

Safety, Health and Environment Leadership Team (SHELT)

30th January 2015
10am – 12 Noon
LT266, Roderic Hill, South Kensington Campus

Minutes

Present: Michael Lytrides – Director of Estates Projects – (ML)
Denis Murphy – Estates Projects Construction Safety Manager – (DM)
Stephen Hughes – Head of Safety Estates Facilities – (SH)
Bob Barnett – Russell Cawberry – (BB)
Phil Winsor – Quest Interiors – (PW)
Richard Wilson – Lowe Build – (RW)
Matthew Smith – W&L Installation – (MS)
Colm Finnegan – Laing O’Rourke – (CF)
Ross Marley – Elecro – (RM)
Mark Gomm – MSL – (MG)
Mark Baker – 8Build – (MB)
Mick Stanton – Richardson Hill – (MS)
Craig Middleton – SPIE / ICL – (CM)
Lawrence Hooker – LXES – (LH)
Jack Wheeler – LXES – (JW)
Carlos Griffiths – Bouygues UK
Patrick Hailstone – Willmott Dixon Interiors
Richard Byrne – Laing O’Rourke
Mike Graystone – Skanska

Apologies: Dean Trigg – Estates Projects Construction Safety Advisor – (DT)
Sara Muir – Head of Energy and Environment – (SM)
Surrinder Johal – Safety Director – (SJ)
Danny Brittin – Longcross – (DB)
Gavin Turner – W&L Installations – (GT)
Nigel Walker – Halsion – (NW)

Agenda Item

Action

1. **Item 1 – Attendance and apologies**

- (a) Michael Lytrides (ML) and Denis Murphy (DM) welcomed everyone to the first SHELT meeting of 2015.
- (b) Apologies were noted as above.

2. **Item 2 – Minutes from last meeting and actions arising**

- (a) The minutes of the December SHELT meeting held on 17th December 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

- (b) Stephen Hughes (SH) requested the attendance sheet be updated to reflect non-attendance at last meeting due to sickness.
- (c) DM reminded members that templates for DAB's were to be forwarded for discussion in time for February's meeting to get an understanding as to how supervisors interact with operatives and how information from RAG reports is given as feedback.
DM added this would lead to further information in readiness for ICL supervisor training roll out during 2015.
- (d) As an introduction DM advised the meeting that 2014 was an opportunity to get to know one another and set the scene for the cultural changes necessary, to meet SHELTS stated aim and objectives.
Consequently 2015 would be a year for action, when policies would be firmed up and implemented on issues including noise, dust, vibration and manual handling.
DM stated that following the behavioural based safety training (BBS) undertaken in November, organisations should be reviewing current policies and revising them in light of the necessary changes required to initiate improvements to supervisor leadership and supply chain engagement.
Policy changes should include, for example, Daily Activity Briefings (DAB) and supervisor's soft skills training.

3. **Item 3 – Behavioral Safety Training Reports**

- (a) DM stated that there were still outstanding statements and these must be submitted before the next meeting.
- (b) DM reminded SHELTS that the Olympic Park learning documents, as noted in the Terms of Reference document, is a good starting point for understanding how improvements to safety culture could be achieved.
- (c) DM noted that good quality documents had been received from Quest and Phil Winsor (PW). PW was asked to explain what the organisation had decided and introduced himself as the Managing Director of Quest Interiors stating that this was a small company.
PW explained the below steps that Quest had taken:
- Completed ISO audit (environmental Health & Safety) after one year and passed.
 - In process of completing Achilles Audit which is a requirement.

PW posed the question: As a small company how do you go about implementing a safety culture improvement process with site managers and site teams?

For Quest, this has been achieved through promoting safety culture changes by:

- Attending BBS training which had been made available via ICL.
- Working with the CIBT, initiating additional safety cultural training consisting of 2 x ½ days training sessions for managers and supply chain partners (similar to the BBST training)
- Introducing Daily Activity Briefings, as an opportunity to engage with the workforce and encourage ownership of site safety and allow feedback from everyone involved.

- Reviewing the competence of site supervisors and in addition to SMSTS training, encouraging site supervisors to upgrade their knowledge by undertaking an NVQ Level 4 in construction site safety. This consisted of 9 modular sessions, and a formal examination.
PW added that the average age of the site supervisors was 50+ and that re-education could only have a positive outcome.

