



**Department of Energy**  
National Training Center  
P.O. Box 5400  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185-5400

MAY 06 2010

MEMORANDUM FOR JACK CRAIG  
MANAGER  
SAVANNAH RIVER SITE

FROM: ARNOLD E. GUEVARA   
DIRECTOR  
NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER  
OFFICE OF HEALTH, SAFETY AND SECURITY

SUBJECT: Savannah River Site Safety Training Workshop Report

Attached please find the final report from the December 8-9, 2009 collaborative safety training workshop conducted in Savannah River Site (SRS), which was attended by key SRS federal, contractor and union representatives.

We apologize for the belated delivery of this report. The report provides results and recommendations developed by workshop attendees on possible enhancements to the safety training programs across the SRS complex. It should be noted that SRS has already implemented numerous initiatives to gain efficiencies in safety training and that the workshop recommendations serve as an enhancement to these on-going efforts.

On behalf of the Office of Health, Safety and Security and specifically, the National Training Center, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation for your support of this effort and extend an offer of any assistance you may need from us in the future. We will be conducting additional workshops at other sites and plan to return in order to share lessons learned and best practices from these other sites. Additionally, we will let you know what actions on a national level are initiated in partnership with the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), with whom we are collaborating to support the Department's safety training program.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (505) 845-5170, extension 117, [aguevara@ntc.doe.gov](mailto:aguevara@ntc.doe.gov), or your staff may contact Jeannie Lozoya, Acting Director, Office of Safety Training Operations, at extension 101, [jlozoya@ntc.doe.gov](mailto:jlozoya@ntc.doe.gov).

Attachment

cc: Glenn S. Podonsky, HS-1  
William A. Eckroade, HS-1  
Mari-Josette N. Campagnone, HS-1  
Sherri Robinson, SR  
Karen McGinnis, HAMMER Steering Committee  
Chip Hughes, NIEHS

---

---

**Savannah River Site Office (SRS)  
Safety Training Collaboration Workshop  
Executive Summary  
December 8-9, 2009**



Performed in Collaboration with the National Institute  
of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) and the U.S.  
Department of Energy Office of Health, Safety and Security  
(HSS), and Savannah River Site (SRS).

**Savannah River Site Office**  
**Collaborative Safety Training Workshop Report**  
**December 8-9, 2009**

**Executive Summary**

A collaborative Safety Training Workshop was conducted December 8-9, 2009 for the Savannah River Site Office (SRS) in order to identify efficiencies in the safety training programs across the Savannah River Site. Representatives from federal, contractor, and union organizations took part in this workshop as well as staff from the HAMMER Training and Education Center and members of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). The National Training Center (NTC) within the Office of Health, Safety and Security (HSS) acted as the lead facilitator for the workshop which included presentations from federal as well as union leadership, HAMMER staff, and NIEHS representatives.

Four breakout groups with representation from all elements worked to identify and define efforts that could be implemented to ensure improvements across the Savannah River Site with their various safety training programs. Groups were facilitated during the 1 ½ days workshop and developed lists that outlined current issues with safety training programs and possible recommendations for addressing those issues (teams conducted a facilitated report out process and subsequent question and answer session for the full body of attendees). The results included numerous commonalities between the groups with the major emphasis being placed on the issues of communications, training quality and portability. A summary of the recommendations from the collaborative groups include:

- Implementing a Safety Training Working Group to address safety training issues.
- Implementing mechanisms to enhance communications across the Savannah River Site to address safety training needs.
- Establishing a Point of Contact (POC) list in order to communicate SRS safety training issues, lessons learned, and corrective actions.
- Establishing a set of standardized criteria to evaluate safety training course approvals and for use in instructor evaluations.

The NTC and the NIEHS are available to assist SRS as they move forward in enhancing safety training at their respective facilities. We will be conducting additional workshops at other sites and plan to return in order to share lessons learned and best practices from these other sites. Additionally, we will let you know what actions on a national level we take along with NIEHS with whom we are collaborating to support the Department's safety training program.

## 1.0 Overview

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Health, Safety and Security and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) teamed to establish a model for collaborative safety training workshops across DOE sites. The objective of this collaboration is to seek areas/topics where HSS, the NIEHS, and unions that are NIEHS grantees can work together with site programs to enhance the safety of site operations through training.

