

Meeting Summary

Note: The DOI Occupational Safety & Health Council is referred to as SHC or the Council in the following notes.

Council Members Present: Barry Noll (OSH), Dave Schuller (OSH), Armando Galindo, Jr. (OSH), Mike May (NPS), Rose Capers-Webb (BSEE), Bill Miller (USGS), Anthony Zepeda (USGS), Dave Choiniere (USGS), Wayne Martin (USGS), Mary Parkinson (FWS), Monte Bowman (BOR), Paul Holley (IA), and Herbert Carpenter (BLM)

Call in participants: Bob Garbe (OSH), Kate Sawyer (OSH), Tim Radtke (OSH); Vickki Johnson and Carmen Craddock (DOI HR) called in for SMIS update.

Meeting Agenda:



December 2015 SHC
Agenda revised final 1

Bureau Roundtable

USGS – Bill Miller. Recently the bureau had gone through realignment and his office had been working through the operational process. The bureau is also revising its policies similar to the other bureaus. They are also fine-tuning the IAS application to make sure it's functional before the other bureaus begin to use it. In the process of implementing the Personal Hazard Analysis database bureau-wide; expecting to roll it out sometime in January 2016. A deputy position was created as part of the realignment and Wayne Martin has become Bill's deputy.

Anthony Zepeda briefed that the bureau is conducting routine Industrial Hygiene (IH) surveys of various centers and field activities with additional assistance provided out in the field. He mentioned that a few months ago there was an IH issue involving renovation at the Reston VA facility and the Interior Business Center was a recipient of some of the renovation dust and had to talk with the department (Armando Galindo and Bob Garbe) to determine who would take the lead – there was a third party IH group that came in and conducted sampling that resulted in levels less than the levels that would require protection measures.

Wayne Martin discussed the employee fatality that occurred at Grand Canyon National Park which required an investigation. The employee died of heat stress. The bureau found that it lacked a *Death and Serious Injury Protocol Handbook* and ultimately used portions of the NPS' handbook. The bureau put together an internal working group to address this need and to create a bureau specific death and serious injury handbook; Wayne asked if BLM would share their handbook before it goes final. The lack of a death and serious injury handbook seems to be common among many of the bureaus.

BLM – Herb Carpenter. His office has been tasked with taking the lead in fielding GPS units for employees due to increased safety concerns while performing field work. The bureau put together a proposal to centrally fund approximately a 1000 GPS field units this year and also buy the advanced services that would also allow two-way texting. With his office's proposal to centrally fund the cost of

these types of units and advanced services, it would help alleviate the field unit's cost concerns. The bureau is also working on rolling out the "send word now" program bureau-wide that would also allow texting capability. The bureau is looking at creating a casualty manual to assist in identifying all actions that should occur when there is an employee fatality. Steve Schlientz offered to provide a point-of-contact for the Forest Service's Land Mobile Radio Program and also provide a copy of the Forest Service's Death and Serious Injury Handbook.

FWS – Mary Parkinson. The national office is spending a lot of time on revising bureau polices – currently updating the electro-fishing, electrical safety, risk management, and several of the heavy equipment polices. Mary's office is very pleased with the support they are getting from her management. The bureau is also developing a FWS specific online 8-hour HAZWOPER refresher course.

BSEE/BOEM –Rose Capers-Webb. The bureau is still working on updating its safety and health program. Over the past year, a complete program evaluation was performed bureau-wide to determine status of all site programs. The bureau will now be working on making program improvements.

BOR – Monte Bowman. Reclamation's accident investigation directive is currently being revised. In the revision, the bureau is also looking to address the same issue with the fatality protocols as the other bureaus are seeking to do as well and they are looking to use the NPS handbook as the initial source but will likely not go as into as much detail they had done. The Bureau's 21 Safety Action Teams are finishing up and are expected to be complete with its final work to be approved sometime in January 2016. Reclamation is setting up a Safety Advisory Board, consisting of all upper-management staff, which will handle the implementation of the 21 safety action team recommendations. In addition, his office is expected to get additional staff to assist with the implementation process. This year the HQ office conducted safety program management evaluations of two of its regions and four focused programmatic audits that are directed annually by the DASHO. The safety management evaluations focused only on questioning staff about the safety program and did not include looking at any of its facilities. The focused audits looked at hazardous energy control and confined spaces.

