

Preliminary Review of
BNL Safety-Related Committees, Councils and Working Groups

Kenneth C. Brog and Robert F. McCallum

September 12, 2006

Background

BNL has 17 Safety-Related Committees, Councils or Working Groups (WG), each with a different area of safety focus: The committees, councils and WGs are:

- Director's Safety Committee (1)
- Aviation and Marine Safety Committee (2)
- Laboratory Environment, Safety and Health (ES&H) Committee (3)
- Laser Safety Committee (4)
- Radiation Protection Committee (5)
- Transportation Safety Working Group (6)
- Laboratory Electrical Safety Committee (7)
- Lifting Safety Committee (8)
- Nuclear Safety Committee (9)
- Firearms Safety Committee (10)
- Traffic Safety Committee (11)
- Institutional Biosafety Committee (12)
- Brookhaven Advocacy Council (13))
- BNL Radioactive Drug Research Committee (14)
- Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (15)
- Price Anderson Amendments Act (PAAA) Working Group (16)
- Pollution Prevention Council (17)

Each committee/council/WG has a documented Charter with three basic sections. The first section is a Charge which, more or less, articulates the intended purpose, general responsibilities and area of safety focus for the committee/council/WG.

The other two sections are devoted to documenting the Membership and Meeting Frequency. In one case – the PAAA Working Group - there are two additional sections entitled “Quorum” and “Decisions”.

In contrast to the consistent use of the three-section format for the Charter, the content and focus of each section differs significantly across the 17 committees/councils/WGs.

Scope of Review

The scope of this review is to “perform an evaluation of the institutional safety committee’s/council’s/WG’s structure and associated charters to identify suggested improvements and efficiencies.”

Results

Summary Results for All Committees/Councils

Most, if not all, of the Laboratory-wide, safety-related committees/councils/WGs were created at BNL prior to the introduction of the following three highly-significant, operations-related concepts in the 1990s:

- Line management being fully responsible and accountable for ES&H performance results within their management domain;
- Field-deployed, customer-oriented ES&H subject matter experts to assist line managers and staff in the execution of their ES&H roles, responsibilities, authorities and accountabilities (R2A2s); and
- Management by management systems (MS) with senior BNL managers having R2A2s for MS stewardship throughout the Laboratory and highly skilled technical leaders having R2A2s for MS ownership.

Consequently, these committees/councils/WGs were originally assigned, and have retained (without consideration of the impact of the above concepts), many of the R2A2s generally assigned and/or expected for MS Stewards/Owners and ES&H subject matter experts in the current BNL operations environment. This suggests the need for a comprehensive reexamination of the functionality and purposes of each safety-related committee/council/WG using as a reference framework the Laboratory’s current MS foundation and its current use of ESH&Q subject matter experts to assist MS Stewards/Owners and line managers.

Another legacy condition associated with several of the BNL safety-related committees/councils is a lack of clarity in regard to the authorities and accountabilities that are vested, or not, in the members of the committee/council/WG. This condition also needs a comprehensive reexamination.

Committee/Council Specific Results

Director’s Safety Committee (1)

The stated purpose of this committee is to provide feedback to the Lab Director on Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) issues. As the committee is chaired by the Lab Director it is unclear what this purpose means.

The stated responsibilities of the committee are to:

1. Participate in the effectiveness review of the Laboratory's OSH Program at the annual OSH Management Review;
2. Make recommendations – presumably to the Lab Director – to enhance the safety performance and culture at BNL;
3. Facilitate communication across the Laboratory community on OSH matters; and
4. Review issues identified by the department's/division's OSH committees that are not adequately addressed through the normal management chain or are outside their management purview.

In regard to responsibility 1, it is unclear why a stand alone committee is needed since the ESH&Q Director is already a party to the noted annual OSH Management Review, the Lab Director is, or can be, invited to such and the other members could likewise be invited if it is deemed important to ensure diversity of input in this annual review.