The following goals were identified prior to the SRS workshop:

- Strengthening the safety of SRS site operations
- Enhancing the quality and efficiency of SRS safety training programs
- Reducing the redundancy/duplication of SRS safety training programs

As a result, a safety training self-assessment workshop was conducted at Aiken, South Carolina on December 8 - 9, 2009 to identify areas of safety training efficiencies that could be addressed by the SRS management in partnership with their contractors and unions. Representatives from SRS, their major contractors, labor management, and labor worker trainers were involved in the advanced workshop planning as well as the workshop itself. The focus of this effort was primarily, but not limited to, health and safety training that meets the requirements of Title 10 CFR Part 851, Worker Health and Safety Program Rule.

The following items were used as starting points for facilitated team discussions amongst four separate breakout groups:

- Current safety training programs
- Specific safety training (including specialty training) currently offered or planned
- Identified safety training needs
- Current collaborations between SRS, contractors, and unions
- Concerns, impediments, and/or barriers to providing effective safety training
- Reasons and/or factors that contribute to effective safety training
- Frequency and instances of duplicative or redundant training courses
- Content consistency between the same or similar safety training courses
- Lessons learned and any notable trends regarding safety training

---

## 2.0 Methodology

Collaborative pre-planning meetings for the SRS workshop were conducted in order to finalize the logistics, agenda, representation, and goals for the session. Data that was used during both the pre-planning sessions and the workshop included DOE Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS), the Computerized Accident/Incident Report and Recordkeeping System (CAIRS), and various other HSS and NIEHS data sources such as the Minimum Health and Safety Training Criteria guidance document.

The SRS safety training self-assessment was conducted in a workshop format over a 1 ½ day period with representation from contractors, union leadership, and worker trainers. The NTC,

within HSS, served as the lead facilitator for the workshop with additional individual facilitators for each of the four separate breakout groups. Each breakout group had representation from federal, contractor, and union staff in order to enhance this collaborative effort. Prior to the start of the various breakout sessions, welcomes were conducted by SRS, NTC, and NIEHS leadership and union leaders who presented their thoughts and objectives for this collaborative effort.

Safety training representatives from the HAMMER facility were in attendance and outlined their challenges in implementing the Hanford Site safety training program particularly in the areas of standardization and reciprocity. Some of the successes highlighted included the standardization of lock out/tag out training and equivalencies granted for union delivered health and safety training. Additionally, a NIEHS staff member presented SRS specific summary data from both the ORPS and CAIRS databases. A question and answer/open discussion period preceded the initiation of the four breakout sessions. At the end of the 1 ½ day session, report-outs were conducted by each of the four teams to the entire group with a question and answer session following each report.

The following section summarizes the results of the four breakout teams. Additionally, attached is raw data outlining specific information captured from each breakout group.

### **3.0 Results**

There were areas of commonality between the four breakout groups but most fell under the two major headings of communications, and training quality and portability.

The following is a summary and roll-up of the results under these headings.

#### **Communications**

The largest single area of commonality between the groups is the issue of communications. Participants assessed that communication among the various SRS training programs would improve on some of the communication issues that have been present in the past. Many groups noted that a Safety Training Working Group (STWG) similar to the one currently operating at the Oak Ridge Reservation would enhance the communication within SRS. Additional areas of concern and possible improvement in communications were identified to include:

- Increasing communications between the different stakeholders to keep everyone informed of potential issues and the state-of-training (initiatives, policies, etc.) at the SRS was also identified as a mechanism that could improve the efficiency of training and the sharing of those results between stakeholders. Establishing and using a “POC” list which would include all stakeholders (DOE, Contractors and especially ALL union training representatives) could be one mechanism to use to implement improved communications.
- The ability to share training schedules and lessons learned was also identified as a way to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of the training efforts across the site. Being able to schedule training from an approved list of courses (discuss in more detail in Training Quality/Portability) based on when it would be most efficient and effective versus having

to provide it “in-house” with potential wait times, will allow more individuals to attend training quicker and easier.

### **Training Quality/Portability**

While standardization of training was not identified as an issue at the SRS, due to the centralized current M&O training organization, the following additional mechanisms were identified that could potentially improve reciprocity and efficiency.

- Establish a standard set of acceptance criteria for safety training course evaluation that can be used to ensure that all training courses that teach the same topic would be evaluated consistently. By using a standard set of criteria, if a course is accepted, based on the criteria, it could be added to the approved list and available to all.
- Along with acceptance criteria used to add a course to the approved list, a standard set of evaluation criteria should be established to evaluate course implementation on a consistent and ongoing basis. Each organization would evaluate the course offering against a set of criteria and a determination made to keep the course on the approved list, remove the course from the list, or request modifications/revisions made to the course for it to remain on the list. By performing these evaluations on a consistent basis, the quality of the safety training can be maintained. If these evaluation results are captured and disseminated consistently, everyone could be made aware of potential problem areas (courses, instructors, etc.) or noteworthy practices.
- The safety training needs for new workers supporting activities under the ARRA were noted in a number of breakout teams with concerns that some workers were being used to perform tasks that they did not possess the expertise to perform.