NPS – Mike May. He shared with the Council that the NPS has been developing a national safety, health and wellness strategy to try to build consistency across its 408 Park units. The initial rollout has already taken place and he will brief the Council later during his presentation on the remaining phases of the strategy. The NPS is conducting its own Serious Accident Investigation (SAI) training to build up its team capacity and in doing so has been able to train approximately 40 of its own employees per class versus the seven or eight that they would typically get in the inter-agency SAI course. They are planning to rewrite their SAI training course using their learning and development team. One significant change is to add more hands-on training using scenario based sessions versus the typical classroom type presentation training that has been offered in the past. The office of risk management, law enforcement, and work force management are now starting to develop a suicide prevention and awareness program that would focus more on what other law enforcement agencies are doing that include better peer-to-peer support. The bureau just recently filled three of its regional safety manager positions.

BIA/BIE – Paul Holley. This year his office was able to complete a contract to finish developing the bureau's Safety SharePoint site. The Safety SharePoint site needed to be replicated to allow use by the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) due to the bureau's reorganization. His office is also working on a Line of Duty Death protocol similar to what the other DOI bureaus' addressed a need for. The bureau completed its three safety program evaluations in three regions this year. The Indian Affairs reorganization is still ongoing and will result in BIE becoming its own standalone bureau. His office

is currently awaiting the final Inspector General's report on Safety and Worker's Compensation programs since the Worker's Compensation program responsibilities falls within his office.

OSH – Barry Noll. Barry briefed the current activities within the Office of Occupational Safety and Health. The safety program evaluation conducted by OSH is currently undergoing a process change which will include the use of a U.S. Public Health Service Officer and no longer use the current team of contractors from Federal Occupational Health. The one Public Health Service Officer will be conducting the safety and health program evaluations. Since the program evaluations will only use approximately 6 to 9 months of the officer's time, the remaining time will likely be used to supplement industrial hygiene field work under Capt. Tim Radtke. The new position will be located in DC. The one piece of the safety program evaluation process that the office is still trying to capture is the need to have an organizational behaviorist on the team. This position is only a recent addition to the evaluation team and we have only had them participate on three of the evaluations. The office is also in the process of developing an online employee safety course that should be finished and released by the end of fiscal year 2016. This course, as well as the executive and supervisor courses, that the OSH office created is not meant to replace any current bureau training course but rather to complement them.

As a reminder, DOI is a National Safety Council (NSC) corporate member. As a corporate member, a DOI representative sits on several of the NSC safety committees. Barry sits on the NSC Transportation Safety Committee; currently that committee is heavily focused on over the road trucks and school buses. The NSC just created a new "government committee" that is expected to have representatives from local government up to federal; the formal structure of the committee has not been determined yet – he will release information as it comes out. If any bureaus are interested in having a representative participating on any of the NSC committees, please let Barry know and he inform the NSC.

Occupational Medicine & Industrial Hygiene Programs Update – Bob Garbe, Tim Radtke, and Kate Sawyer

Tim began his update discussing the exposure assessment module. There are over 70 assessments entered already into the system and somewhere between 850 and 1000 individual tasks that have been assessed and entered. A few changes that have been made to the system are the upload capability feature for files and photos. There is also a new "request for assessment" page so that a log can be compiled to determine assessment needs.

Future work plans include a noise module which will include a database of sound level meter readings and a modeling calculator that will allow you to plug in assessed data and then be able to calculate the noise exposure in an eight hour period. There have been several assessments conducted the last few months; one assessment has been done on trail work and silica exposure which identified an overexposure to silica. This particular assessment also looked at hand tool use. Herb asked Tim if there is going to be a characterization based on geography, essentially focusing on specific geographic areas with levels of silica. Tim responded that during these assessments they already knew the geology of the area and percent of silica in the rocks that the employees were working on. That geologic data is in the assessments that will assist in making a judgment for a particular area. Herb also asked if there was going to be an official policy letter or assessment on the lines of the risk of fire crews using respirators versus the risk of silica. Tim responded stating that there is still a need for better characterization on that of fire type work before any type of judgments can be made in certain areas, such as placing firefighters in respirators, which would likely be the last thing they would want to do.