In regard to responsibility 4, it is also unclear why a stand alone committee is needed since the noted review, which is clearly important for the Lab, is, or should be, a fundamental part of the R2A2s for the OSH MS Steward/Owner.

In regard to responsibilities 2 and 3, it is clearly advantageous to have a diverse group of Lab workers assembled periodically to accomplish the desired results. However, again, this should be part of the OSH MS Steward/Owner responsibility.

In summary, the noted purposes, functions and responsibilities of this committee should be assigned to the OSH MS Steward/Owner who should work with the BNL Operations Forum – assuming such a forum or an equivalent will be created in the future – to assure the desired OSH outcomes.

It is concluded that the Director's Safety Committee should be abandoned and its functions and activities be evaluated for continuance or not under the purview of the OSH MS.

Aviation and Marine Safety Committee (2)

The stated purpose of this committee is to advise the ESH&Q Director on all aviation and marine safety issues and concerns that impact the Laboratory and its population.

The committee is tasked with (and, presumably, is therefore responsible for):

1. Assisting the Lab in matters related to aircraft and marine safety that impact Lab programs;
2. Reviewing Lab activities involving the use of aircraft, marine vessels, or small boats;
3. Reviewing requests for Lab aviation activities and recommending action to the ESH&Q Director; and

4. Reviewing requests for Lab marine vessel and small boat activities and recommending action to the ESH&Q Director.

In general, it seems reasonable to have a committee to perform these tasks. However, significant clarification is needed in several areas.

For example, in regard to purposes 3 and 4:

- What authority, if any, does the committee have in regard to reviewing requests for Lab aviation, marine vessel or small boat activities (e.g., approval authority or not)?
- Is it expected that all such proposed activities throughout the Lab must submit a request to this committee for review and then receive approval from some independent entity (i.e., the committee, the ESH&Q Director or another party) prior to pursuing the activity?
- What is the interface or connection between this committee and research and development (R&D) or maintenance and operations (M&O) Work Planning & Control processes of the Laboratory in regard to proposed work?

Also, in regard to item 2:

- What is the expectation and process for the committee's review of ongoing activities involving aircraft, marine vessel or small boats?
- Is this a risk-based process?
- What is the interface or connection between this committee and R&D or M&O Work Planning & Control processes of the Laboratory in regard to ongoing work?

In summary, this appears to be an important committee designed to address a highly focused area for which there are relatively few subject matter experts within the Lab. However, there are significant deficiencies that should be addressed

It is concluded that the Aviation and Marine Safety Committee should be retained but with greater clarity about how it functions, who it serves, what R2A2s are vested in the committee chair and its members, and how these interface with the Laboratory-wide Work Planning & Control processes.

Laboratory Environment, Safety and Health Committee (3)

The stated purposes of this committee appear to be three fold:

1. Advise the operating organizations (not clear what specific organizations this refers to) and the Directorate (not clear what directorate this refers to) on environmental impact, radiation and general safety and health matters associated with all Laboratory facilities
2. Provide independent assurance to the Associate Laboratory Director (ALD) for ESH&Q that an in-depth analysis commensurate with the hazards involved has been performed and that the project or facility can function without undue risk.

3. Assist line managers or ALDs in reviewing ES&H-related issues as they determine appropriate.

In regard to purposes 1 and 3, it is not clear why a committee is required since the primary function of the BNL ESH&Q Directorate is to provide technical support services, including advice, reviews and analyses, to operating organizations, directorates/divisions and MS Stewards/Owners throughout the Lab.

