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## I. Purpose & Scope:

The purpose of this unscheduled assessment is to document lab wide performance of ISMS operations in light of the DOE SLAC ISM report.

## II. Definitions:

- Results of this assessment will be tabulated, indicating areas/items noted as needing improvement and reported to TJNAF Senior Management.

## III. Requirements

The assessment will be conducted based on the deficiencies noted in the DOE SLAC ISM Report.

## IV. Team Members

Lead: Michael Epps  
Members: Jacqueline Bacon, Debra Brand, James Coleman, Christopher Curtis, Bob Doane, Craig Ferguson, John LeRose, Bob May, Cindy Saban.

## V. Specific Areas Being Assessed

Specific areas identified in the DOE SLAC ISM Report are to be assessed for TJNAF compliance.

## VI. Final Report

The final report is to be Appendix A to this document.
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I. Purpose & Scope:
The purpose of this unscheduled assessment is to document lab wide performance of ISMS operations in light of the DOE SLAC ISM report.

II. Summary of Assessment:
The assessment compared JLab ISMS performance against the results stated in the DOE SLAC ISM Report. Areas or processes which need improvement were detailed in the “SLAC ISM Final Report Summary” provided to Senior Management in June.

III. Results:
See attached “SLAC ISM Final Report Summary” for detailed findings from this assessment.

IV. Effectiveness Evaluation:
The assessment was effective in providing JLab management with an overview of ISMS performance as compared to the DOE SALC ISM Report which was used to establish criteria for the assessment.
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SLAC ISM Report Summary

There is a strong indication that the implementation of the DOE’s directives is inconsistent across the laboratory at SLAC. We have reviewed the safety protocols and procedures currently in place at JLab in light of the findings in “The Report” and have developed a set of recommendations that should at least mitigate any similar findings at JLab. What we would like to see achieved is a uniform and effective set of rules, protocols, and training at JLab with enough flexibility to avoid the problems that a “one size fits all” approach often generates.

1. TRAINING: The consistent and lab-wide application of ISM and EMS principles was identified as an area of concern. To combat this, it is recommended that focused and frequently repeated training be introduced for all staff. Specifically:

   ◆ ISM: No training has yet been conducted at the lab. This should be developed to ensure full understanding and consistent application. Incorporate the “ISM Wheel” showing the relationship between the seven elements of work management and the five core functions of ISM.

   ◆ Hazard analysis and risk coding: Training is needed to counteract inconsistent implementation across the lab. Include what is required by a hazard analysis and the classification of hazard levels.

   ◆ Causal Analysis: Expand causal analysis training for line managers and require causal analysis (reviewed for acceptability by QACI) for appropriate event investigation.

   ◆ EH&S Manual: Training recommended for all staff as a way of communicating the information in the manual. Training should be given which includes manual overview, method of access, implementation, and review of key chapters.

   ◆ LO/TO: Some concerns exist as to the effectiveness of the JLab LO/TO program. Recommend that the current LO/TO training be reviewed for clarity and effectiveness.

The process used to develop Safety Warden Training was identified as a good system and could be used as a guideline. Also investigate existing line management safety training plans from other facilities and modify for Jefferson Lab. The DOE’s Energy Facility Contractors Group has published reports on *Excellence in Work Management* and *Excellence in Job Hazard Analysis* which can be used as a reference for any training developed for Jefferson Lab.

2. SAFETY DOCUMENTATION:

   ◆ ES&H Manual:
     - The “Standard Work Planning” section should be modified to include pre-job walk down.
     - The original document was structured to cover most of what we do. Now, it is not used that way – portions are used as needed for reference. EH&S should considering adding hot links to their webpage for a more direct access to specific procedures and processes.

---

1 The Report on the Inspection of Environment, Safety, and Health at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
2 http://www.ecog.org/wg/wm/library/wm/EFCOG%20Work%20Management%20BOK%20DRAFT--FINAL.doc (pg 5)
3 EFCOG: Work Management Subgroup Knowledge Portal
• Continue to improve the F&LM work permit processes. The work permit process is in its initial stages of implementation. Develop a plan to track permits.

3. **ONGOING PROGRAMS:** Several programs that already exist at JLab were identified as effective ES&H and work planning tools. In general, however, they were not in use lab wide. Expansion of these systems was seen as beneficial to the lab. Specifically:

• ATLis: recommend expanding use of ATLis type system for work planning, hazard analysis, pre and post job feedback across the lab. It may need modifications to suit use elsewhere.

• Consolidate lessons learned from all sources (e.g. Accelerator Downs, FEL etc.) into one keyword database. We should ensure that these sessions are documented and readily available/accessible to lab staff (central repository).

• A worker feedback mechanism is in place but under utilized. The membership of the Worker Safety Committee needs to be more visible.

• A lab wide worker observation process needs to be formalized to identify issues. Direct worker observations by line management with documented results as illustrated in DuPont’s STOP are appropriate controls to prevent recurrence.