Finally, PW stated that Quest would be signing up to the Constructing Better Health occupational health scheme for all employees and encouraging the supply chain to follow suit.

Richard Wilson (RW) responded by advising that Lowebuild had agreed a similar set of priorities and would be providing a statement of intent in February.

DM congratulated both companies for their efforts and commitment and encouraged other organisations to step up and show a similar commitment to driving safety culture improvements.

4. **Item 4 – Occupational Health Policy**

- a) DM stated that a written statement from all companies was requested prior to the SHELТ in January 2015, outlining a strategy for implementing an OHS throughout the company and the supply chain. Any outstanding documents needed to be submitted.
- b) DM added that RW had also sent though a good statement but needed further work to clarify some issues.

RW talked through the changes made by Lowe Build:

- Joined CBH
 - Site operatives to be issued with personal noise monitors, i.e. pagers that can be set for individual tasks, that will alert the wearer when they have reached maximum permitted daily exposure levels.
 - RW added that he would bring a sample personal noise monitor to the next meeting to show members.
- c) ML asked the members if all contractors had joined CBH or were thinking about doing so. ML suggested talking to Gren about doing a presentation to all rather than individually.
DM stated that the structure is such that the companies need to register themselves but would talk to Gren and seek advice on ways organisations, through collaboration, could reduce costs. DM
 - d) DM added that through SHELТ, ICL would be expecting every company to have an occupational health scheme in place by end of June 2015. In the face of difficulties with this target date, ML agreed that individual companies should arrange an early meeting with DM and he to discuss. Richard Byrne of LOR advised that employers had legal responsibilities to ensure the safety and health of all individuals regularly exposed to occupational health issues, even if they are employed by a third party.

ML added that the contracts are refreshed in August and that ICL would be looking for the addition of the mentioned schemes but that recognition of the transition period would be factored. As long as companies were working towards the goal of achieving these improvements, then this

shouldn't hinder them from being considered for projects.

The question was raised that if the question of them having the policies in place was not necessary then why is this being asked for on the form?

ML stated that it would be interesting to see where companies are on the continuum. This year is about recognition of the migration period of such policies and that next year the focus would be shifted. ML added that he wants to see signs of progress,

DM stated that all contractors needed to take more responsibility for occupational health issues and committing to an occupational health scheme would be a good starting point. This would be in line with the commitment to the Terms of Reference everyone had signed up to and in line with the Government's 2025 strategy.

5 Item 5 – Dust Presentation – Richard Byrne (Laing O'Rourke)

To follow

Presentation led by RB to discuss: How can we help to manage risk through elimination/reduction?

(a) Discussions were held around:

- Accurate measure of exposure and how to specify the correct equipment especially around silica exposure.
- Face fit masks – alternate masks that are available that still protect whilst bearing in mind every day restrictions such as overgrown facial hair or stubble. 'Pushed to test' masks were offered as a substitute in these situations.

(b) SH expressed concerns over the reality of implementation of standards and expectations across all including sub-contractors.
Who is tasked with the responsibility– the individual or the supervisor?

DM stated that the legal responsibility lies with the employer. Contractors who employ sub-contractors have a duty to ensure that those who come to work on their sites, are adequately trained and supervised. The contractor who employs a sub-contractor is considered as the "employer", for the purposes of ensuring the safety of those undertaking the work.

PH asked should an individual who has been given the correct training but continues to come back and do the same wrong thing - should the responsibility not lie with the individual?

DM stated that individuals have legal responsibilities under section 7 of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 and can be prosecuted. A recent example of this occurred when the HSE visited a site and an operative was observed using a cutting tool incorrectly. The operative was fined £200. However, it must be recognised that Principal and/or Main Contractors need to have robust systems in place for inducting operatives to site work and make time to interrogate the individual's understanding of the RAMS presented and furthermore, to ensure the control measures agreed, are rigorously adhered to.

DM also stated that DABs and supervisor training needs to be implemented. Supervisors were not ready for the training last year but DM hoped that supervisor soft skills training would be rolled out, before the start of the summer projects.

(c) A discussion was held around going back to basics and the need to have the design team on board in order to ascertain control measures.

ML added that the designers and contractors need to meet in the middle. The 2 stage procurement process would create the opportunity for valuable discussion to be had and to seek out added value. DM stated the intention was to 'up the game' and to improve the quality of outcomes, by giving projects time for improved planning and preparation.