In regard to purpose 2, clarity is needed in several areas:

- What is the R2A2 for the ESH&Q Director relative to assuring that an in-depth analysis commensurate with the hazards involved has been performed and that the project or facility can function without undue risk? Shouldn't it be presumed that line managers are responsible and accountable for these assurances as part of ISM and as more explicitly required in the work planning and control systems in place at BNL, Furthermore, shouldn't it be presumed that these line managers execute their R2A2 requirements with the help of ES&H subject matter experts from the ESH&Q Directorate and elsewhere. Accordingly, it is not clear how the committee R2A2s and those of the ESH&Q Director relate to the R2A2s of line managers in the area of hazard identification, analysis and mitigation. Also, it is not clear how the committee R2A2s and those of the ESH&Q Director relate to the Experimental Safety Review Committees that seem to have clear authority for R&D projects.
- When, at what level and how does the Lab ES&H Committee get engaged?
- Does the committee or its members have any approval authority?

In summary, it is difficult to see why the Laboratory ES&H Committee is needed, except possibly for highly hazardous activities requiring more specialized subject matter expertise. And, in such cases, it seems more effective, efficient and credible to use a highly focused committee like those discussed below.

It is concluded that the Laboratory ES&H Committee should be abandoned.

Laser Safety Committee (4)

The stated purpose of this committee is to advise the ESH&Q Director on all laser safety issues and concerns that impact the Lab and its population.

The committee is tasked with (and, presumably, is therefore responsible for):

1. Promotion of proactive laser safety improvements through the development and oversight of an effective comprehensive laser safety program.

In regard to this responsibility, clarity is need in the following areas:

- What is the committee's specific R2A2 relative to "development" of a laser safety program? Shouldn't it be presumed that the Laboratory has a program manager

and/or MS Steward/Owner who is primarily responsible and accountable for development of such, and therefore shouldn't this committee be an advisor to the program manager or MS Steward/Owner? (Note: It is realized that the ESH&Q Director is probably this person but the concept is different.)

- What is the committee's specific R2A2 relative to "oversight" of an effective comprehensive laser safety program? It is not clear whether oversight means they have approval authority or just the ability to comment and recommend. Additionally, it is not evident this action is at the request of the Laser Safety Program Manager or MS Steward, or, whether this committee serves as an independent entity that has some explicit approval authority.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee, established to address a highly technical and potentially hazardous work activity for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. However, there are significant deficiencies that should be addressed.

It is concluded that the Laser Safety Committee should continue to exist but with greater clarity about how it functions, who it serves, and what R2A2s are vested in the committee chair and its members.

Radiological Protection Committee (5)

The stated Charge of this committee is to support and guide the maintenance of the Lab-wide Radiation Protection Program.

The noted responsibilities of the committee are:

1. Act as the Standards Based Management (SBMS) expert review committee for radiological issues;
2. Advise Lab management on resource requirements for radiation protection;
3. Define a hierarchy of Radiological Control (RadCon) documents;
4. Recommend RadCon policy, guidance and Lab-level procedures;
5. Advise the Radiological Control Manager on conflict resolution over the interpretation of RadCon policy, regulations and procedures;
6. Act as a liaison to the cognizant ALD, provide feedback on Radiological Protection Committee (RPC) activities and solicit input from the ALD for use in the decision-making;
7. Develop and Operations Procedure for the conduct of the RPC and any other procedures deemed necessary; and
8. Revise the BNL RadCon Manual when necessary.

In essence, this committee is the technical support service entity for the Lab-wide Radiation Protection Program

In summary, this is a highly focused committee – in essence a technical support service entity - established to address a highly technical and potentially hazardous set of work activities for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. The committee

has clear R2A2s with very limited decision or approval authority. As such, the committee provides inputs to key decisions made by the Laboratory's Radiation Protection Officer and RadCon Manager and cognizant line managers.

It is concluded that the Radiation Protection Committee should continue to exist with no significant changes in its functions or R2A2s.

Transportation Safety Working Group (6)

The stated purpose of this committee is to advise the operating organizations and the ESH&Q Director on transportation safety matters associated with the transfer or shipment of hazardous materials both on and off site.

