

Chair,
Cho Nai Cheung

The Mission of the CAER
**Process Safety Group will
improve safety through
training and sharing
information through
experience gained from
Incident Investigations
and with regulatory
compliance.**

Objectives:

Share process safety
experiences including
incidents

Technical sharing

Educational forum

Regulations updates and
clarifications

Resource networking
Continuous Improvement

Attendees: Chris Bowman (ConocoPhillips), Ken Axe (Shell Refinery), Curtis Tong (Dow), Eric Schneider (Air Products), Tom Dodds (Rhodia), Sabiha Gokcen (Tesoro), Richard Doss (HASA), Matt Brennan (Chevron), Sid Olia and Will Muiru (General Chemical BPW), Steve Peckham (General Chemical RW), Cho Nai Cheung and Nicole Alaniz (CCHS).

Incident discussions

Ken recapped the discussion from last meeting regarding cell phone use and the strong suspicion that it may be the ignition source to a fire at a station. Eric brought up the explosion at the Big Spring Alon Refinery in TX in February and the location of office buildings next to control rooms.

Regulatory Updates

CCHS informed the group that the comment period for the Safety Culture Guidance Document was Monday. This will be finalized and sent out by end of month. CCHS also discussed the recent round of EPA RMP/EPCRA inspections that occurred at the refineries in Contra Costa County. CCHS noted that the inspections went well and each facility did a great job preparing for it. It was also discussed that these EPA audits were focused on the following topics: flares, relief devices to atmosphere, and notifications during an incident. EPA also noted generally that many facilities may not be timely in their notification to all the proper agencies (e.g. state OES not just CCHS). It was also discussed that the group believes it is the intent of EPA to inspect these facilities on a 3-year cycle.

General Discussion

The group continued their discussion on process safety metrics, specifically the leading indicators. At the last meeting it was decided that the group would discuss with subject matter experts and evaluate the metrics to see which ones could be readily applied. The group went through each indicator and gave feedback based on what their company thought in terms of ability to track the indicators and whether these are worthwhile indicators to track. The following are a list of comments the group had on the different leading indicators:

- MI: The first indicator listed for mechanical integrity was something the facilities felt they would be able to track, but not as an aggregated value but rather in subdivided sections (e.g. relief device, pressure equipment, etc.) The second indicator was felt by the group to be too broad to determine what should be tracked. The group felt that there should be more clarification on what CCPS means by equipment that is in a failed state. The group proposed the tracking item beis the number of times equipment was left in service beyond the acceptable operating parameters/capabilities.
- Action Item Follow up: The first comment was that depending on your facility you will either look at this as a whole or in separate topics as some

Chair,
Cho Nai Cheung

The Mission of the CAER
**Process Safety Group will
improve safety through
training and sharing
information through
experience gained from
Incident Investigations
and with regulatory
compliance.**

Objectives:

Share process safety
experiences including
incidents

Technical sharing

Educational forum

Regulations updates and
clarifications

Resource networking
Continuous Improvement

facilities use different databases to track action items from different sources (e.g. PHA, Incident Investigations, etc.). Secondly it was discussed that to be more accurate as to the intent of the indicator the word action item should be replaced with recommendation. There was also a discussion on aggregating overdue items with items that received approved extensions. It was decided that only overdue items would be tracked but if the facility has the capacity to track items that received approved extensions they should do so as a separate number.

- MOC: In the discussion of the leading indicators for MOC's, the group felt that the indicators were difficult to accomplish and were not clear on how to decide on a percentage of MOC's required to audit. It was brought up that a better indicator would be to look at how many temporary MOC's were not closed by their approved end date. The percentage of start-up indicator was deemed unfavorable and unclear.
- Training: The groups expressed that training and especially competency is a good indicator; however, difficult to assess and measure and therefore the proposed indicator ~~isand~~ seen as weak in directly relating to safety improvements.
- Safety Culture: CCHS is already putting together a guidance document.

It was decided that facilities could focus on three of these indicators: MI, action items follow-up and MOC as a trial basis. Please send note to Cho Nai if you would like to propose different indicators be tracked.

Next Meeting

Finalize the leading indicators as a group and start tracking these metrics for 2008. There is also going to be ISS training on May 14 delivered by Dennis Hendershot. More details to come.

The next regular meeting is scheduled for May 21st at 1350 Arnold Drive, 1st floor conference room from **10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.** (This meeting is being move due to the ISS workshop) I will be sending reminder notices so please confirm your attendance to the meeting by end of day Tuesday May 20. Hope to see you all at the next meeting.