Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from November 8th, 2017
3. Review of the agenda
4. Update on the Laboratory Safety Initiative – Jude Van Buren and Mark Murray
5. Update and discussion on restricted contracts – John Slattery
6. Update on post-doc taskforce and post-doc unionization effort – Kelly Edwards
7. Good of the order
8. Adjourn

1) Call to order

Rosenfeld called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

2) Review of the minutes from November 8th, 2017

The minutes from November 8th, 2017 were approved as written.

3) Review of the agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

4) Update on the Laboratory Safety Initiative – Jude Van Buren and Mark Murray

Jude Van Buren (Senior Director, Environmental Health & Safety) and Mark Murray (Assistant Director, Building & Fire Safety, Environmental Health & Safety) were present to update the council on a Provost funded two-year Laboratory Safety Initiative (LSI) to identify and overcome barriers to safety in the University of Washington’s research laboratories. A handout and a PowerPoint were used as part of the presentation (Exhibit 1) (Exhibit 2). Van Buren explained she and Murray will provide an update on the Initiative, which began in June, 2016, and will end in June, 2018 – and will also demonstrate the newly-created online UW Lab Safety Dashboard.

Murray explained LSI has included:

- Working directly with 90 (UW) pilot labs to immediately improve safety
- Engaging leadership support
- Developing and sharing best practices
Identifying barriers to safety practices

Removing the identified barriers to safety by:

- Increased service
- Mentoring
- New tools
- Streamlined processes to decrease administrative burden

Information was given on the selection criteria for the 90 pilot labs (Slide 4, Exhibit 2). The labs were selected in part to assure a broad assortment of UW departments were represented. There are roughly 1000 active labs at the UW in total, and PIs from pilot labs comprise 33 of the roughly 80 scientific departments on campus.

It was clarified that whereas biological and radiological hazards have institutional oversight and national requirements that help ensure safe practices are followed, chemical use in research has less governance. Murray explained a checklist of 30 questions – broad-based and chemical-related (all questions weighted equally) – was developed and PIs of these labs were invited to participate based upon historical lab safety performance (rating < 75), and size and relative hazard of their chemical inventory.

Survey findings from the initial survey showed that “unclear roles and responsibilities” (at all levels both internal and external to the labs) was believed to be the greatest barrier to safety in UW laboratories (Slide 9, Exhibit 2). Some labs had no knowledge laboratory waste could be picked up (free of cost) via a university service, for example. A related slide was shown on the UW Laboratories Safety Responsivity Matrix (Slide 11, Exhibit 2).

In September 2017, another survey was generated and the perception of barriers had changed, showing the former #1 barrier to have dropped to #4. The top four barriers from the (second) September 2017 survey were found to be:

1. Lack of resources or tools
2. High turnover of staff/students
3. Shared spaces
4. Unclear roles and responsibilities

Murray added that 86% of the PIs in the pilot group had not taken the Lab Safety & Compliance class required by EH&S for PIs and lab supervisors, and marked improvement in lab safety became evident after those PIs attended the training. A council member suggested labs with PIs who did not attend this training should be able to be shut down as safety precaution. Another member felt they should be warned and then shut down if the training is still not taken. There was some discussion of recently-implemented Lab Safety Recognition Awards (Slide 13, Exhibit 2).

**Outcome**

A description of the outcomes of LSI (to date) were included in the handout:
“Upon completion of two rounds of lab surveys since the launch of the initiative, about two thirds of the pilot labs are now meeting or nearing safety expectations. Completion of Laboratory Safety and Compliance training by pilot PIs has more than tripled. The average lab safety performance rating of the pilot labs has increased by more than 20%. The rate of improvement of the pilot labs is higher than that of the control group, supporting a conclusion that added attention, tools, and assistance received as part of the initiative is making a difference. We anticipate that EH&S will be able to favorably influence at least half of the pilot labs who have yet to improve their safety rating, but directives and assistance from beyond EH&S will likely be needed to motivate the remaining PIs to engage.”

Other findings were also included (Exhibit 1):

- Safety training is a key factor in clarifying roles and responsibilities
- Additional and more streamlined EH&S trainings are in demand
- Communication of EH&S services and resources available to laboratories needs to be improved
- Electronic documentation of laboratory safety performance reports enhances consistency of communication, expectations, and service provided
- Clients are more likely to positively engage with EH&S and make changes when it is presented as a resource and consultation agency (rather than an enforcement agency)

**Demonstration of Lab Safety Portal**

Murray demonstrated the UW Laboratory Safety Portal, which shows average lab survey safety ratings for various UW departments. The “user view” was shown. The Portal shows the UW target, UW average rating, and the Departmental Average rating (above 75 is passing score).