It is further noted that this WG provides independent assurance to the ESH&Q Director that all transfers and shipments of hazardous materials to and from BNL comply with appropriate regulatory requirements as well as the BNL Hazardous Material Transportation Manual. In essence, this says that the WG has no explicit decision authority in regard to such transfers or shipments but implies the WG is a provider of critical information – primarily in the form of reviews - to a person – the ESH&Q Director – who does have such decision authority and/or is primarily responsible for providing key inputs in this area to the Contractor Assurance process. In other words, the WG is primarily an entity serving the ESH&Q Director who may or may not be the final decision authority for transfers or shipments of hazardous materials. This needs to be clarified in the Charter

In regard to its primary function it is noted that the WG is required to review essentially every proposed change to transportation safety related documents, facilities, operations, procedures, incidents, violations, equipment failures causing actual or potential release of hazardous materials and audits/appraisals by internal or external entities. In other words, the WG is a “required technical support service provider” to anyone doing anything related to transfer or shipment of hazardous materials. This being the case, it is imperative to clarify what the WG members will be held accountable for, who they are accountable to and, more importantly, who will be responsible and accountable for conformance of hazardous material transfers or shipments to applicable requirements and BNL expectations.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee – in essence a technical support service entity - established to address a highly technical and potentially hazardous set of work activities for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. The committee is advisory in nature with no apparent decision or approval authority.

It is concluded that the Transportation Safety Working Group should continue to exist but with greater clarity about how its results are used in decision making and what R2A2s are vested in the committee chair and its members.

Laboratory Electrical Safety Committee (7)

The stated purpose of this committee is to be the principal advisory committee to various BNL entities on safety matters related to electrical systems, equipment, and components.

The committee has the following areas of responsibility:

1. Advise about electrical safety-related items which are brought to the committee's attention;
2. Review at least biannually and recommend for approval changes, as necessary, to the BNL Electrical Safety Policy, ES&H Standards 1.5.1 (Electrical Safety), 1.5.1 (Lockout –Tagout Requirements), 1.5.2 (Design Criteria for Electrical Equipment), and 1.5.3 (Interlock Safety Standards.);
3. Approve, in conjunction with the Central Training Office, the objectives, content and target audiences of electrical safety-related training programs¹;
4. Review internal and external accident and incident reports for applicable lessons learned;
5. Act as the “Authority Having Jurisdiction” for National Electrical Code? (NEC) interpretations; and
6. When requested by the SHS Division or the (ESH&Q) Directorate
 - a. Recommend for approval proposed changes or modifications to existing facilities or new construction which significantly affect electrical safety
 - b. Advise as to Conformance-to-Standards of departmental/divisional Electrical-Safe-Work rules and procedures
 - c. Review proposed or established Hazard Assessments
 - d. Review Safety Interlock Systems.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee, established to address a highly technical and potentially hazardous work activity for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. In addition, the functionality, purpose and R2A2s for this committee are relatively clear.

It is concluded that the Laboratory Electrical Safety Committee should continue to exist with little or no significant changes.

Lifting Safety Committee (8)

The stated purpose of this committee is to advise various BNL entities and the Deputy Lab Director for Operations on lifting safety matters associated with all lifting at the Lab. (Note: The term “Lifting Safety Matters” is well defined in the Charter.)

The committee has the following areas of responsibility:

¹ This concept, which seems to be logical and important, does not appear to be present in any of the other committees, councils or WGs, even those of a more disciplined nature.

1. Provide independent assurance to the Deputy Director that an in-depth analysis, commensurate with the hazards involved, has been performed and that the project or facility can be operated or constructed without undue risk.

An important feature of the committee's charter is that the specific items requiring review by the Lifting Safety Committee, as well as those not requiring such review, are explicitly defined either in the charter or by references contained therein.

