups. Recommend reviewing the proposal with PCD, CEF, MFD, Controls, and other support groups as needed.

- b. Gate 17 hours of 6 am–4 pm will impact SSRL and future LCLS users. Recommend that closing time be extended to 10 pm, subject to results of traffic flow study.
- c. It was suggested that one automatic gate be tried on a trial basis before committing to this solution.
- d. Consider moving the Sector 30 Gate alarm panels to the Main Gate.
- e. Consider a hybrid and possibly phased implementation of building card readers and gates that might alleviate the concern for servicing users (e.g., card reader system from SPEAR facility, Gate 17 moved to PEP ring road entry, etc.).
- f. **Action:** Present traffic flow study results at next SC meeting (Sherin).
- g. **Action:** Sherin to revise gate proposal considering SC feedback for review and comments by SC ahead of next meeting. The level of comment will determine if this is discussed at the next SC meeting.

### **C. Safety committee proposal**

- 1. Goal: Review and advise on new proposal for use of safety related committees, citizen committees, subject matter experts, lab safety officers, and project safety office in the work planning process at SLAC - presented by C. Ferguson, B. Sherin,
- 2. Observations:
  - a. The proposal appears to be “Building Inspection Office-centric”, i.e. it divides projects into BIO and HEEC approval channels, implying the HEEC will basically replace the Safety Oversight Committee (SOC). The approval flow chart seems to reflect this, implying that no review is need for some things outside the purview of the BIO.
  - b. The SOC provides at least one valuable function: it identifies which reviews and approvals are needed for a project. This function needs to be maintained in the new system.
  - c. In the past Citizen Committees have provided an excellent forum for peer review, which might be missing from new proposal.
  - d. In the past there have sometimes been contradictory requirements from different SMEs, requiring negotiation between SMEs and committees. This process needs to be clarified in new system.
  - e. An appeals process is needed for cases when an SME imposes a requirement that is extremely burdensome and has little or no value.
  - f. If Citizen Committees become purely advisory without authority, then need persons of authority for each area – presumably the safety officers and SMEs. Presently there is no SME for non-ionizing radiation, for example.

- g. The thresholds for project reviews are not clear. A significant bottleneck could result if everything has to go through the BIO or HEEC.
  - h. Not sure how to interpret the phrase “review process managed by Project Safety Office”. Does this mean that project manager hands over responsibility to another directorate? It is unclear who has the authority to approve a project. The new review program should be integrated and balanced with the Work Planning and Control and R2A2 programs.
  - i. Concern : we haven’t defined what has to go through the project safety office and at what level; looks like more than what hits the requisition ; could become a significant bottleneck; unclear who has the authority to approve a project.
  - j. How do other labs do to meet this need?
  - k. Big projects typically have independent outside reviews for which credit should be given.
  - l. The current review process is ineffective, inefficient and given too much credibility.
3. Recommendations and actions:
- a. Specify the thresholds for project reviews.  
**Action:** Review thresholds to be presented and discussed at next SC meeting.
  - b. Consider the following recommendations for revising the safety review program:
    - 1) Integrate and balance the new review program with the Work Planning and Control and R2A2 programs.
    - 2) Revise approval flow chart to include the full range of experimental equipment (non-BIO) projects as needed. The charter of HEEC may need to be revised if it becomes the new non-BIO SOC.
    - 3) Include a process that gives credit to independent outside safety reviews (e.g. Accelerator Readiness Reviews, safety audits, etc).
    - 4) Clarify project manager responsibilities and qualifications and who has the authority to approve projects.
    - 5) Adopt reasonable practices from other labs if appropriate.  
**Action:** Report on these recommendations at next SC meeting (Sherin et al.).
  - c. Please put dates on documents when distributed to the SC.