Tim briefed that he has been working on one of the projects with the Forest Service is a research agenda for wildland fire. In the priority of topics, the issue with silica and naturally occurring asbestos

were highlighted. Silica is popping up quite frequently in the exposure assessment database priority list. Another item that is high on the priority list is noise exposure. He has also been working with NIOSH on an HHE at Carlsbad Caverns which is a more in depth look that also looks at the seasonal variations in the caves, which would provide data that would assist in determining limitations to control the radon exposure in the caves. This information could also be used to address exposures in other types of caves, such as those found in abandoned mines. Herb mentioned that his interns and staff are working on a guidance document. The Denver OSH office has been coordinating with the Department's Emergency Management office on the biosafety by security issues that continue to come up. Anthony asked Tim a question on the sound level data collected and entered in the database; Tim said the data collected is equipment specific that would allow others that use the same type of equipment to have data and to use in the noise exposure calculator tool to get an exposure profile.

Dr. Kate Sawyer gave an update on the medical program. She has been busy working on the medical standards program and has been doing a lot of validation of reports. She spent time in the Bureau of Reclamation to help create a new medical standard for the rope access program. Kate has also been spending a lot of time assisting in the wildland fire program regarding its medical evaluations and reviews. Due to remoteness of locations and access to clinics, there have been some issues with the capability of getting firefighters audiometry and pulmonary function testing and how to address these shortfalls. Kate has been doing a lot of reviews on medical non-clearances. Herb asked if the agency was moving toward having a standard for firefighters required audiometry testing. Kate stated that our standard already requires audiometric testing but as she said earlier there are capability issues with the remote clinics to provide those services. The goal for the entire program is to have audiometry. Herb also asked if the department is going to provide policy on whether or not firefighters will be in the hearing conservation program; he went on to state that the primary problem is that we don't have any standards to address this. Kate responded and said that the current problem is that they just do not have sufficient documented data on the firefighting program to address the issue. Tim Radke stated that the project that the U.S. Forest Service is doing right now involves the collecting of noise dosimetry data on firefighters in the field and should be helpful to DOI as we move forward on this issue. Kate stated that there is a lot of great progress being made in the medical standards program. She informed the Council that the draft updated medical program handbook is out for review and also posted on SafetyNet.

Overview of Current Forest Service Safety & Health Program – Steve Schlientz

The U.S. Forest Service (FS or Service) seems to have similar issues as many of the bureaus mentioned during the roundtable. Some background on the FS – on average it has approximately 40,000 people in its service during peak seasonal times of the year, this year alone they had 25,000 firefighters. The FS currently has 175 safety managers and on the headquarters staff, there are currently six employees. Recently the bureau started using an electronic safety reporting system, called "E-Safety," that integrates worker's compensation reporting. The system was created for the private sector with the Service being the first government agency that has developed a completely integrated system. In the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as a whole, it had \$71 million in Worker's Comp. costs two years ago with the Forest Service making up about 50% of those costs. Over the last two years the Service has reduced its Worker's Comp. costs \$6 million. With the use of this new electronic system, the Service's Worker's Comp. specialists can now run robust reports to better manage the cases. The initial challenge was to get to get the old compensation cases off the rolls. Additionally, work culture changes helped to reduce the number of reportable injuries. Work effort resulted in a reportable case reduction of approximately 26% over four years.

Steve briefed the Coordinated Response Protocol which was created to replace their serious accident investigation process. It was started in December 2012 and it took about 18 months to assess where they were, to develop a process, vet it through regions using focus group meetings all before a final

process was created that would satisfy the vision of the Chief of the Forest Service. In general the service has been very pleased with the new process – however, there are some areas where they need to do some additional work.

