

National Committee on Occupational Safety and Health (NCOSH)

Minutes of the 57th Meeting, March 16th, 2017

Location: Room 122, M-3, Ottawa

Duration: 1 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

<p><u>Members Present:</u> Cathie Fraser (RCEA) - Chair Lawrence Mak (PIPSC) Terry Lindstrom (GM, OCRE) Lawrence Charlebois (PIPSC) Paul Treboutat (DG, DFS)</p>	<p><u>Resource Persons:</u> David Shane (NRC OSH Group) Frédéric Dorval (NRC OSH Group)</p> <p><u>Invited:</u> Shifawn O’Hara (NRC OSH Group)</p>
<p><u>Regrets:</u> Ian Potter (VP, Eng) – on Leave Duncan Stewart (GM, SDT) Gordon Fougere (RCEA) Michael Vandenhoff (RCEA)</p>	<p><u>Recorder:</u> Margarita Garcia (NRC OSH Group)</p>

Agenda Item	Action Items	Responsible
<p>1. Approval of Agenda</p> <p>The Agenda was approved without changes</p>		All
<p>2. Approval of Minutes of 56th Meeting</p> <p>The minutes from the 56th meeting held in December 2016 were approved without changes.</p> <p>The members proceeded to review the 56th meeting minutes’ action items.</p> <p>No new Working Groups have been established. LOTO final draft to be circulated to working group one more time then presented to SEC</p> <p>NRC Workplace Violence Prevention Policy: Dorval met with bargaining agents on February 22, 2017, made revisions. Consensus was reached on final version to be circulated to NCOSH, then to SEC for approval</p>	<p>Future Working Groups all to include PBI and titles of members</p> <p>Final version of WVP Policy to be sent to NCOSH</p>	<p>All</p> <p>Dorval</p>

<p>NRC Hazardous Products Safety Program final draft to be sent to NCOSH for secretarial approval.</p> <p>OSH Considerations on lease agreements: Fraser is requesting clarification on responsibilities of HWLO regarding control and life cycle of hazardous materials.</p> <p>Missing data on SEC report discussed at December meeting can be due to information being tagged incorrectly, inadequate information provided in the eHOIR in time for reporting, or reports that are incomplete are sent back to management for further input and are often corrected by next SEC report.</p>	<p>Fraser to confirm with Vandenhoff and inform Dorval if any concerns remain.</p>	<p>Fraser</p>
<p>3. New Business</p> <p>a) OSH related roles data – Enquiry from RCEA</p> <p>Fraser opened the discussion regarding additional OSH roles and responsibilities that are being asked of employees (particularly in the TO group) in addition to their own duties, including but not limited to biosafety, radiation safety, COSH, Internal Ergonomics Program or HPP coordinator, respiratory fit-testing, emergency fire and evacuation planning, lab inspectors, first aid attendants. The bargaining agents would like to see formal recognition, improved training and an understanding of further legal requirements or implications for them as they fulfill these additional roles or duties. Lists of these roles were presented to the Committee for M54, Sussex, M36 and Royalmount. Shane mentioned that some of these roles are legislatively and operationally required in order to obtain licenses.</p> <p>Fraser would like a recommendation from NCOSH to HRB or to the President regarding recognition for these roles.</p> <p>Lindstrom would like clarification on what kind of recognition the bargaining agents would propose.</p>	<p>Bargaining Agents will draft a proposal with recommendations to be tabled at June NCOSH meeting</p>	<p>Dorval</p> <p>Fraser, Mak</p>
<p>b) NRC Occupational Road Safety Program</p> <p>A focus group of stakeholders was established last summer to provide input into the draft NRC Road Safety Program which included IRAP, EMS, ASPM and DFS personnel. NCOSH provided feedback in the December meeting and all action items requested have been implemented.</p>		<p>Dorval</p>

