

CONSTRUCTION WORKER SAFETY TRAINING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING 08/04/2010

Attendees:

Randy Coleman
Greg Gales
Frank Hejmanowski
Bob Legard
Karen McGinnis
Stan Scott

Deana Colley
Ted Giltz
Nadine Highland
Steve Maki
Red McKennon
Bill Taylor

Kristin Eby
Paul Gravelle
Gary Karnofski
Mark Manderbach
John Roberts

Red McKennon chaired the meeting.

I. SAFETY TOPIC:

Bob Legard provided the Safety Topic on Hanford's Site Wide Safety Procedures. Bob said that he wanted to make sure that our affiliates from offsite are aware of the standard safety culture at Hanford to know how important it is to take safety home and apply what you've learned.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

The meeting minutes from the May 19, 2010 meeting were approved.

III. STATUS UPDATES:

Program Schedule

Bob Legard started by saying that several months ago he, Red (McKennon), Jim (Gamin), and Steve (Maki) put together a prioritized schedule to identify the most urgent needs for the program. Bob reported that most of these items have been completed. A few items associated with the Site Wide Safety Program were held up pending completion of Site Wide Standardization.

Karen McGinnis said the equivalency process is very cumbersome because every company has their own program for evaluating equivalencies. Bob (Legard) has to interface with the Interpretive Authorities for each of the contractors and it is those Interpretive Authorities that are busy doing Site Wide Standardization. The Interpretive Authorities are tapped out and Bob (Legard) is doing the best that he can. Currently, they do not have the time to go through the materials to be able to approve equivalencies.

Bob Legard noted that he has better success when the equivalency requests come individually because it is quicker to chase them down one at a time. Once he has completed the effort, a memorandum is drafted and documented by obtaining the appropriate signatures.

Tables have been developed that help the Interpretive Authorities (IA) determine whether a course is equivalent or not. The purpose of the table is to identify the page number referencing which training requirement or Learning Objective was met. The table provides the IA with a quick reference and therefore he/she doesn't have to spend as much time reading through the course material. The table has helped, but it is still a slow process.

Training Equivalency

Bob Legard gave the equivalency statistics for FY 2010. There are as follows:

690 equivalencies granted
\$383,746 tuition cost avoided
\$706,030 man/hour cost avoided
\$1,089,776 total cost avoided

Bob also provided a comparison chart of FY 2009 and FY 2010 total costs avoided. Bob (Legard) stated that currently we are a little below the FY 2009 marks, but noted that we still have approximately two months left in this fiscal year.

Several questions were asked regarding what the numbers represent and how figures are obtained.

Red McKennon clarified that the cost avoidance represents training that did not occur because equivalencies were developed.

Bob Legard described the method he uses to get these totals and added that the same method is used each time to remain consistent. First, he generates a Crystal Report that queries the classes that construction workers typically are required to take. By using the same query each time, the reporting remains consistent. Bob put the information up on the screen for all to see and described what each column was depicting. Bob added that he maintains a quarterly chart, as well.

Web Page

Bob Legard said we have done a lot of work on the web page. He mentioned that Kristin Eby is here to answer any questions that may come up. Basically, the HAMMER is revamping the external web page. Bob pulled up a demo of the new external web site up on the computer for everyone to see. He showed where the Construction Worker Safety web page is going to be located, the web address is www.hammertraining.com. He pointed out the red tool bar showing the clickable "CWSTP, Construction Worker Safety Training Program" and continued to demonstrate how to navigate through the page. Bob mentioned that we also have a new video and then played it for the subcommittee.

Red McKennon said he thought the web page was well done.

Bob Legard thanked Michelle Edwards and Kristin Eby for their hard work. He mentioned that Vivid Learning Systems filmed and edited the video and also thanked Karen McGinnis for backing the effort.

Red McKennon mentioned that all of the Technical Authorities should be signing the same document not just CHPRC.

Bob Legard noted some changes to the memorandums were made such as adding each company's Training Manager as well as the appropriate Interpretive Authority (IA), the HAMMER Director Karen McGinnis and the Building Trade affiliate Training Director. The addition of these signatures conveys that the review is complete and that the training is considered equivalent.

Red McKennon said there should be a listing of Business Agents and Points-of-Contact for the Subcontractors.

After some discussion, it was decided to add a hyperlink to the local Building Trades affiliate logo so that when clicked their website will launch.

Mark Manderbach said that he has asked his secretary to compile a list of Business Agents and Points-of-Contact for the Subcontractors.

Kristin Eby said that the hyperlink could be added and also asked for pictures since the video would not utilize the entire space.

IV. Items for Discussion:

Database

Bob Legard described the intent behind the database as a method to track employees training records and eliminate redundant training by entering the employees' completed training into a database and having it accessible to the Subcontractors. Currently these records are behind the Hanford firewall and the Subcontractors cannot access the files.

Bob said that the Building Trades recently started including him at their pre-job meetings with the Subcontractors to answer any training questions that they may have. He said that he would cover this more in Open Discussion.