Steve stated that overall the Service has seen a significant change in work culture over the last few years. Every single leader talks about safety with every meeting being started with a discussion about safety. Every event ends with an after-action report with safety being one of the items that is discussed. In addition, the Service holds six safety engagements twice a year with a spring and a fall session. In the spring, when all the seasonal and temporary employees are on duty, they hold a four to a six-hour safety session. In the fall, at the end of the season, they hold another 4 to 6 hour session to gain insight on how well things went.

With regards to serious accident fatality investigations, Steve said that the Service learned that they could do a simple law enforcement death investigation in about two weeks and use those results so the family could begin the process to get death benefits. A lesson learned that they wanted to share with DOI.

Briefing on Forest Service CRP/FLA – Barry Noll & Armando Galindo

Barry and Armando talked a little about their experiences as observers on the Forest Service's dispatched Coordinated Response Protocol teams. Forest Service's Coordinated Response Protocol (CRP) is designed to minimize the impact of the accident review process on land management agency personnel who may have witnessed or participated in the event where an accident occurred.

Armando was tasked to participate as an observer at the Forest Service's South Lake Tahoe fatality incident. On this incident the response team was quite large and with team members that covered almost every aspect of a firefighting operation from PPE, to first responders, to air activities, etc. There were approximately 19 people assigned to this CRP team. Mike mentioned that the incident involved a 20 person fire crew and the CRP response team consisted of 19 people, which to him seemed more negative as a heavy footprint rather than just sending possibly 4 or 5 people to investigate. Barry said he will respond to it when he presents his perspective and experiences. Armando said that during the interview process there were only two or three people in the room at any given time so the individual being interviewed would not feel comfortable. The interviews provided a collection of narratives from different perspectives. Due to him having to depart, he was not involved in the CRP Phase 3 portion. The timeframe between phases one and two, Steve Schlientz mentioned that it's approximately 24 to 48 hours from initial notice of an incident to having a team on site. Herb inquired about team sizes on responses, specifically in how the size would impact operational capabilities. Steve mentioned that the size of the team and the duration on-site depends on the level and complexity of the incident. Armando stated that he felt the amount of information had been collected to draft the report and their pending recommendations would address everything that he felt were correctable. The response itself was well-managed, especially with the amount of resources dispatched.

Barry talked about his experience on the response team for the *Twist River Fire*. He felt the CRP process worked really well. The first item he talked about was the joint delegation of authority letter; the delegation letter comes out from the Forest Service's DASHO similar to how the DOI delegation letters come out but the FS's letter goes out to a pre-designated team lead, basically a trained and ready team on standby. Mike stated that the NPS has standby teams. Barry discussed an interesting statement within the FS's letter that states "you as the response team leader have the Chief of the Force Service's full authority to execute and complete a thorough learning review as well as technical analysis of this tragic accident." Barry stated that he has not seen any delegation letter within the department that says you are operating with the head of the agency's authority. Barry thinks this is

one item that should be looked at for inclusion in the rewriting of the department's delegation letters. The Forest Service's delegation letters also provide a cost accounting code upfront with which those designated to respond can use so that they can travel immediately. The department has experienced some issues with cost accounting when an incident crosses agency boundaries but with the way the CRP joint delegation of authority letter is setup, it removes the accounting issue.

The CRP Phases consist of Phase 1 which is the initial notification of an accident and subsequent deployment of an investigative team; Phase 2 involves all of the information collection; Phase 3 involves taking the information collected in Phase 2 and analyzing it (the sensemaking phase) using many members that were not involved in the collection of the information – with some cross-over of members that were involved, the draft narrative is also created; Phase 4 involves the Learning Review Board activities.

Barry reiterated that the department is only looking at the FS CRP to better understand it and not because the department wants to unilaterally adopt it. Furthermore, Barry stated that a thorough review of the CRP process may lead to identifying certain methods that could be used to improve the DOI investigation process.

Prescription Medication – Bob Garbe & Barry Noll

Bob ask about the historical background on the subject. Mike mentioned that the NPS brought up the issue initially with Barry. Mike gave historical background as to how the subject came up – referencing a government vehicle accident where the employee driver was using prescription medication which indicated the employee shouldn't have been operating a vehicle while taking the medication.