## **4.0 Recommendations**

- Implement a Safety Training Working Group to address safety training issues.
- Implement mechanisms to improve/enhance communications across the SRS.
- Establish a POC list in order to communicate SRS safety training issues, lessons learned, and corrective actions (attached is SRS Workshop POC attendee listing).
- Establish a set of standardized criteria to evaluate safety training course approvals and for use in instructor evaluations.

## **5.0 Conclusion**

The SRS Safety Training Workshop conducted in Aiken was the second of a number of planned events across the Department to bring together federal, contractor, and union staff in an effort to increase efficiencies in safety training at DOE sites through communication and collaboration among these organizations. The collaborative teamwork conducted during this workshop and subsequent recommendations highlighted in this report can be used by SRS management as they consider additional enhancements to improving safety training efforts at their facilities.

Two Attachments:

Breakout Team Raw Data

SRS Workshop Attendee List

**Collaborative Safety Training Self-Assessment Workshop**  
**DOE Savannah River Site**  
**December 8-9, 2009**

*Breakout Session Notes*

**Breakout Group 1:**

Lead Facilitator - Larry Palmer

- Look at training and make sure it meets the sites needs. Sometimes workers arrive at worksites with a lot of certifications, but it does not meet the needs of the site. Example: Teamster HAZWOPER eight hour refresher training is not widely accepted.
- Demolition and deconstruction (D&D) using craft personnel for tasks not associated with expertise.
  - With the ARRA funding D&D has increased, and more workers to be brought onsite. The question is how are these folks brought on to the site? New hires and moving staff around.
  - [Third party evaluation] to ensure match between task and qualifications. NTC talk to D&D folks here.
- ARRA training pipeline
  - Appropriate level of job and safety training? New people may not be aware of the DOE culture, whether it is someone new, or someone from a trade who has not worked in DOE sites.
- Conduct a monthly forum between contractors (D&D, production, and construction), DOE and labor unions to discuss training needs (communication/coordination). It is necessary to open the line of communication.
- Oversight of sub contractor training - how are training expectations related to subcontractors?
  - What are training expectations for those levels of contractors and how is that type of information given out to contractors and workers? Who ensures that health and safety training get implemented in contract language?

**Breakout Group 2:**

Facilitator – Lamar Palmer

Issues of interest:

*1. Know what safety training is required that can be provided outside.*

- Funding for training will continue to be available.
- External training providers offer turnkey courses.
- External trainers can provide trainings on unique topics (such as asbestos abatement) that contractors do not usually keep trainers updated on.
- Savannah River and/or union trades can work together to provide annual training requests and needs.
- Need to integrate administrative logistics for course completion, training records.
- NIEHS mixed-trade training is beneficial to attendees; value added.
- Trainings should incorporate DOE lessons learned and site specific issues.

*2. Reinstitute cross-cutting training at Central Point. Standardize courses and develop DOE Clearinghouse for available training.*

- There is a need for a central point of contact to facilitate the clearing house concept.
- It would serve as a repository for training.
- Courses were not available for download in the DOE forum, but the forum provided a point of contact for training.
- Besides available training, it should also provide the availability of trainers.
- It is recommended that NTC develop such resource tool for DOE.
- The resource should be available for contractors and subcontractors.

*3. Evaluate outside (external) provided training for acceptance at the site on health and safety training.*

- What is acceptable certification for contractors?
- Is certification and completion card enough?
- There is a need to conduct evaluations on training certifications.

*4. The development of a contractor/training provider working group in the complex to share and promote good practices.*

- It should be a worker-level workgroup that encourages the continuation of coordination of safety training.
- It should also provide feedback from the worker level to the managers and trainers.
- The minutes of proceedings and feedback should be provided to trainers and managers.
- The workgroup also would need a champion as head to convene meetings.

**Breakout Group 3:**

Facilitator - Jim Junker (SRNS)

*Issues of interest:*

1. Integration of ISMS/VPP/851
2. Production vs. construction training process
3. Meaningful worker involvement
4. Examples of hands-on training
5. Clear DOE direction on training

6. School to work programs
7. Integration of lessons learned into training (site & complex)
8. Method of training determination (hands-on, computer-based, lecture, etc)
9. Methods of evaluation (short/long term), Competency-based approach
10. Training performance indicators for 851
11. Training redundancies (site to site) % common, % unique

851 Employee rights responsibilities in GET (orientation) training and other training.

ISMS in everything

VPP employee run and operated

All the "programs" incorporated in the way they do business

Not a specific cause on 851 training

Integrated into other courses

Delta so small between 851 and what they were doing, no changes necessary.