The basic R2A2s of the Lifting Safety Committee are clear, that is, to provide recommendations - on all items referred to the committee - to the Deputy Director for Operations who is the designated decision authority for all such items. It is equally clear in the charter that all items referred to the committee may not be conducted or move forward without the approval of the Deputy Director for Operations or his designee. It is not clear that this R2A2 is explicitly identified in M&O Work Planning & Control documents.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee, established to address a highly technical and potentially hazardous work activity for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. In addition, the functionality, purpose and R2A2s for this committee are very clear.

It is concluded that the Lifting Safety Committee should continue to exist with no significant changes.

Nuclear Safety Committee (9)

The stated purpose of this committee is to advise various BNL entities and the Deputy Lab Director for Operations on nuclear safety matters associated with nuclear facilities, facilities operating under the authorization basis conditions of a Department of Energy (DOE) Safety Evaluation Report, and also on the storage and use of fissionable material as needed.

The committee supplements both the Lab Nuclear Safety Officer's (NSO's) and the Criticality Safety Officer's institutional responsibility.

The committee has the following areas of responsibility:

1. Review major changes and additions to Authorization Basis Documents, including; Authorization Agreements, Unreviewed Safety Question Determinations, Safety Analysis Reports, and Technical Safety Requirements, for BNL nuclear facilities; and
2. Provide assurance – through the above reviews - to the Deputy Director for Operations that the above noted documents are complete, accurate and appropriately address the hazards involved.

In regard to the committee's agenda, review items and schedule, it is noted in the charter that the committee relies upon the Lab NSO and organization managers to bring before the committee those matters that, in their judgement, require review by the committee. That is, the committee has no explicit R2A2 associated with ensuring the proper items get brought to its attention. In addition, it is clearly stated in the charter that responsibility for maintaining operations within the Facility Authorization Basis lies with line organization management.

In regard to committee R2A2 it is noted that members of the committee are authorized to vote for or against recommending to the Deputy Director for Operations approval of items brought to the committee for review.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee, established to address a highly technical and potentially hazardous work activity for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. In addition, the functionality, purpose and R2A2s for this committee are very clear.

It is concluded that the Nuclear Safety Committee should continue to exist with no significant changes.

Firearms Safety Committee (10)

This is a Lab committee that is mandated by DOE Order 440.1.

The functions of the committee are:

1. At least annually, inspect armories, ranges, cleaning facilities and any other firearms-associated facilities;
2. Review, evaluate and approve changes to firearms-related safety analysis reports, policies, lesson plans and operating procedures; and
3. Assist Lab management in providing safe firearms activities.

Based on this description, it is unclear who has ultimate R2A2 for safe firearms activities since function 3 says the committee will assist Lab management in providing such while function 2 says the committee will approve changes, thereby inferring approval authority for essentially everything that governs firearms activities.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee, established to address a highly technical and potentially hazardous work activity for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. Although the functionality and purpose of this committee seem clear, except possibly for item 3 (which appears to be a minor part of the committee's scope of work), there is confusion about the R2A2 of the committee. This needs to be addressed

It is concluded that the Firearms Safety Committee should continue to exist but with greater clarity about how it functions, who it serves and what R2A2s are vested in the committee chair and its members.

Traffic Safety Committee (11)

The stated purpose of this committee is to advise the Facilities & Operations (F&O) Director on all traffic safety issues and concerns that impact the Lab and its population.

It is then noted that the committee is tasked with the promotion of proactive traffic safety improvements through the development and execution of an effective and comprehensive safety program.

Based on this, it appears there is no Traffic Safety Program Manager, or a MS Steward or Owner, who is responsible and accountable for the ultimate performance of the BNL Traffic Safety Program. It also appears that this committee, which has no apparent decision authority, is expected to be accountable for traffic safety performance results.

It is further noted that this committee meets weekly, or at the request of the Chair, indicating the committee is a near-real-time advisory entity for the F&O Director.

In summary, this committee functions like advisor staff to the F&O Director with no additional R2A2s.