The question that arose after this accident was, “how can you compel or can you legally compel an employee to tell you if he or she is taking prescription medication that could cause impairment?” It is not as simple as, “you can compel them.” Bob responded and stated that in OPM regulations you can require anyone who is in a safety sensitive job, and you have a defensible analysis to support it, that you can require employees to inform you of anything that would affect the safe and efficient performance of that job. Simply taking a prescription medication and divulging that information to the agency doesn't permit the agency to make unilateral decision relative to whether the person actually represents a safety concern. In addition, many prescription medications could reasonably be considered to be related to a disability of some sort and as such the agency would be guided by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) – which would require that individual situations be treated on its own merits. Similar to those programs with medical standards (law enforcement, fire programs, etc.); Bob offered to provide some language that could be used to encourage bureaus or offices to create a policy that “would require employees to report all changes in health status – which would be inclusive of prescription medications.” Herb mentioned that unless you are in a position that has a medical standard, historically agencies' medical polices have been restrained from trying to expand medical requirements to the general population. Kate mentioned that the ADA prohibits an agency from asking all employees to disclose that they are taking prescription medications.

Mike stated that the lack of the agency addressing prescription medication is something that has been overlooked for too long. It's time to look at adding prescription medication use to DOI policy. Mike also stated that it is time to define what “safety sensitive” means because it is unclear. Mike also stated that we need a basic policy to address prescription medication – even if it's in the agency's illicit drug use policy. Bob suggested working with Solicitor and Human Resources (HR) to create a joint HR/Safety policy.

Collateral Duty Safety Officer (CDSO) Program - Barry Noll

Barry began by seeking input from the council to address CDSO program variances in bureaus and to address these variances with the expectation that it would insure more program uniformity from one bureau to the next. The end product of the discussion will be presented to the DASHO Council. A few questions presented to begin the discussion were related to how CDSOs are designated; how are they trained; how much time do they get to do their jobs; and are CDSO performance standards established. Monte and Herb both mentioned that it's common for CDSOs to be over-delegated with additional duties. Paul also stated that this over-delegation also impacts IA full-time safety officers as well. This current process is not very effective due to time commitment constraints for each duty assigned. There was council consensus for the department to create a uniformed CDSO training course that all designated CDSOs could attend. The training course should be held a few times a year or more frequently as needed. Bureaus can supplement the core CDSO training to address bureau-specific safety program requirements.

The council proposed several issues that should be addressed if the expectation is to improve the CDSO program effectiveness. The discussion points would be analyzed and subsequently presented to the DASHO Council to address the program priority needs. For more details on the discussion points, please review the attachment.



CDSO Discussion
Points from Dec 2015

Industrial Hygiene Service Discussion – Bob Garbe and Tim Radke

Tim began the discussion that talking about the industrial hygiene staffing levels that focused on a compiled department staffing list. Based on safety program evaluations, there is a consistent IH deficiency among bureaus. Tim mentioned that the core effort to creating IH programs is based on exposure assessments; currently there is significant on-going effort to complete IH exposure assessments. Barry mentioned that there had been past discussions to augment the DOI OSH IH staff to assist bureaus in meeting their respective IH needs. Basically, setting in motion opportunities that would let bureaus request IH services from OSH, similar to how Bob and Tim are currently requested to conduct field work. Bob also stated that it would be beneficial to create a data driven program that would document exposures and demonstrate to leadership a specific IH need exists. A simple method would be to increase working capital funding to augment the OSH IH staff to get a Public Health Service officer rather than trying to create an FTE. Among other work, this position could also be used to further completion of department-wide exposure assessments and then to assist bureaus in development of relative IH programs. Bill inquired as to why not use the IH working group to do a lot of the field work rather than seeking two additional staff resources to do the work. The response was that the IH working group was setup to look at IH data and to make necessary recommendations to the department.