1. Integration of ISMS, 851 and VPP - incorporated into all training programs

They did their initial gap analysis

Spectrum video shown weekly

Employee concerns program - mechanism through which employees report concerns (file complaints)

Performance indicators for everything

Unclear whether they trickle down to workers in terms of whether the workers know what the performance indicators are.

7. They do integrate lessons learned into training out to site training manager distribution

After recent issues, rolling time out - day long stand down

Hazard identification, on-site housekeeping, BBS observations

Now review work packages

6,900 M&O side/2,100 ARRA

Any worker has the right to stop work if they are uncomfortable - management approval needed to restart

Time out process too

No retaliation is embedded into their thinking now

Human performance indicators

Fact-finding

More people disciplined for hiding things or lying than reporting incidents or concerns.

*Changes in the last three or four years:*

Employees NOT afraid to report the smallest of injuries.

Laborers - OSHA 10 hr.

Georgia Tech also teaching OSHA 10 and 30 to sub contractors/technical representatives, supervisors.

ARRA Work

1. D&D of R reactor
2. D&D of P reactor
3. Solid waste removal from burial ground to ship out.

Training for all on D&D site gets the same training  
All on burial grounds also get same training  
All who work with waste get HAZWOPER  
Same training whether ARRA or permanent employee  
Amount of HAZWOPER training doubled (24 hr course) for TSD workers

Training done at union training centers does get into the SRS training database

Facility assessment board doing audits regularly  
Testing on RAD varies site to site

**NRC**

Complex records all in one system, all background, security, training

Same basic training for everything - delta training for specific plant if needed (one to four hrs.)

SRS does computer-based training (CBT)  
Confined space was CBT but changed back

Candidate courses for complex-wide record keeping.

HAZWOPER  
RAD I&II  
Asbestos  
Fall Protection  
CPR/First Aid

**DOE**

Site unique records for Security, financial, personnel training - all separate

No same training - every site unique

Respiratory  
Confined Space Awareness  
GET - Plant Access & Fire Watch  
Scaffolding  
Hazardous Energy Control (HEC)  
ESS

Need for course content standardization  
Standardize evaluation

3. *Worker involvement and lessons learned*  
Observations  
Stop work

Writing lessons learned

Lessons learned are shared internally and externally

Post incident fact-finding teams include floor workers

Behavior-based observation - voluntary (passes trends to site) there is training for this

Local safety improvement teams (employees with one manager)

Self-assessment/audits (requires assessor training) procedures - need to have experience and training.

Assessor training increased recently

Trainers at SRNS search lessons learned database for content

#### 6. *Knowledge capture/transfer*

Institutionalizing the knowledge before people retire

Apprenticeship programs

Average SRS worker - over 50

Weak record keeping/documentation

No real way to transfer knowledge set up

S&H managers meetings

Facilities manager's meeting

\*Shared meetings with DOE, site contractors and unions needed to meet and discuss safety programs/practices

#### **Breakout Group 4:**

Facilitator - Brenda Kelly

Concerns and Issues:

They want answers to these questions

- Why training is not recognized from site to site (portability of training)?
- Why are employees in the trades required to have training before they are hired?
- Why are employees in the trades not paid for their training? They only get paid after they are hired.
- Can we have written guidance on reciprocity?
- Can the DOE give us a policy then all parties involved can use that as guidance and develop their own policy, which address Site Specific Training?
- In order to meet all conditions, can a website be developed which posts the deltas between the sites in order for the employees to meet all conditions?
- Lack of safety culture
  - If an employee leaves the site and comes back at a later date they can test out of training with an 80%.
  - The SRS trainers allow people to test out of refresher and it was observed that there could be complacency.
  - There does not seem to be a realistic safety culture.

#### *Actions Determined by Group 4:*

- 851 training should be developed and incorporated into other training and should be available on a DOE web site
- Reciprocity across the DOE complex should be developed and the deltas should be available on a website
- Site specific training should be made available on a DOE website
- The DOE should develop an 851 training policy for all of the parties to use as guidance
- Improved communications
- Follow up meeting should take place so that the attendees of this meeting can see if any of the actions have been taken
- The attendees wanted to see a final report from this workshop
- There needs to be a better sense of cooperation, understanding and compliance
- Value the time and effort to train and ensure they will be paid

#### Actions items to be worked:

- Follow-up meetings to status item
- Receive a final report from DOE
- Improve communications
- See a better sense of cooperation understanding and compliance with regard to 851
- Use NIEHS minimum criteria