A member recommended the Provost’s Office be levied in relation to broadcasting the dashboard in order to increase use of the tool. A member suggested there be inspections annually of labs under a certain score.

**Follow-up**

It was noted LSI has six months remaining before the Initiative is concluded. In the remaining time, labs still improving their safety rating will specifically be addressed. Van Buren and Murray explained that in the spring of 2018, EH&S plans to apply everything learned through LSI to improve safety in all UW laboratories. It was noted advertising and increasing use of the UW waste removal service was very effective in reducing lab dangers, and EH&S is interested in continuing that endeavor in the future.

There was some discussion of sustaining the Initiative after the funded two years ends. It was noted 1.5 additional FTE were hired to support the initiative, and as part of the LSI timeline, those positions will be terminated at the end of the two-year period.

Rosenfeld recommended the guests present the Initiative in a Faculty Senate meeting in order to increase awareness of other PIs and faculty involved in research. He explained FCR is considering
sponsoring a Class C resolution to urge that the extra FTEs (added to EH&S as part of LSI) be continued in order to pursue the Initiative through coming years. A member recommended that the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) be consulted before the Class C is drafted.

Van Buren and Murray were thanked for the presenting, and they left the meeting.

5) Update and discussion on restricted contracts – John Slattery

John Slattery (Vice Dean, Research and Graduate Education, School of Medicine) was present to discuss FCR’s procedures during review of restricted research proposals. Rosenfeld explained the topic arose from a recent contract review by the FCR that resulted in the council voting to deny a waiver.

The specific case in-question was discussed at-length, and two outcomes came out of the discussion:

- It was decided Deans of colleges (wherein a restricted research proposal has been sent to the FCR) will be copied on communications sent by FCR members to the relevant PI.
- It was decided the “Subcommittee on Reviews of ‘Classified, Proprietary, and Restricted Research’ proposals” Review Template Form (used during review of restricted proposals) would be amended, and a new question added. The new question will ask PIs to “spell out the practical impact of the restriction(s) placed on them according to their own perspective.”

Slattery and members agreed the revisions to be useful in avoiding issues that arose in the recent case in the future. Slattery was thanked for holding a discussion with the council, and he left the meeting.

6) Update on post-doc taskforce and post-doc unionization effort – Kelly Edwards

Kelly Edwards (Associate Dean, Graduate School) presented a status report on the work of the UW Postdoctoral Student Taskforce, as well as the ongoing postdoctoral student unionization effort. Rosenfeld recalled the Class C resolution on postdoctoral fellows put forth by FCR in the past academic year (2016-2017), which included several recommendations relating to the improvement of conditions of employment for postdoctoral fellows (including requesting that the Provost’s Office charge the Task Force for Postdoctoral Affairs to develop the policies and practices that would bring UW in line with national guidelines and peer institutions).

Edwards recapped the Class C resolution passed the Faculty Senate on March 2, 2017. She explained she communicated with then Senate Chair, Zoe Barsness, which resulted in a charge letter being sent to the Taskforce in early April, 2017. There were delays in work for the Taskforce orders for various reasons, and in October 2017, the postdoctoral researchers at the UW started a campaign for a union forming process. After this was done, a halt had to be placed on the work of the Taskforce, as state law restricts the university from altering employment benefits for employees currently engaged in a union drive. Edwards explained that this has been a challenge for Office of Postdoctoral Affairs (OPA). She noted the timing made it so the work (of the Taskforce) was not started until after the union drive began, which barred its continuing.
A member noted the efforts to form the Taskforce predated awareness of the unionization efforts, which might comprise one argument for the work of the Taskforce being able to continue.

Edwards explained she would like to have follow-up from the faculty to stir movement in the Initiative, especially given the support from the FCR and Faculty Senate. It was noted the current Provost plans to retire in summer of 2018, at which point a new Provost will start at the UW. Rosenfeld noted he would speak with the current Faculty Senate chair to see what the delay is in forming the group and getting them working.

There was some discussion of which UW positions are classified as postdoctoral fellows (to be included for purposes of the union drive). Rosenfeld explained this was one of the main questions to be addressed by the Taskforce. It was noted UW Research Associates are included in the Faculty Code, and so are being treated as “faculty” (and not postdocs) for the purpose of the union drive. It was noted this issue is going to be resolved by the Washington State Public Employment Relations Commission (PERC) Board, who will look at evidence from both sides during a hearing on December 20th, with a determination to be made in January, 2018.