Anthony mentioned a concern that USGS is having related to the Exposure Assessment (EA) database; it's cumbersome and not user friendly. The EA database needs more programming work. The single programmer is assigned work to two different databases with the EA database not being a priority. The expectation is to conduct exposure assessments, then enter them in the database – so the database needs to function optimally and be useful. Bill was concerned with the current “use” status of the EA database which currently is a “voluntary” database. His main concern is that we are trying to establish an enterprise system to capture exposure information for analysis to implement the IH program, and yet the department is not requiring all bureaus to use it. Bob stated that the department is requesting

funds to establish a Public Health Service position to handle the evaluation program and then to use remaining time to assist with the exposure assessments and to provide bureau IH program support. Bill suggested including EA database support resource needs in the IH initiative for the DASHOs. Mike stated that we need something tangible to give to the executives. Everyone is competing for the same money and so we need to have a compelling argument to justify getting any IH funds. Bill suggested the EA database needs and IH resources needed to conduct any assessment follow-up work be referred back to the IH Work Group; Tim agreed to the request.

More work would be needed to address this subject in more detail, so the consensus of the council was to hold this topic over and continue this discussion at the next SHC meeting.

SAI Shared Operations Discussion – Herb Carpenter

Herb mentioned that the BLM's main constraint is having staffing to conduct SAIs; primarily having qualified "chief investigators." He asked is there a way to pool resources either departmentally or between bureaus so that we can have a better cadre, such as chief investigators, to be ready to serve upon request. How do the bureau managers feel about providing, for example, a chief investigator to serve on an SAI from another bureau? The SAI Team Lead would still come from the respective bureau.

Mike stated that the NPS has a good size investigation cadre and if another bureau had a need, they would query there folks for support. Mike stated that they have two rosters; one for those fully trained and ready to respond as a team member; the other list are those that have been trained but are awaiting a "shadow" assignment. Mary said that they have had one individual from FWS participate in a BLM investigation. The FWS doesn't have a problem helping out when it can, but the concern is that the FWS doesn't want to be included on any rotation schedule. Monte said that BOR has a lot of SAI classroom trained members but very few who have been on an actual investigation. Herb discussed a tree fatality scenario and wanted to know how the other bureaus would have handled the investigation – send a full SAI team or a single investigator. With the exception of USGS, all would have sent a team to investigate, consisting of three to four members. Barry suggested that we go back to looking at the emergency management's ROSS system that we talked about last year. This system would let a bureau that has an investigative need to call-up someone from this system. The bureaus would decide if or how they would use the system. There would still be a need to enter names of qualified investigation team members before it could be useful to others. Barry mentioned that the concept of using a trained investigator from another bureau could be done since they do a specific type of work, that is – technical investigative work. Barry summarized the discussion – look at some type of exercise scenario for SAI trainees to get them off of a "shadow type" list to a "fully-trained" list; begin a review of SAI policy – seems that it may be time to address some needed changes; and lastly to look at some form of a dispatching mechanism that could work across agency boundaries – whether that is ROSS or some other mechanism.

Safety Management Information System (SMIS) Update – Armando Galindo

Armando briefed the following new additions to the SMIS application: updated the home page; updated employee module interphase (user guide completed); updated the supervisor reporting module interphase; added an upload feature to the SMIS accident reporting module; added the upload feature to USGS Inspection and Abatement System (IAS) module; added the upload feature to Exposure Assessment (EA) module, also will expand to individual shops and tasks; report reviewers can now reassign an accident/property report; made changes to safety manager's dashboard; and made changes to the OWCP form section. The SMIS team will continue to work on fixes identified by high end users; expanding the OSHA report to include Youth Conservation Corps; importing IAS to BLM, BOR, and FWS; completing upload capability to all of EA; hearing conservation module to EA with noise calculator; safety manager report generator; NPS park reporting module; expanding email

notifications to address OWCP timeliness issues; new manual for supervisor module; working with BIA to separate BIE from BIA; contracting new programmers to meet new security expectations for all federal IT assets in lieu of OPM breach.

Bill mentioned that he would like to see an opportunity at some point to be able to upload electronic SAI reports into SMIS. Barry suggested possibly creating a repository for the electronic reports. A comment was made regarding maintaining employee medical records that are a department-wide problem. Bob stated that all of the medical records belong to OPM and we are just the custodian of records. Bob also stated that the best program to house records, that he is aware of, is in the wildland fire program. Bob mentioned also that he believes HR conducts evaluations and reviews of bureau HR programs but that is not fully aware of what that encompasses but he does not believe it includes medical records program. Vickki Johnson responded and confirmed that the HR accountability program audits that are conducted at bureaus do not include a review of medical records in place in that program. Vicki also went on to explain a recent HR Directors meeting that included the topic of medical records and how bureaus were storing them. Based on that meeting, there were differences in how bureaus were actually storing them - some were using eOPF to store them but then OPM required that the bureaus remove them - other bureaus were storing them in file cabinets in facilities.