Red McKennon said the two focus areas are the database and accessibility. The database stores information, however, accessing the data is the more difficult with respect to the training plans, objectives, and requirements. Red was of the opinion that there is no existing means to deliver what everybody wants but in the interim there are Points-of-Contact that know the training requirements and will ensure each individual has a training plan. He mentioned that there are also issues with the reimbursement program yet to work through.

Reimbursement/Pilot Program

Stan Scott stated the purpose of the Pilot Program and gave a brief history regarding efforts to get this part of the program approved. Meetings have been held to explore other opportunities. For instance, a mechanism through the State Employment Security office and the Dislocated Workers Program was discovered through a meeting with Work Source. However, due to stipulations and a limited amount of funding, this opportunity is not being pursued.

Bob Legard gave a report about the HAZWOPER program showing the magnitude of students who could potentially benefit from this program. He reported the following for the period from April 2009 to date:

220 members inquire about the class.

Roughly, 110 members have completed the class.

60 members actually have received jobs on the Hanford Site.

Gary Karnofski said that he would like to talk with Work Source again because favorable changes have taken place that may provide an opportunity to work together. For two or three years, Work Source, the National Training Center (NTC) and the Health Safety and Security division under Glenn Podonsky have been working together. HAMMER staff members Bob Legard, Randy Coleman, and Pat Aldridge have been participating with the National Training Center as well as the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) to do collaborations around the complex. Gary stated that this opportunity is an 851 tie-in.

Randy Coleman said HSS has reached out to the unions and they had a list of topics. One of topics was training, which lead to discussion about the HAMMER model and 851 was tied-in for consistent roles and responsibilities at the sites and the National Training Center.

Gary Karnofski mentioned that HAMMER staff members have recently been to LANL and also had a conference call with NIEHS. There is interest in implementing the successes that the Hanford Site has experienced and the HSS and NTC are putting together a white paper on things to move forward on such as: the Construction Worker Program which was suggested due to the tremendous success of the program. The Construction Worker program is being considered as a complex-wide activity. Savings could be realized through tuition coverage and would be exponential if implemented across the DOE complex. NTC understands the Hanford model and knows that this model is not common across the complex. This program will not be an immediate fix but the white paper is being developed and the Construction Worker Program is definitely being considered.

Pre Jobs

Bob Legard noted that the Building Trades have included him in their pre-job meetings with the Subcontractors to answer any Training questions that may come up and to be able to report back to the HAMMER about the number of workers who will need training. HAMMER also prepared information sheets with contact numbers and other pertinent information that will help the Subcontractors with training questions. Bob distributed these information sheets at pre-job

meetings, but this still only gives limited time to get classes scheduled and prepare for these employees. The intent is to put these into a packet and distribute at pre-bid meetings. An information sheet was displayed for the subcommittee to see. Bob described the contents of the document and provided reasons why each of the sections are needed. He said that the information sheet satisfies one aspect of the database because there is a mechanism to track Subcontractor employees training.

Steve Maki inquired about HID numbers. He wanted to know if an individual's name could be looked up to retrieve an HID number if a student does not remember their HID number.

Bob Legard said they could do that if they have their Social Security number. Bob said because this is going to be on the external website, it's a way for you to call somebody that can get that information for you. This is just a method to get the information.

Legard was asked how many pre-jobs he has participated in.

Bob Legard replied about a dozen or so stating that the meetings are usually held every week on Wednesday. If there are any issues, they have three or four days to get those jurisdictional items resolved. Bob said that he asks questions that will aid the HAMMER in determining if training sessions need to be added to the schedule to accommodate the identified needs. He clarified that HAMMER is trying to get the students on-site quicker and more efficiently.

Gary Karnofski described the differences in contracts to explain why there is difficulty in getting the workers on-site.

Mark Manderbach said that the BTRs put their names in the database to hold spots. If the Subcontractor's sub-tier attends class and doesn't cross the BTRs name off and write-in their own name at the bottom then it looks like the student was a no-show which creates extra costs.

Karen McGinnis mentioned that we have been having some no-show issues. She mentioned a particular class held on a Saturday for 14 people and only 7 showed up.

Mark Manderbach said that efforts are being made to try to train the Subcontractors and their sub-tiers to reduce the no-shows by scheduling ahead of time or holding the spots, but then it is up to the BTR to make sure they are not a no-show.

Greg Gales mentioned that it does help the Subcontractors if Bob is at the pre-job meetings because questions can be asked about needed training or a print-out of the training needs for a particular job containing contact numbers and other information can be provided. Subcontractors are faced with the difficulty of getting a group of 20 workers, collect their names and then expect them to sit on the books for three weeks waiting for this job when the workers can go to work somewhere else.

Gary Karnofski said the database and maintaining their records is an improvement and has created efficiency. For instance, if a worker were just performing for one Subcontractor a week prior and then reports to another Subcontractor the next week, their training records follow them to the new job.

Ted Giltz mentioned that HGET, Lockout/Tagout, 40-Hour HAZWOPER, and Rad Worker training are all classes that translate across the Hanford Site.

Karen McGinnis said unless they let their refresher training lapse (and that is why they need a training management system - so they can stay current) students do not have to go back through the 40-hour training.