It is concluded that the Traffic Safety Committee should not continue as a Lab-level committee, and that accountability for the BNL Traffic Safety Program should be clarified.

Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) (12)

The stated purpose of this committee is to provide oversight of all research activities involving recombinant DNA and DOE Etiologic Agents as well as other biological hazards that require this level of review.

The Charter makes it clear that the functions and R2A2 of this committee do not supplant:

- The normal BNL Work Planning System - which provides the means for all departments/divisions conducting experiments to establish a graded approach to determine the level of rigor used in the documentation, hazard analysis and review of their experiments;
- The department Experimental Safety Review Committees that review new experiments and significant modifications to experiments; or
- Work approval by the department/division chair.

Following completion of these activities by the appropriate personnel, those projects, experiments or work activities that involve the above noted materials must seek and achieve final approval by the IBC prior to initiation (presumably). In this approval

process the IBC ensures concurrence by appropriate subject matter experts. It is evident that this committee has approval authority that cannot be overridden by line managers.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee, established to address a highly technical and potentially hazardous work activity for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. The R2A2s of the committee chair and its members are clear and credible.

It is concluded that the Institutional Biosafety Committee should continue to exist with no significant changes in its functions or R2A2s.

Brookhaven Advocacy Council (13)

The stated purpose of this council is to advise and make recommendations to the Lab Director on the resolution of employee, guest, and user concerns/issues that are brought to the attention of the council.

The committee is charged with the authority (and presumably the responsibility and accountability) to:

1. Receive and respond to employee, guest and user concerns/issues;
2. Analyze and research data (presumably relevant to such concerns/issues); and
3. Propose resolutions (to the Lab Director).

In the execution of this authority and the development of its recommendations, the council is required to pursue a clear set of goals related to professionalism, fairness, confidentiality and compliance with BNL policies.

Although these goals and the authority of the council are very clear, there is no mention of the following items having high relevance to the basic and highly important purposes of the council:

- The process by which the council “receives” issues/concerns of employees, guests or users is not specified. For example, it is not evident whether such information (1) comes directly from the individual employee, guest or user; (2) is solicited (i.e., formally or informally); or (3) provided to the council by managers, supervisors or peers?
- The manner in which the council interfaces with and/or complements or supplements the functionality of the Lab-wide Human Resource MS is not specified. It is not clear whether the R2A2s of the Steward and Owner of this MS are consistent with de-facto R2A2s of the council members.
- The fundamental reason for this council reporting to the Lab Director as opposed to the Human Resource MS Steward is not clear; this may indicate a weakness or failure of this MS and/or the stewardship of such.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee, established to address concerns and issues related to the Lab’s most valued resources, i.e., its employees, guests and users.

Failure to adequately address these issues and concerns is clearly a high risk for the Lab. On the other hand, there are other key processes, MSs and organizations within the Lab that are dedicated to ensuring concerns and issues raised by employees, guests and users are addressed adequately.

It is concluded that the Brookhaven Advocacy Council should continue to exist but with greater clarity about how it interfaces with the Human Resource Directorate and the Human Resource MS Steward as well as a reexamination of the manner in which the council makes recommendations to the Laboratory Directory.

BNL Radioactive Drug Research Committee (14)

The implied purpose of this committee is to “ascertain, on the request of an investigator, whether a proposed experiment involving radioactive drugs on human subjects meets standards by the Food and Drug Administration as authorized by paragraph 361.1 of the Federal Register.”

There is nothing in the charter of this committee that addresses the authority or accountability of the Chair or its members. More significantly, there is no indication that the committee has approval and/or oversight authority over proposed experiments involving radioactive drugs on human subjects. This implies that the conclusions of the committee’s “ascertainments” are informational or advisory in nature. In addition, it is not clear what entities are the primary or intended recipients of the committee’s results, i.e., the investigator, his/her supervisor, both, and/or another party.