SMIS Functionality Discussion – Barry Noll

Barry gave some background on department discussions related to the future of SMIS and its ability to communicate with other department systems. The OSH office picked Maximo as the first system to attempt to have SMIS communicate with. Barry explained that Maximo's primary purpose is to track facility condition surveys and to create work orders.

Barry opened the functionality discussion by asking the bureaus "What do you want SMIS to do for you?" SMIS is undergoing enhancements and OSH would like to get specifics from the bureaus on what functionality do you need from the SMIS. The objective is to make SMIS more than what it really is. So the question for the users is if they had to envision a SMIS of the future, what would it look like? This discussion is not to make a decision; it is only to collect information for planning purposes.

Mary stated that a real challenge using SMIS is pulling out data. Herb mentioned that a critical issue with the use of the system is the ability to data mine the database. Vickki also said that she and others would like to see a more robust system that could accommodate everyone. She also said that she would be interested in seeing a system that could also provide, as Herb stated, a more predictive analysis process that could be used in other programs, specifically in the worker's compensation program. Vicki went on to say that a system that could provide this type of predictive analysis keeps the agency, as a whole, ahead of the game as opposed to being in a reactive mode. To actually be able to pull data from the system that could provide decision-makers with timely and accurate information is important to not only the worker's comp program but to other programs as well. Bill liked the discussion on the predictive measures and Maximo topics but he would also like to see a linkage to the property databases. Barry stated that we will begin the cross-talk work with Maximo to learn from and then they would try to link it to other systems. David suggested a smaller drop-down menu of selectable options that would improve the ease of pulling like cases from the system; this would also simplify the ability to trend data. Bob suggested possibly creating a primary drop-down list and then immediately below that would be the remaining options.

NPS National Safety Strategy Presentation – Mike May

Mike stated that the National Park Service made some tremendous strides in reshaping its culture, most of which started with the introduction of the behavior-based safety program called Operational Leadership. To date they have trained over 23,000 employees. Mike stated that the National Park

Service, since its creation, has averaged at least one fatality a year up until the last two years with which they had no fatalities. This was not by accident. There is disparity in the safety programs between the parks. Leadership understands and knows there are pockets within the National Park Service that have deficient programs. Leadership wanted a collaborative venture between the Washington office and all of the parks and so they created “conversations” to begin the collaboration. The presentation contains a breakdown of this new strategy. Mike said that he will share the presentation as soon as he can once all of the implementation tiers have been officially rolled out by the Bureau. For more detailed information on this topic, please contact Mike May.

DOI Watercraft Committee Update – Gary Hill

Gary Hill provided a short DOI Water Safety Work Group (WSWG) activity report.

Over the past week and a half, he and the other committee members determined a date to hold their face-to-face meeting in San Diego, which will be January 5-7, 2016.

During this meeting they will review all watercraft accidents that occurred in FY 2015 and they will continue to review the MOCC instructor and student manuals. There is a new initiative that the FWS will bring up called “GOS” which stands for gear over the side. They will look at safer ways to conduct science while pulling instrumentation or anything that is towed behind a boat. They are also planning to hold an MOCC while at this meeting. Recently NCTC released an updated version of the MOCC refresher course that is in DOI learn and there are some really positive things in this new revision; it will be interactive, it will have power points, videos, animations, and a full review of the 15 chapters currently in the MOCC, as well as an online test. Gary mentioned that several months ago Barry asked that he contact Teresa Cole, from the National Safety Council, regarding interest in participating in their marine program. Gary sent her emails and never received a reply and then he finally learned that she is no longer the chair of the marine program committee. Barry said that he would do some research and see who is in charge of that committee now.

