

APRIL 30, 2008
HSS/UNION MEETING TO ADDRESS TRAINING

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Introductory Remarks. Glenn Podonsky made the following points:

- More than a dialogue, the intent of HSS is to participate in a productive manner, to develop working relationships with the unions, to work the issues, identify actions, and institutionalize a process for addressing and resolving issues to improve worker health and safety throughout the DOE Complex.
- DOE needs to improve in program implementation in a variety of areas, one of which is training.
- HSS will have representatives at each topical meeting related to the functional area discussed. Representatives from the Offices of Worker Health and Safety (HS-10), Environmental Policy (HS-20), Corporate Safety Analysis (HS-30) and the National Training Center (NTC) are engaged in today's meeting to address training.

National Training Center. Jeff Harrell identified 3 key items:

- The role of NTC has been expanded to address specific areas of contractor and worker safety training program development and implementation.
- NTC needs to collaboratively scope its new role with regard to developing training classes, training pre-requisites, as a training clearinghouse, in leveraging existing/union training, and utilization of the worker for delivery of training to the crafts.
- NTC, as the HSS central training organization will actively coordinate with other HSS offices such as HS-10, HS-20 and HS-30, as well as, HAMMER, National Institute for Environmental Sciences (NIEHS) and others who have a training interface with HSS at large.

Conduct of Meeting. HSS and unions agreed to a path forward in which various unions combined to form core working groups to address the respective identified topical areas. A union lead is designated for each core group whose role is to serve as a primary point of contact to HSS and for union representatives, to facilitate meeting discussion, and continue as the union primary point of contact in follow-on activities to the meetings.

Overarching areas of intent to be addressed during the April 30 meeting are as follows:

1. Identify DOE's set of minimum standards and pre-requisite programs for entrance to work on DOE sites
2. Establish the full plethora of training courses and identify integrated opportunities for training development and delivery among DOE, the unions, and other agencies (i.e., NIEHS)
3. Establish a role in holistic delivery - shared use of training classes, training centers, etc.
4. Utilize a data driven approach to support changes in safety outcome as a result of training (statistical analysis to support training as it relates to safety)

HAMMER. Although an established and recognized training facility, Karen McGinnis talked about funding and the need for buy-in of the HAMMER facility programs from labor, DOE and

contractor management, and other agencies (e.g., FEMA, DOT, OSHA) to ensure the success of the common vision, mission, and goals of worker health and safety at DOE sites. Jim Spracklen discussed the critical role of labor, management and agency partnerships which is attributed to the success of the Facility.

DISCUSSION TOPICS. Meeting Facilitation: Gary Batykefer/Dale Hill (SMWIA)

1. HAMMER Modeled Training – Discussion Overview

- The HAMMER training program and facility is advocated by the unions and other training organizations (e.g., NIEHS) as an ideal in not only meeting, but exceeding worker training needs.
- The identified attributes of the HAMMER training concept to be modeled includes:
 - Worker involvement
 - Training environment
 - Bias toward hands-on training
 - Partnerships/collaborations among unions – with a dedicated champion for each organization
- The success of the HAMMER training program was also attributed to onsite worker trainers/instructors and a factor in assessing HAMMER-modeled training development at DOE sites. The CPWR’s investigation of the recent Las Vegas construction project fatalities (10 in 17 months) brings to the forefront the need for worker involvement in training development, building the skills of the trainers, providing training to solve health and safety issues and most importantly the effectiveness of worker/peer led training.
- It was agreed that both DOE and Union training requirements are needed to leverage an overall improved training model.
- Critical to its success, the development of a HAMMER-modeled network is key.
- There is a need to identify the physical assets of existing training facilities/infrastructure that are present within various union programs and grantees and programs to support broader training (i.e., confined space, co-located). [It was noted that there are 168 SMWIA union worker training facilities throughout the US and Canada alone.]
- Worker involvement is necessary for worker buy-in.
- Statistical data will support training issues/needs.

Issue: What is necessary to develop and establish HAMMER modeled training at all DOE sites?