6 Item 6 – Noise Policy

(a) DM explained that following on from the noise document provided by Danny Brittin (DM) and Carlos Griffiths (CG), it was discussed last month that examples of best practice were to be provided in order these can be put into the 2015 Construction Safety Code of Practice.

DM stated that no documents had been received. DM requested that these be sent across as soon as possible with the intention to have a noise policy in place by June.

ALL

(b) DM reminded everyone that the Control of Noise Regulations came into effect in 2005 but the industry had yet to fully implement the law. For example, best practice required the application of engineering solutions as control measures, but there was still too much reliance on the use of PPE.

(c) DM agreed that he and Dean Trigg (DT) would produce a draft policy for SHELТ consideration by end of March.

7 Item 7 – Vibration Policy

(a) DM stated that it was requested last month, that SHELТ members come back with thoughts on how their companies can approach and look at implementing and using the information contained within Richard Wilson's presentation, or whether other HAV monitoring systems will be or are used within their companies. Ideas provided would be incorporated with the 2015 Construction safety Code of Practice.

DM added that it was a good presentation from RB and there were lots to consider in terms of technology available.

DM requested members should look back at the regulations and see what is required, what is available at the moment and how best practice could be applied to an ICL policy.

(b) DM agreed that he and DT would produce a draft policy for SHELТ consideration by end of March.

8 Item 8 – Manual Handling Policy

(a) DM requested volunteers to provide a presentation on best practice that could be used as ICL policy.

(b) Colm Finnegan (CF) of Laing O'Rourke and Lawrence Hooker (LH) of LXES volunteered. CF/ LH

DM stated the deadline would be the March meeting for this draft policy statement.

9 **Item 9 – Contractor’s Monthly Statistics**

- (a) DM explained that the AFR figures were of great importance and even though the 2 RIDDOR spike had pushed the AFR to 0.32, he wanted to congratulate and applaud our contractors, for having done so well during 2014. For information, the AFR for 2013 was 0.19 which was a very respectable outcome and mirrored the average for the Major Contractors Group UK.

DM added that this year the focus on monthly reports would reflect what is seen on site and explore further near misses in order to address the underlying trends rather than the headlines. In order to do this, DM requested transparency and honesty from SHELТ members in order to get actual figures.

- (b) The terminology of a ‘near miss’ was discussed. RB of LOR thought that using near misses may not be a true reflection of what needs to be addressed and that sometimes the ‘danger’ has come out of the blue and may not necessarily have been avoidable. The LOR system called ‘Take 5’ was discussed, which is a launch app. For phones rather than white cards.

Plan versus actual assessment was talked about and picking a high risk activity, taking a task sheet and monitoring the steps actioned e.g. installation of cladding. This would be beneficial as it would indicate the ‘real life’ steps that were being conducted.

DM stated that he took a different view to RBs and believed that implementing a near miss policy was an important part of the site management system and it didn’t matter what this process was called. The crucial element was engagement and participation by the workforce, embedding a culture of individual commitment and working together as a team, to look after one another on site.

- (c) The members discussed what they viewed to be negative about the process and potential pitfalls – such as feedback that isn’t necessarily useful and the admin involved.

DM stated that even if the reporting is not valuable that people were still engaged and this was a continuous process that would eventually gain traction, with positive behaviours as the outcome.

SH added that if follow up wasn’t being observed from reporting near misses, the process became a waste of time – people would know that they had reported something but that nothing was being done about it.

DM agreed that this was a two way engagement and referred to the commonly used system of ‘You said, we did’, where site management used a poster system to show the workforce, that their concerns had been actioned.

DM further went onto say that this may be a learning curve for smaller companies.

10 **Item 10 – Lessons Learnt – Patrick Hailston - Willmott Dixon Interiors** Attached

Presentation led by PH: Sharing Knowledge

- a) Having nominated scaffolding companies for onsite works was discussed as well as if they would need to be AIC registered.

DM added that he had not had the chance to discuss this yet.

11. **Item 11 – AOB**

N/A

12 **Item 12 – Next Month Meeting**

(a) February meeting will be held at 10.00am at South Kensington Campus on Friday 27th February 2015.

Room: Lecture Theatre 3

Location: Ace Extension Building, Imperial College, South Kensington