Gary stated that he has heard of rumors related to some legislation that would exempt federal employees from going through a state process to get a state boating card. He intends to look further into this and to bring it up at the committee meeting in San Diego. The U.S. Forest Service is interested in adopting DOI’s MOCC standards; they have no formal boat training within their bureau. Herb mentioned that he did not believe that federal employees could be compelled to get a state boating license. Gary said he would look into it. Herb asked are we going to be changing our documentation to address the new PFD labeling requirements. Gary stated we would have to supplement our policies once the official Coast Guard policy goes into effect.

2015 OIG Report Discussion – Bill Miller

Bill inquired as to what the next steps would be for the OIG inspection report. The OSH office is not involved in any action related to the OIG report. Barry did mention that the OIG report response was being written by Mary Pletcher. The OIG interviewed people from most of the Bureau’s even though the report findings were focused at the department level. No further information to share.

Alternate Standard Development for “Sigg” Fuel Bottle Use – Barry Noll & Dave Schuller

Barry briefed that at some point in the past the U.S. Forest Service applied to OSHA for a supplemental standard specifically for “Sigg” fuel bottles. OSHA concurred with their request and granted the Forest Service the authority to use these bottles subject to the provisions of the Supplemental Standard. It is important to note that the authority to use this type of fuel bottles had only been granted to the Forest Service, and therefore the Forest Service cannot legally extend that coverage to any DOI bureau. In order for any DOI agency to use these bottles legally, DOI will also have to apply to OSHA for approval of its own supplemental standard. Similarly, any state firefighting agencies that use the transportation guide (see below link) will have to individually apply to OSHA for a supplemental standard in order to use this type of fuel bottle. OSH recommends that

the Department pursue the OSHA supplemental standard since there is still a need within the DOI to use these fuel bottles. The SHC concurred and OSH will take the lead on the recommendation.

Transporting Aluminum Fuel Bottles Inside Aircraft

<http://www.fs.fed.us/t-d/pubs/htmlpubs/htm03512315/>

Interagency Aviation Transport of Hazardous Materials Guide, available at

http://www.fs.fed.us/fire/aviation/av_library/index.html.

Safety Awards Program – Dave Schuller

Dave briefed the newly created *Interior Safety & Health Achievement Award*. This new award is for the *Safety and Health Award of Excellence* nominations that were not selected due to the rigid selection requirements of the award. As a result, OSH created this lower-level Departmental award for the nominees that have contributed greatly to the value of the safety and health of employees, visitors, and volunteers and are deserving of Departmental recognition nonetheless. After bureau and office review, OSH will publish the new guidance in the DOI Safety and Health Award Instruction. This award instruction will serve as a policy bulletin and as the primary source of information to provide guidance to the bureaus and offices on the DOI safety awards. This award will be managed solely by the Office of Occupational Safety and Health and will not be part of the overall Convocation Honor Awards Program. Additionally, the award will consist of a safety coin, engraved with the nominee's name, and a certificate. The current plan is to have the DOI DASHO sign the certificate of recognition; should the DASHO not concur with this proposal, the alternative plan will be to have the Director of OSH sign the certificate.

DASHO Agenda Discussion – Barry Noll

Barry sought DASHO agenda topics from the SHC.

- **Next DASHO meeting:** March 7, 2016
- Suggested agenda topics:
 - CDSO Program
 - Personal flotation device labeling requirement

Other Business – Open to the Council

Determine SHC meeting schedule.

Calendar Year 2016 SHC Meeting Schedule:

- March 1-2, 2016 – Denver, CO
 - June 8-9, 2016 – Reston, VA
 - August 31 – September 1, 2016 – San Francisco, CA
Tentatively at San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park
 - November 30 – December 1, 2016 – Reston, VA
-

Action Items

Action #	Action/Task	Resource Assigned to Task	Completion Date
1	Create a CDSO paper for DASHO Council	Barry Noll	By 3/7/16
2	From SAI Discussion. Evaluate possible exercise scenarios for SAI trainees; Start SAI policy review; Evaluate a “dispatching” mechanism that could work across agency boundaries (e.g., ROSS or some type)	DOI OSH	ASAP