Actions:

1. Define minimum standards and pre-requisites for DOE site access [HSS]
2. List of physical and intellectual training assets already available through the unions. [Unions]
3. Align existing union assets with HAMMER program model and identify resources/needs/gaps - including physical [Unions]
4. Beyond specific crafts, identify broader training needs and benchmark current programs [Unions]
5. Provide safety & health data/statistics to support needs[Unions]
6. Provide DOE-wide analytic safety performance information [HSS]

7. Instill worker involvement ethos through analysis function - expand lessons learned to/from workers [HSS/Unions]

2. BASELINE OF CURRENT TRAINING INITIATIVES

It was proposed that the 851 Rule could be used as a driving worker health and safety training requirement in analyzing aligned union training requirements and delivery gaps. A set of minimum training standards for allowing workers to be qualified for site access and assigned duties needs to be established.

Issue: Need to identify minimum DOE training needs

Actions:

1. Baseline DOE Training requirements [NIEHS/HSS]
2. Baseline current DOE training activities [HSS]
3. Unions to submit their training catalogs [Unions]
4. Utilizing 851 Rule as the driving requirement, matrix HAMMER/NIEHS and union training catalogs; identify gaps [HSS/NIEHS/HAMMER/Unions]

3. STANDARDIZATION OF TRAINING REQUIREMENTS SITE-WIDE

The unions noted that full DOE management support to worker access to training is imperative and that a provision of a pre-qualified list of contractors will improve the situation in order to account for who should be trained and who should be doing the training. HSS is working toward ensuring Federal accountability and using its oversight function to verify consistency in implementation of training requirements. It was proposed that DOE funded inspections would go a long way in ensuring consistency in training implementation by contractors site-to-site.

Issues:

- Lack of consistency in training requirements/implementation contractor-to-contractor and/or site-to-site.
- Identified need for DOE oversight to ensure constancy in training requirement implementation.
- Identified need for construction safety reciprocity across the sites.

Actions:

1. Provide examples of specific inconsistencies creating concern (e.g., collocated workers) [Unions]
2. Oversight action to review training in the Field [HSS]
3. Establish criteria for basic requirements (e.g., 10 hour OSHA) from which reciprocity across DOE sites can be defined [HSS]
4. Unions requested further discussion with HSS to establish minimum standards to qualify and pre-qualify contract workers that enter DOE sites based on safety, training, technical competency qualifications. [HSS/Unions]

4. SPECIALTY TRAINING

DOE and the unions have already expressed in previous discussions, the need for training beyond compliance of the minimum requirements to adequately address worker safety issues. Confined space and co-located training were identified as key areas of concern. In addition,

hazard identification, incident investigation, lessons learned from near misses, and conditions of old infrastructure were identified as significant areas of prevention training that would improve worker health and safety at DOE sites. The need for concentration on common and potentially hazardous situational environments was identified (e.g., need for fall protection training and impacts of aged facility infrastructure).

Issues:

- Need for broader based training to accommodate common non-craft specific situational environments in which workers are inadequately trained and response or lack there-of may jeopardize workers safety
- Fragile infrastructure requires crafts to carry an expert based “intellectual property” to enable repairs and operations
- Need for improved analysis of accidents with regard to training needs and special situations
- Fear of retaliation with regard to reporting

Actions:

1. Identify existing DOE/Union specialty training programs/benchmark developers and deliverers [HSS (NTC, HS-10)/Unions]
2. Quantify reliability – target modernizations, analyze impacts of infrastructure beyond design life to crafts’ expert based intellectual property [HSS/Unions]
3. HSS to follow-on with an analysis of cost vs. liability – development of a business model to better account for cost vs. liability. [HSS]
4. HSS to provide a forcing mechanism through its analysis function to address/review training shortfalls and/or positive outcomes [HSS]
5. DOE to share complex wide analytic results. [HSS]

5. “ONE SIZE DOES NOT FIT ALL”

It was agreed that “one size does not fit all”. There was a proposed need to recognize how people learn and what modalities are most effective for which audience. It was agreed that although the use of all modalities (i.e., blended training) is ideal, that tailoring training to fit the audience and fulfill the intent is a key element to ensuring the effectiveness of the training. It was reported by the NIEHS Worker Education Training Program (WETP) that a younger workforce responds to a more high-tech approach as in computerized and/or instructor led classroom settings compared to that of the experienced/older worker; and stated that training can be customized and cost effective without replacing the classroom because of economic issues.