In summary, it appears as though the functions, activities and intentions of this committee are analogous to a highly focused and singularly directed “peer review” and although this is important to the Lab in that it addresses a highly technical area for which there are relatively few subject matter experts, it is not clear why achievement of the desired outcomes requires a Lab-level committee.

It is concluded that the BNL Radioactive Drug Research Committee should not be continued as a Lab-level committee and that the basic function of the committee – independent peer review of compliance with applicable regulations – should be incorporated into the R&D Work Planning & Control process as applied to this type of R&D.

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (15)

The stated Charge (i.e., the apparent purposes and/or responsibilities) for this committee are to:

1. Review, at least once every six months, the Laboratory’s program for humane care and use of animals;
2. Inspect, at least every six months, all of the Laboratory’s animal facilities, including satellite facilities;

3. Prepare reports following reviews of program and facilities, and make recommendations to the Institutional Official regarding any aspect of the Lab's animal program, facilities or personnel training;
4. Review concerns involving the care and use of animals at the Laboratory;
5. Review and approve, require modifications in (to secure approval) or withhold approval of those sections of all applications or proposals related the care and use of animals as specified in National Institutes for Health (NIH) Grants and Contracts;
6. Review and approve, require modifications in (to secure approval), or withhold approval of proposed significant changes regarding the use of animals in ongoing activities; and
7. Be authorized to suspend an activity involving animals in accordance with specifications set forth in NIH Grants and Contracts.

Although it is apparent that this committee must approve, or not, proposed and ongoing care and use of animals, it is not clear whether such an approval is a necessary condition to proceed. Also, it is not clear what decision authority resides with the recipient (the so-called Institutional Official) of the reports and recommendations noted in purpose 3. In addition, it is not clear who is the recipient of the results of those reviews identified in purpose 4 and it is not clear what actions occur as part of purposes 5 and 6 when proposed or ongoing conditions are "not approved" by the committee.

Finally, purpose 1 indicates that BNL has a Laboratory-wide Program for Humane Care and Use of Animals. If so, there should be a designated Program Manager for such as well as a Lab-wide MS under which this program should reside. Assuming such, the Program Manager and/or the Steward for the involved MS should have the basic R2A2 for this item - as well as for the purposes 2 through 7 on the above list. Additionally, this individual should use an appropriate cadre of subject matter experts – perhaps as a standing committee - similar to the one currently in existence.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee, established to address a specific set of conditions associated with work activities for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. However, there are significant R2A2 issues and non-specified interfaces that should be addressed.

It is concluded that the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee should be reexamined in regard to its reporting relationships, de-facto authority over proposed and ongoing care and use of animals, and interfaces with the cognizant program manager and/or MS Steward.

PAAA Working Group (16)

The stated purposes of this WG are two-fold. First, and foremost, the WG is chartered to evaluate occurrences and conditions that represent a potentially reportable noncompliance with Nuclear Safety Rules (NSR) or a DOE-approved Implementation

Plan required by an NSR.² The occurrences and conditions addressed by the WG are brought to this forum by the PAAA Coordinator who operates under processes that are defined elsewhere.

Each evaluation made by the WG determines if a noncompliance has occurred and whether the noncompliance meets or exceeds the criteria for reporting the event formally to DOE through the Noncompliance Tracking System. Although not stated, it appears to be true that if the WG determines a formal report is necessary, the cognizant line manager must comply. On the other hand, if the WG determines a formal report is not required, the cognizant line manager may submit such.

The second stated purpose of the WG is to advise BNL management of issues related to compliance with the NSR and the processes for identifying, tracking and reporting items of noncompliance. The manner in which this is accomplished is unaddressed in the PAAA WG Charter.

In summary, this is a highly focused committee, established to address a highly technical and potentially hazardous work activity – involving significant risk to the Laboratory - for which there are a limited number of subject matter experts. In regard to its primary purpose, the activities and R2A2s of the WG Chair and its members are clear and credible and the manner in which it interfaces with the PAAA Coordinator and line management is identified explicitly.