<p>Fraser asked who is responsible for completing Annexes A and B. Dorval responded that these are assessment tools that the PBI HPP working group or administrators would use to evaluate and mitigate risks associated with driving. Mak suggested adding a line in Section 3.1, second bullet “refer to Annexes A and B”</p> <p>Trebutat suggested we broaden the introduction and scope statements to include situations where employees must operate vehicles on public roads that are neither NRC fleet vehicles, nor privately owned vehicles but are for operational or testing purposes, excluding research. He reiterated that while the scope includes all vehicles, the rest of the document refers only to fleet vehicles and privately owned vehicles.</p> <p>Lindstrom suggested we include language that reminds employees they have the right to refuse a ride with colleague if they feel a danger exists for example if the driver is driving unsafely, using their cell phone or iPad while driving, smoking in the vehicle which may pose a health risk to the occupants.</p> <p>Referring to Annex C, first paragraph, Fraser suggested removal of the phrase “one of the riskiest activities employees will face” as the NRC often has far riskier activities or environments in the normal course of work and research. All agreed.</p> <p>Changes will be made and documents sent back to NCOSH for final review then to SEC for approval.</p>	<p>Dorval to add line “refer to Annexes A and B” to S. 3.1 second bullet</p> <p>Dorval to review language that broadens the scope adequately and send revised document to NCOSH for final review</p> <p>Dorval to add a line regarding an employee’s right to refuse</p> <p>Dorval to remove phrase as requested After revisions, documents sent back to NCOSH for final review then to SEC for approval.</p>	
<p>c) NRC Program on Hazardous Energy Control (Lockout / Tag out LOTO) Updates re Working Group</p> <p>Fraser asked that changes be highlighted and Shane reiterated the importance of getting this Program sent to SEC as soon as possible as this is a life safety Program. OSH will outline the minimum requirements for which the PBIs can assess their programs consistent and clear across NRC nationally so that all labels and instructions look the same and are easily identifiable.</p>	<p>Tracked changes to be sent to NCOSH then to SEC for approval</p>	<p>Dorval</p>
<p>d) NRC Safe Working Procedure for Materials Handling Equipment (Motorized and manual)</p> <p>No new document tabled. Dorval will circulate most recent version to the focus group of stakeholders. Shane mentioned that this document is to identify the minimum list of</p>		<p>Dorval</p>

<p>requirements, the right type of equipment and safety precautions that are required for each piece of equipment.</p> <p>Fraser pointed out that Section 3.1 states “the Director of ASPM shall...” however ASPM is not always the owner of the equipment, therefore inspection and maintenance responsibility has to be clearly identified.</p> <p>Shane suggested adding “The maintenance requirements will be determined PBI or base building operations”</p>	<p>Dorval to make requested changes regarding maintenance responsibility</p>	
<p>e) NRC Hazard Prevention Program (HPP) Update</p> <p>O’Hara provided NCOSH with a brief review and update on the NRC Hazard Prevention Program development and implementation plans. Effective implementation of HPP will identify all programs that need to be implemented and monitored at each site, including training requirements, preventative maintenance and any appropriate safe work procedures that would need to be developed. Ongoing implementation is part of an action plan using the hierarchy of prevention to eliminate hazards, reduce hazards using engineering controls, administrative controls as well as adequate training and safe work procedures. These measures are all included in the HPP workbook designed to assist supervisors and managers in monitoring HPP. AST along with a consultant helped develop the tool then it was used in OCRE with OSH group assistance. This tool has been improved, integrated into one Excel workbook with more functionality aligning with other OSH programs.</p> <p>Some changes to the HPP include an improved implementation and training approach. The old program identified an HPP administrator, however, the scope of HPP is much larger, with AST and OCRE there was a full time Project Manager, and multiple HPP facilitators required to implement the program. Once the initial HPP action plan is completed, the HPP project manager is transitioned to an HPP coordinator for on-going implementation. The Internal Ergonomics Program (IEP) was removed from the HPP and is treated as a separate program with its own assessment piece. During the pilot, a 7-step implementation approach was defined which includes management engagement, an HPP working group, workspace risk assessments, project assessments and calibration and integration of all the control measures.</p> <p>Charlebois asked if this has been integrated with planning and reporting services and investment management as they include scientific or engineering risk assessments for major capital projects.</p>	<p>NCOSH will receive a status sheet on future PBI implementation phases.</p>	<p>O’Hara</p>

<p>O'Hara responded that the OSH group is currently working on how to integrate this into their approval process. Shane mentioned that currently this is an informal process; however OSH is looking for having a signatory role on corporate projects. HPP can cover the non-corporate or PBI projects.</p> <p>Trebutat and Lindstrom both commented that they would like to ensure better guidance and training up front to streamline the hazard identification stage, keeping it reasonable, practicable and structured, using probability rather than conjecture or highly unlikely scenarios. Initially this rigour in training would likely come from the OSH group.</p> <p>There was consensus and recognition that this program requires a considerable amount of resources which may affect the capacity of a portfolio in one quarter or period held against another. General Managers have some control over programs and would have to identify the bandwidth required to carry out their HPP programs, adjusting in program support.</p> <p>Trebutat asked if would there be any harm in asking SEC if there needs to be a KPI that requires portfolios to commit a percentage of their total available capacity to health and safety programs implementation.</p> <p>Lindstrom replied that the GMs in research portfolios have the opportunity to do this in their operating plans; Shane agreed that it may be better to amend the requirements in their operating plan to identify specific sections on resource requirements to implement the applicable OSH programs for them that year and that feeds into any adjustments going forward.</p> <p>O'Hara finished the presentation with identifying the next steps: Awareness and Training phase working to consolidate the implementation and training material developed by AST and OCRE pilots, developing a communications plan, training our OSH advisors, start implementation with PBIs and management engagement in May based on a priority schedule determined by the assessment of the PBI at highest risk.</p> <p>Current Implementation status: AST has completed steps 1-5, currently on step 6; OCRE has completed steps 1-4 and are working on risk assessments</p> <p>NCOSH will receive a report on PBI status of implementation based on the 7 phases.</p>		
<p>4. Business Arising a) OSH 3-year Plan</p>		

Shane presented a high-level overview of the OSH 3-year plan that was put together for Council to outline future goals and corporate direction for OSH. As OSH responsibilities are largely determined by legislation, the role of OSH group is to help figure out a way for NRC management to fulfill their legislative requirements. Shane outlined three phases in this plan: dependent, independent and team or collaborative phases.