Issue: Identified need to align training modalities to the audience

Action: Group types of training with audience and modalities [Unions]

A recount of key actions/activities identified in the meeting was provided. In closing, HSS discussed the overarching worker health and safety initiative not only in terms of having talked to the unions, but in looking at other corporate mechanisms, collaborations, data sharing, and sustaining meaningful operations. As part of a total initiative, HSS commits to sharing information amongst their outreach partners, to include the unions, and sharing the results of HSS corporate analysis. This has resulted in the development of an HSS Outreach Program website to facilitate open access amongst all parties relative to the totality of HSS outreach activities. In addition to posting information on the HSS outreach website and providing links to

participating union and union related websites, documents will be provided for direct posting on the HAMMER Facility, NIEHS WETP, Metal Trades Department, CPWR websites.

The intent of the meeting summary is to focus on the gist of the meeting discussion, with an attempt to capture the essence of all the representatives stated and the tasks to be completed to implement the path forward in addressing and resolving identified issues. The attached Appendix provides some more detailed comments (and commenters) to enable understanding of comments and the roll up of the path forward; however, in no way captures all of the data and dialogue from the meeting.

DRAFT

APPENDIX

APRIL 30, 2008

HSS/UNION MEETING TO ADDRESS TRAINING

Discussion Overview

1. HAMMER Modeled Training

- Partnerships at HAMMER currently includes 8 unions: Metal Trades Department, BCTD CPWR, ICWU, IUOE, IABSORIW, Teamsters, USW and the SMWIA. The BCTD and Metal Trades Department provide 61 trainers that export knowledge. Strong supporters of the facility, a visit to HAMMER is highly recommended for a full appreciation and understanding of its impact. [T. Schaffer]
- NIEHS, a strong supporter, believes that the core of HAMMER is its collaboration. [C. Hughes]
- Peer training is the foundation of HAMMER's success and is supported by safety statistics. HAMMER has received VPP STAR recognition for the quality and effectiveness of the training program. [D. Molnna]
- Standardized training can only work with supporting policy/standards. The HSS Offices represented in the meeting are acknowledged for their presence and relative importance in addressing the issues. [K. McGinnis]
- Hands-on training and coming to the sites pre-qualified are pertinent elements of worker Success. [D. Hill]
- Benchmarking, establishing core values, and identifying best practices are key to Ensuring consistency in training implementation. Worker involvement in the development of health and safety programs for safety professionals is key to getting workers onboard. [R. Coleman]
- HAMMER training should not be limited to east and west, there is a need for dedicated facilities at all sites complex-wide [D. Stephens]
- The following elements were identified in response to the question by Barb McCabe as to what the HAMMER concept to be pursued is:
 - Worker involvement
 - Training environment
 - Bias toward hands-on training
 - Partnerships/collaborations among unions – with a dedicated champion for all organizations
- Worker/peer training is often the most effective form of worker training. Workers need to be engaged in developing training curriculum, training abilities of trainers need to be developed, and all workers need to be trained to solve health and safety issues. These were identified as key elements in safety training reported by the Center for Construction Research and Training (CPWR) reported following an investigation/analysis of 10 worker fatalities within 17 months in the City Center project in Las Vegas, NV. [D. Ellenberger]
- DOE needs to provide pre-requisite training requirements to be included in the development of a HAMMER modeled network. [G. Batykefer]
- The HAMMER modeled training should be viewed in terms of the concept, not the facility. HSS is prepared to encourage the Under Secretaries to embrace the dedication of funding to implement the training concept complex wide. HSS has the

organizations/functions that can inspect to insure requirements are being met. [G. Podonsky]