#### Recommendations:

- Guidance or policy on training reciprocity from DOE must be worked out with all parties. It should also address site specific trainings.
- Make available existing 851 tools to everyone. 851 training (such as NIEHS 851 training module) should be developed and incorporated into other training and should be available on a DOE website and in a timely manner.
- Worker involvement in events and lessons learned should be shared.
- Better communication with all. Timely distribution involving workers in investigations.
- Prime contractors ensure 851 training
  - Standardized training
  - Attend same classes

#### *Questions/Comments*

- *Regarding subcontractor oversight, what is the issue?* Subcontractors' trainings are not clear when they switch tiers or tier down. It's not clear how training worked in subcontractors.
- *Is there a process in place for subs to be evaluated as they come on site to ensure training has occurred?* When it comes to D& D, it's not clear. This is most likely because new people are being brought in without knowing their background. The NRC has a record of training so people can move around easier from site to site as it keeps the trainings and experience they had.

- There is a desire to having a working group; EFCOG is a resource to assist with the development of a working group. However, the idea is to have local contractors, unions, DOE to communicate with each other.
- *What is the next step?* NTC will put together a report, will get to group for review, and then will submit it to management. All the meetings will generate reports, and combine the reports and DOE will do nationwide assessment of needs. Cannot guarantee what local management will do
- Reciprocity of training issue—it has been an issue for DOE HQ. Recognizing similarities to training should be occurring. HS is looking at this issue: where there is duplication, where can we standardize training to meet minimum requirements.

## Report Backs

### ***Group 1- Gary Gustafson presented the report***

- Teamster HAZWOPER eight hour refresher training  
Does it meet DOE/SR needs/requirements?  
Not accepting sites eight hours  
Needs analysis for training to ensure matching site requirement
- D&D using craft personnel for tasks not associated with expertise. [Third party evaluation] To ensure match between task and qualifications. How are they brought on to site? Moving from other areas, new hires.  
NTC talk to D&D folks here.
- ARRA training pipeline
  - Appropriate level of job and safety training?
- Monthly forum between contractors (D&D, production, construction). DOE and labor unions to discuss training needs (communication/coordination)
- Oversight of sub contractor training - how are training expectations related to subs?

### ***Group 2 – Don Ellenberger presented the report***

1. Know what safety training is required that can be provided by grantees.
  2. Reinstate cross-cutting training at a central point - clearinghouse for available training.
  3. Evaluate training from outside for acceptance at the site
  4. Contractor and training providers working group in the complex would be useful
1. Knowing what training is available
    - Funding will continue
    - Oak Ridge example planning and execution
    - Turn-key cause provided
    - Unique special causes that we do not keep trainers up
    - Annual training requests generated provided by SR and building trades
    - Direct costs to contractor = 0
    - Need to integrate administrative logistics from causes completed training records, electronic system

- Mixed trades training is a benefit to attendees - value added
  - Incorporation of lessons learned
  - 851 requirements are included in training
2. Central POC as facilitator
    - Repository for training
    - Causes not available for download (in sites' experience)
    - Includes training providers
    - Needs broad availability (to subcontractors)
    - Recommend NTC accomplish this function
  3. Workgroup
    - Needs program owner
    - POCs from sites from providers
    - Needs to be a priority for long-term
    - Include
      - Maybe other agencies
      - Could reduce costs
    - Need minutes of proceedings and feedback to trainers and managers

***Breakout Group 3 - Herman Potter presented*** (See breakout notes)

Discussion

Subcontractor training - unclear how well it is working now. Subcontractor technical reps might know, but were not present for this meeting.

Is the process in place for subs to be evaluated as they come on site to ensure training has occurred?

Things less clear in D&D work

EFCOG good group to deal with complex wide issues

DOE needs to adopt the minimum criteria!

***Breakout Group 4***

- Training not recognized from site to site
    - Portability of training
  - Is the mindset to make things better at facilities?
    - Safety culture attitude cooperating
  - Will anything come out of this?
  - Communication of past events to the site
  - Integration issues
1. Follow-up meetings to status items
  2. Receive a final report from DOE
  3. See a better sense of cooperation, understanding, and compliance with regard to 851
    - a. Value time and effort of employees
  4. Use NIEHS minimum criteria as model

5. Guidance or policy on training reciprocity from DOE must be worked out with all parties, each site
6. Make available existing 851 tools to everyone
7. Share lessons learned with everyone as they happen
8. Better communication with all. Timely distribution involving workers in investigation
9. Prime contractors ensure 851 training
  - a. Standardized training
  - b. Attend same classes
  - Have some type of system (Project Labor Agreement) in place that everyone works to