The Dependent phase includes: work area inspections, site visit development, life safety issues, fire safety systems in place and operational, Incident investigation.

PPE: fairly good compliance overall, some hot spots with 50-60% compliance that we need to address
LSAP – help management understand what does safety leadership mean, collective efforts to help identify and resolve issues. Still have work to do to keep momentum going. Some portfolios have engaged employees effectively.

Independent phase: Coaching and informal observations by OSH personnel at this time, with the intention of looking for something positive in the field, unless there is an immediate hazard or danger that requires attention. Establishes a positive relationship with employees.

Interdependent phase: employee to employee coaching on safety matters.
OSH standard and compliance: OSH audit provided recommendations moving forward.
Investment and project reviews requiring OSH input
Strengthening the Near miss and good catch concepts, as well as the '5 whys' in the investigation process, KPIs.

PHASE 3 – we all start looking out for each other Team /collaboration: peer mentoring, COSH working effectively, audits, contractor safety, mental health and wellness, coaching

OSH group – we have several sources that drive our priorities: NCOSH, SEC, Dialogues, Audit, PBIs, OSH 3-year Plan.

OSH is putting together a master document to outline and integrate all these projects and priorities.
We will do a risk based assessment to determine the sequence of implementation.
The NRC dialogues also shifted the OSH priorities and changed the approach.

Lindstrom noted that there is low % compliance for workplace inspections, despite that is legislatively mandated.

<p>Shane noted that work place inspections are a due diligence activity for management.</p> <p>Lindstrom noted that there are still pockets in the organization that are still not compliant with using PPE. Supervisors and managers need to be diligent with checking and enforcing PPE programs as a means of ensuring safety of employees.</p> <p>Shane reiterated that this situation is also an opportunity where positive coaching is a good tool.</p>		
<p>b) Review OSH Policy Instrument Status Report (via NCOSH Priorities documents for 2016 and 2017)</p> <p>Dorval confirmed that the 2017 Priorities document has been revised according to action items from last NCOSH meeting, however this will also be impacted by what Shane just mentioned regarding consolidating all the priorities. An updated priorities list will be brought forward at next NCOSH.</p>	<p>An updated priorities list will be brought forward at next NCOSH.</p>	<p>Dorval</p>
<p>c) SEC Report (October 2016):</p> <p>eHOIR – The OSH group reviews investigation descriptions and corrective measures and asks supervisors for revisions whenever the information provided is inadequate or unclear. It is recommended that Directors take ownership on the quality of investigations and corrective measures that are proposed.</p> <p>Directors and GMs should be reviewing eHOIRs, and if you have a major or reportable incident, you should contact your local OSH advisor right away and your local COSH committee to ensure investigation is done appropriately and without undue delay. Results are meaningful, supervisors should discuss with their director before submitting the eHOIR.</p> <p>Mak asked if the job demands assessments of the 20 positions listed in the SEC report were they the ones of most serious cases?</p> <p>Shane responded that JDA are for positions that are identified that are the most prevalent in terms of opportunities for accommodation. We asked which positions would be most receptive to accommodation issues due to work related functions...</p>		
<p>e) Roundtable:</p>		

<p>Shane provided NCOSH with an update on the Corporate OSH Audit. One of the recommendations is that OSH develop a preventative maintenance program standard, contractor safety program, improve on communicating OSH time codes and how OSH activities are captured.</p> <p>Fraser suggested we add this to the agenda for JUNE – OSH Audit and consolidated master list of priorities.</p> <p>Fraser indicated that an email was sent to all regarding the Environmental Stewardship Office (ESO) and asked if they would have an impact on health and safety of NRC employees. Fraser suggested we put this on the agenda for JUNE and ask ESO DG Gary Fudge to join, provide an overview of their program, what their rollout strategies and impacts, and employee responsibilities. Committee agreed.</p> <p>Mak requested that the NRC OSH group provides NCOSH with an updated COSH membership list at the next meeting.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 4:03 pm</p>	<p>add to the NCOSH JUNE Agenda– OSH Audit and master list of priorities</p> <p>OSH to invite Gary Fudge, ESO DG to June NCOSH to discuss overview, rollout and impacts</p> <p>Dorval to request COSH ToRs with updated Terms of office for distribution at June meeting</p>	
<p>5. Next Meeting:</p> <p>The next meeting will be held on June 28th, 2017 with Employer as Chair.</p>		