- Need to identify existing requirements, both DOE and Union and use that menu to leverage a new model. [B. McArthur]
- HSS Analysis office suggested expanding lessons learned to/from workers; instill worker involvement ethos; in addition, HS-30, though its analysis function can work with HAMMER in making “business case for safety”. [B. Roege]
- Key component of training requires the “real props” that are a primary investment in the HAMMER facility. The training is as real as it gets, and cannot be duplicated in classroom environment. [R. Ault]
- HAMMER facilities site wide -- Bricks and mortar unlikely - physical assets are present within various union programs and grantees – these need to be identified with regard to developers and deliverers. [R. Ault/HSS]
- DOE funded inspections would go a long way in ensuring consistency in training implementation. [D. Ellenberger]
- HAMMER’s greatest success is its ability to provide training facilitation and coordination; there are a lot of discrepancies in how training is viewed at different sites; needs to be recognized and supported by management at all sites. [M. Gill]

2. BASELINE OF CURRENT TRAINING INITIATIVES

- HAMMER success is directly related to peer training (workers from the site/site specific experience), training workers at that site. Need to set up workers onsite who are trained and up-do-date. [T. Schaffer]
- HAMMER modeled training is about developing and maintaining relationships; checking back to see how the workers are doing. [K. McGinnis]
- Worker trainers are the human capital of the organization. [C. Hughes]
- NIEHS offers to help with base lining of training for DOE; identified the need for HSS leverage at other sites to ensure consistency and the need to create contractor partner involvement and enforcement, as well as, the need for construction safety reciprocity across the sites. [C. Hughes]
- It was reported that there are 168 union worker training facilities throughout the US and Canada. [G. Batykefer]

3. STANDARDIZATION OF TRAINING REQUIREMENTS SITE-WIDE

- It would be beneficial for DOE to establish basic requirements (e.g., 10 hour OSHA) from which reciprocity across DOE sites can be defined. [G. Batykefer]
- Provision of a pre-qualified list of contractors will improve this situation. Federal vs. contractor creates barriers to worker access. [B. McCabe]
- Provisions for an established list of preferred sub-contractors recognized by DOE to perform work as qualified contractors who meet the criteria established in this exercise would incorporate pre-qualified workers to some degree, as well as, a performance and favorable track record working in the DOE network. [G. Batykefer]
- Full DOE management support to worker access to training is imperative (e.g., via contract vehicles that would exclude health and safety training funding cuts). [D. Molnna]

- Inconsistency in training access to workers at some sites was reported by the USW. USW reports Oak Ridge – 29, Portsmouth - 89, Paducah - 23, Hanford - 32, INL - 1, WIPP – 0. [D. Stephens]
- HSS is working toward ensuring Federal accountability; want to leverage HSS responsibility for policy, oversight, and enforcement to encourage the federal force to “do the right thing”; HSS needs to lead the charge in encouraging the support of the DOE Under Secretaries. [G. Podonsky]

4. SPECIALTY TRAINING

- Incident investigation, hazard identification, near miss programs are prevention training programs that are needed and should be jointly run by both workers and managers. [D. Stephens]
- Need to quantify reliability/target modernizations of old infrastructure (e.g. Y-12) [R. Ault]
- Need to look at infrastructure beyond design life; how this forces the crafts to carry “expert based intellectual property” [MJ Campagnone]
- Analysis is ineffective without accurate reporting; safety is separate from reliability; HSS to follow-on with an analysis of cost vs. liability – DOE to share complex wide analytic results [B. Roege]
- Question proposed as to how this gets communicated to the contractor who “wants to get the work done” – what mechanism is in place? [D. Weinstock]
- HSS can be a forcing mechanism with the Under Secretaries through its Analysis organization. The development of a business model to better account for cost vs. liability. [G. Podonsky]
- Cost vs. liability - these programs need to ensure no retaliation, programs that do not punish (e.g., NRC investigation of the cost of shutdown at Hanford - Tank Farm incident). [R. Ault]

5. “ONE SIZE DOES NOT FIT ALL” [Delivery of training - online/classroom/hands on]

- Need to recognize how people learn – what modalities are most effective [MJ Campagnone]
- The younger workforce responds to more high tech approach in computerized and/or instructor led classroom setting; training can be customized and cost effective without replacing the classroom because of economic issues. [E. Harmon]
- Blended training is ideal – awareness through online training and classroom and hands on tailored to the audience [C. Hughes]
- The criteria is the effectiveness – classroom vs. interactive [D. Ellenberger]
- Utilization of all types of training that is tailored to the audience and fulfills the intent. [R. Ault]