

Meeting Date 10th March 2010

| Asbestos Liaison Group Technical Sub Committee (ALGTSC) | |
|---|--|
| Minutes of the meeting of the ALTSC held on the 10th March 2010 at TICA offices Darlington | |
| <p>Present: Peter Austin (ACAD), Steve Sadley (ARCA), Collette Willoughby (BOHS), Steve Watkins (UKATA), Martin Gibson (HSE)</p> <p>Apologies for absence: None</p> <p>Introductions: Peter Austin opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking them for attending</p> | |
| <p>Minutes of previous meeting: Minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed and accepted by the Committee</p> <p>Matters Arising: Item 4.0 Communication arrangements/Meeting frequency PA noted that the arrangements agreed at the meeting on 12/5/09 had been changed and that the ALGTSC would meet in person on a regular basis.</p> <p>Item 5.5 Waste water from DCU's and discharge DCU's should discharge into a foul drain. However, because of the chemicals resulting from the soap etc, it may be necessary to get permission from the sewage operators to do so. This is complicated because the authorities responsible vary across the UK. Contractors don't wish to be in the situation whereby they need to notify every job regarding the discharge from the DCU.</p> <p>Actions: SW and SS to investigate further and report back to the Committee.</p> <p>A.O.B. PA informed the Committee that he had begun the review of previous ALG memos and had come across a Memo 04/08 regarding training and RPE for licensed scaffolders which had been changed significantly but which had not been reissued with a new number. MG was at a loss to explain this and agreed that it would cause confusion and would investigate the circumstances and report back to the Committee.</p> <p>Actions: MG to investigate and report back to Committee</p> | |
| Agenda Items | |
| 1.0 | The use of unpowered ori-nasal half masks and the guidance in HSG53 |
| | <p>PA informed the Committee that HSG53 contained the guidance that this type of mask should only be used for < 1 hour and that this would have serious implications for not only the asbestos industry but anyone who uses RPE of this type. PA accepted that there were genuine reasons for the < 1 hour rule but suggested that we needed to give better guidance on what would be a suitable time to allow between periods of use. MG said that he would expect the type of asbestos work where this type of RPE to be appropriate would be of a relatively short duration or of a type where operatives could</p> |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| | <p>take frequent short breaks when it was not necessary to wear the RPE, and although it would only effect a small number of jobs, if it was clear that operatives would have to wear items of RPE for significantly longer than 1 hour then the HSE would expect them to select a type of RPE suitable for use > 1 hour, i.e. the full face power assisted type. While the Committee did accept this, a number of situations where this could be problematic could be foreseen such as large scale removal of cement roof sheets, licensed scaffold erection and analysts carrying out visual inspections inside large enclosures. These types of activities have their own risks which would be added to by the restricted vision and loss of mobility that inevitably occur when wearing a full face mask. MG explained that the HSE were looking at a number of issues to do with the use of RPE and that the HSE will include this in the next re-write of HSG247.</p> <p>Action: PA and SS to remind their members of guidance in HSG53 and advise on amending POW and selection of RPE.</p> |
| <p>2.0</p> | <p>The use of flame retardant coveralls for asbestos removal work on offshore installations</p> |
| | <p>The issue of flame retardant coveralls on oilrigs, etc was discussed and the Committee agreed that they should be compulsory when carrying out asbestos removal work, not just on offshore platforms but on petrochemical plants and other sites where there was a risk of fire. The Committee asked if this type of coverall met with the criteria specified for work with asbestos, i.e. did they have hoods, elasticated cuffs and ankles, etc. MG said that he was unsure as to their exact specification but that he would look into it and report back to the Committee.</p> <p>The topic of what other types of garment would be of help to operatives working in severe conditions, i.e. cold. SW reported that they provide thermal undergarments to be worn inside the enclosure which are then disposed of as contaminated waste and that these garments can be purchased at a very low cost. The industry now has widely adopted the use of disposable coveralls as the use of cotton coveralls had highlighted problems with laundering them which meant that their use was rare now and restricted to sites where the contractor could carry out their own washing of coveralls.</p> <p>Action: MG to look into the specification of flame retardant coveralls SW to look into sourcing thermal undergarments for use inside the enclosure And both to report back to the Committee.</p> |