It is concluded that the PAAA Working Group should continue to exist with no significant changes in its functions or R2A2s.

Pollution Prevention Council (17)

The stated purpose of this council is to assist in the development, establishment, management, and promotion of Lab-wide pollution prevention and waste minimization policies and programs.

In fulfilling this purpose the council is expected to

1. Provide a comprehensive approach to meeting the various pollution prevention and waste minimization requirements;
2. Serve as a forum for increased communication and consistent implementation of pollution prevention activities

In essence, purpose 1 would be expected of an “advisory council” for the Lab-wide Pollution Prevention Program Manager and/or the steward of that MS in which this program resides; and purpose 2 would be expected of a pool of people that this program manager or steward would use to promote implementation of their initiatives.

² Upon issuance of the Worker Safety and Health rule the charge of this committee will be expanded to occurrences or conditions relevant to this rule.

In summary, the stated purposes and responsibilities of this council, i.e., promoting and supporting the objectives of pollution prevention and waste minimization, appear to be of significant value to the Laboratory. However, there is no apparent reason why this should be handled by a Laboratory-level council.

It is concluded that the Pollution Prevention Council should be abandoned as a Lab-level council. If deemed important by the Pollution Prevention Program Manager and/or the steward of that MS in which this program resides, the council should be reconfigured as an advisory council to such.

Recommendations

General Recommendations for All Safety-Related Committees/Councils

The following two recommendations are made for the entire portfolio of BNL safety-related committees/councils:

1. Reexamine the functionality and purposes of each committee, council and WG using as a reference framework:
 - a. The Laboratory's current portfolio of MSs and their functions;
 - b. The Laboratory's current distribution of ES&H subject matter experts, including "embedded" (line owned), "distributed" (support owned but predominantly field-deployed) and centralized (support owned and centrally used) personnel; and
 - c. The general, but not universal, rule that safety committees/councils/WGs should be used predominantly for work activities for which: i) the hazards are high; ii) the mitigation solutions are highly technical; iii) there are relatively few subject matter experts available Laboratory-wide; and iv) consistency of decision making about risk elevation is essential. (Examples of such activities include, but are not limited to, using firearms, lasers, radioactive materials, and bio materials).
2. Clarify the R2A2s of the Chairs and members of each committee/council/WG using as a reference framework:
 - a. The R2A2s of :MS Stewards and Owners for assuring the performance and deployment of their MS requirements Laboratory-wide,
 - b. The R2A2s of: line managers for ES&H performance results throughout their management domain; and

- c. The R2A2s of ES&H subject matter experts for the credibility and responsiveness of their support services.

Committee/Council-Specific Recommendations

Using the above recommendations as guidelines, a review of the charters for each safety-related committee/council/WG was conducted to determine which of these should be considered for 1) abandonment, 2) retention, but with significant refinements or 3) retention as is without significant change.

The following committees/councils/WGs are recommended for abandonment:

- Director's Safety Committee (1)
- Laboratory ES&H Committee (3)
- Traffic Safety Committee (11) – as a Lab level committee
- BNL Radioactive Drug Research Committee (14) – as a Lab-level committee
- Pollution Prevention Council (17) – as a Lab-level council

The following committees/councils/WGs are recommended for retention, but with significant refinements in functional and R2A2 clarity:

- Aviation and Marine Safety Committee (2)
- Laser Safety Committee (4)
- Transportation Safety Working Group (6)
- Firearms Safety Committee (10)
- Brookhaven Advocacy Council (13)
- Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (15)

The following committees/councils/WGs are recommended for retention with essentially no change in functional or R2A2 clarity:

- Radiation Protection Committee (5)
- Lab Electrical Safety Committee (7)
- Lifting Safety Committee (8)
- Nuclear Safety Committee (9)
- Institutional Biosafety Committee (12)
- PAAA Working Group (16)