Gary Karnofski followed Karen by saying that the “lapse in training” subject gets back to the tuition reimbursement issue. He stated that if a worker does not have a job and they are going to lapse in one of our courses, the worker has to pay for it. However, the jobless worker is not going to pay for it because they will wait to go back through another Subcontractor and then the Subcontractor will pay HAMMER to provide the 40-hour session again.

Greg Gales questioned if HGET is the same across the board because they have experienced sending a student to the Vivid center to do HGET and then find that CHPRC doesn’t accept the Vivid version of HGET.

Stan Scott said HGET is the same, but each company has individual modules they tack onto it. The basic program is still the same.

Gary Karnofski mentioned that there might be a two-hour piece they might have to take for CHPRC.

Red McKennon said each company has their own modules. In CHPRC’s case there are eight different modules. They are appended to the HGET, so if a student does not know who their future company will be when they start the training there might be an issue.

Bob Legard noted that HGET is one of the Site Wide Programs, too. Everyone has to complete HGET. Then, when they go to the contractor specific facility, they have to take that extra little bit.

Board of Directors Presentation

Bob Legard presented an outline of what is usually presented at the BOD meeting. It contained a history, brief description of the focus areas, an update of the program and the future of the program.

Red McKennon mentioned that the BOD talked about the definition of success at the last BOD meeting. Red was of the opinion that this subcommittee captured the four or five different topics associated with assigned responsibilities. Red said that he felt that the BOD should be giving some consideration of where this subcommittee is and when the assigned duties will be

completed. Red stated that the subcommittee should be able to claim success on a couple of the focus areas. For example, the equivalency process is robust and is good enough, however, marketing and focus are needed. Equivalencies are now being provided and therefore this subcommittee can say a specific type of training is standardized. He questioned whether the process had been institutionalized to the extent that success could be claimed.

Karen McGinnis stated that she thinks success can be claimed and that there are different levels of success. In order to have standardized training you have to have standardized safety programs. The first one out-of-the-shoot was Lockout/Tagout and that was a clearly a success as a standardized program. People can now take a class and go from one end of the Site to the other.

Randy Coleman said that the Construction Worker Training Program didn't really know what building a standardized program consisted of early on. There were four elements to the process: standardized training, access to training, an accessible database that would hold those qualifications, as well as the equivalency process and reimbursement. This subcommittee set out on a mission to build an organization that would take care of construction workers and their training needs. The success is an organization that we call the Construction Worker Training Program. Bob is at the forefront of that effort involving all the locals. It is not certain what infrastructure will be needed to keep the effort going or moving forward or identifying any additional needs. There is a need to identify deltas that HAMMER or Hanford can fulfill through help with instruction for health and safety training, to provide augmentation to existing courses that would help construction, and provide infrastructure support items as far as classroom or props for locals that would help them in their programs.

Karen McGinnis said HAMMER needs to get its hands around the Subcontractors regarding: when they're going to show up, how they're going to get trained, what they need and how to get them to AMH. Karen requested the help of the forum to better prepare the Subcontractors and stated that this subject is also a Board of Directors topic.

Bob Legard mentioned that one of the items of discussion, the pre-job meetings that he has been attending, go a long ways to identify the training that is needed. He has linked the pre-job meetings together with the Tuesday morning ARRA meetings. Attending both meetings provides insight into what is coming down the road. Bob provided an example with Subcontractor Skanska. At one of the meetings it was announced that Skanska would be building up their work force with an additional 200 workers. Identifying the need in advance helped, however, it could have been better. Bob stated that scheduling the physicals as another issue.

Gary Karnofski noted one thing that is hanging out with this activity is the proposal letter to the Department of Energy (DOE). An endorsement by the BOD to redraft the proposal letter for acceptance of this program as an ongoing activity is necessary because it is a living activity and Gary said that he would find the letter and forward it. The importance of the letter is to obtain DOE buy off on this institutionalized program. In order to accomplish the DOE buy-off, the Construction Worker Safety Subcommittee needs to go back to the Board so the Board endorses

the rest of the program back to DOE. Afterwards, the subcommittee needs to resubmit another letter to the BOD.

Closing Comments

Steve Maki said it would be nice to have the HAMMER course information and the cost.

Gary Karnofski mentioned that the data is probably on the website as much as possible because it is a living activity too. He noted that one-stop shopping for the Construction Worker Program would be very useful.

Bob Legard noted that he had put a little book together to take to the pre-jobs and he had the information on courses and course costs.

Karen McGinnis added that in spite of the RA training surge, a lot is going on here and she expressed her pleasure. This program is getting a lot of interest from HSS. It is a huge success and no other DOE site has gone to this length. Karen said that she thinks the subcommittee will make a great presentation at the Board of Directors and then again on October 7 at the HAMMER Steering Committee. She expects the presentations to be well received. Karen then reminded the group that two Internationals will be attending the Steering Committee meeting and it will be followed closely.

Bill Taylor said they are putting all their muscle behind the standardization of the procedures and the flow down to HAMMER.