| <p>3.0</p> | <p>The entry into live enclosures by other trades</p> |
| | <p>SS had asked the question of what training does someone require to enter an enclosure should it be necessary, i.e. electrician or plumber. MG said that if this situation should occur and was of a "one off" nature, then they would need to be face fitted for the appropriate RPE and given instruction/training on the decontamination/transit procedures and the fitting and use of RPE/PPE. MG went on to say that although the training could be in the form of a toolbox talk, that it should still be documented. Furthermore, all stripping removal work inside the enclosure should cease and the person entering the enclosure would need to be accompanied at all times and at each stage of the process. If rectifying the problem would require disturbing asbestos material then the person would require more appropriate training such as the 3 day new operative course and organisations who could foresee the need for someone to enter enclosures on a regular basis to rectify problems should plan ahead and provide the</p> |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| | maintenance engineer with training, face fit, medical, etc. |
| 4.0 | Gas and electrical safety of DCU's |
| | <p>PA informed the Committee that a serious accident had occurred recently where 2 operatives had nearly died using a DCU after being overcome by CO poisoning inside the DCU and asked the Committee if they would support the mandatory use of gas detectors until the problem could be eradicated by use of electric showers. SS said that instructions on the use of DCU's and ensuring that they were sited in a well ventilated area with no modifications to the boiler flue, etc already existed. It was agreed that a meeting should be sought with manufacturers of DCU's to discuss this and other safety issues, along with the minimum signage proposals.</p> <p>Actions: PA to contact interested parties to try to arrange meeting MG would investigate the circumstances surrounding the recent incident and report back to the Committee</p> |
| 5.0 | ARCA article on the use of enclosures |
| | <p>SS informed the Committee that ARCA had felt that there was a need to produce guidance on when an enclosure was necessary for removal of asbestos after a number of instances where clients had expressed confusion over this and other issues such as when work with asbestos could be classed as sporadic and low intensity. CW also informed the Committee that she had recently carried out an audit where the contractor had indicated on the notification form that they intended to carry out hot work but had not sought a waiver and had proceeded to remove the asbestos without suitable control measures in place. SW and PA also agreed that clients were often unaware of guidance with some clients insisting that they agree to undertake hot work before being allowed to tender for contracts. MG agreed that there was a need for guidance aimed at providing licensed contractors with something to issue to clients which would explain a number of key areas such as hot work, environmental cleaning, etc and suggested that the Committee compile a list of topics which would form the basis of a future ALG memo.</p> <p>Actions: All Committee members to submit suggested topic for future ALG memo to PA by the end of April 2010</p> |
| 6.0 | How the ALGTSC will issue guidance |
| | <p>The topic of what form should the ALGTSC guidance take was discussed. MG suggested that in most cases our recommendations should be submitted to the HSE through the ALG which, if appropriate could form the basis for an ALG memo on the subject. The possibility of an alert email directly from the ALGTSC was debated but it was a concern that this would not be given the same level of importance without the weight of the HSE/ALG behind it.</p> |
| A.O.B. | <p>MG informed the Committee that the HSL had been asked to look at the design of airlocks/baglocks and the way this affects the movement of air through an enclosure. The investigation would also look at NPU's and air management in general and its findings should be ready in time for the revision of HSG247.</p> <p>PA asked the other Committee members if they had been informed of the proposal by Martin Morrell of Construction Skills to set up an apprentice scheme for asbestos</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | workers. The Committee members replied that yes they were aware of Martins proposals and that they were broadly in favour of such a scheme but could foresee a number of difficulties which would have to be overcome before it would work. |
| Date of next meeting | Proposed date 20th May 2010 tbc |