It was noted once the PERC Board determines which employees at the university are considered included part of the union drive, cards already received will be counted, after which there will be a determination as to whether or not a union will be formed.

A member noted the union drive will have an effect on PIs and research, as plans for employee funding are made at the time grants are written. However, another member felt the unionization effort would not likely have serious economic consequences for PIs, as UW researchers are generally paid well relative to national standards.

Rosenfeld noted he would bring the issue up with faculty senate leadership as soon as possible.

7) Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

8) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Eliot Brenowitz, Michael Rosenfeld (chair) Ex-officio reps: Ann Glusker, Larry Pierce, Charles Hirschman President’s designee: Mary Lidstrom Guests: Susan Camber, Lynette Arias, Jude Van Buren, Mark Murray, John Slattery, Jennifer Harris
Absent:Faculty: Donald Chi, Todd Herrenkohl, Nicole Gibran, Chuck Frevert, Benjamin Marwick, Paul Fishman, Nicole Gibran, Todd Herrenkohl
Ex-officio reps: Jake Busche

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – Lab Safety Initiative -FCR Summary.pdf
Exhibit 2 – FCR LSI presentation 121317.ppt
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LAB SAFETY INITIATIVE UPDATE

Overview

A Provost funded two-year Laboratory Safety Initiative from June, 2016 to June, 2018 to identify and overcome barriers to safety in the University of Washington’s most complex research laboratories.

LSI Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Murray</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>EH&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Harvey</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>EH&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Hagen</td>
<td>Analyst / Lab safety mentor</td>
<td>Provost funded position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serena Tarica (0.5 FTE)</td>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>Provost funded position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advisory Task Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department or College/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Bidwell</td>
<td>Research Technologist</td>
<td>School of Environmental &amp; Forest Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Lutz</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Berg-Rood</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Division of Medical Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Lee</td>
<td>Lab Manager</td>
<td>Genome Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Adams</td>
<td>Building Manager and Safety Officer</td>
<td>Molecular Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Gallucci</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Pedersen</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude Van Buren</td>
<td>Senior Director</td>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Hajar</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Comparative Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Murray</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hopkins</td>
<td>Chair Emeritus</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Honeydew</td>
<td>Facilities Specialist</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Harrington</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>College of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sungwoo Hong</td>
<td>Research Scientist III</td>
<td>Environmental and Occupational Health Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Harvey</td>
<td>Lab Safety Program Manager</td>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Davis</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pilot 90 labs

PIs for these labs were invited to participate based upon historical lab safety performance (rating < 75), and size and relative hazard of their chemical inventory. These PIs represent 33 of approximately 80 scientific departments on campus. These pilot labs are surveyed three times over the two-year duration of the initiative.

Barriers identified

- Unclear roles and responsibilities
- Lack of resources
- Inadequate facilities and maintenance of facilities

Projects to break down barriers (completed to date)

- Creation of a Lab Safety Initiative website and newsletter
- Catalyst surveys to study demographics and collect feedback from pilot labs and control groups
- Personal invitation to PIs to complete Laboratory Safety and Compliance training
- A new Laboratory Safety and Compliance training course for administrators
- Promoting Laboratory Safety and Compliance training to pilot PIs
- Coaching, mentoring and enhanced service to implement best practices and management
- Collection of hazardous and unknown chemicals (CHUC event, 1.5 tons of waste removed)
- Development and implementation of a Lab Safety Award program
- Responsibility matrix developed for the university research community
- Partnering with campus vendors to promote personal protection equipment options and resources
- Roundtable discussion groups, free webinars, and seminars with guest speakers
Outcome (to date)

Upon completion of two rounds of lab surveys since the launch of the initiative, about two thirds of the pilot labs are now meeting or nearing safety expectations. Completion of Laboratory Safety and Compliance training by pilot PIs has more than tripled. The average lab safety performance rating of the pilot labs has increased by more than 20%. The rate of improvement of the pilot labs is higher than that of the control group, supporting a conclusion that added attention, tools, and assistance received as part of the initiative is making a difference. We anticipate that EH&S will be able to favorably influence at least half of the pilot labs who have yet to improve their safety rating, but directives and assistance from beyond EH&S will likely be needed to motivate the remaining PIs to engage.
Initiative findings

- Safety training is a key factor in clarifying roles and responsibilities
- Additional and more streamlined EH&S trainings are in demand
- Communication of EH&S services and resources available to laboratories needs to be improved
- Electronic documentation of laboratory safety performance reports enhances consistency of communication, expectations, and service provided
- Clients are more likely to positively engage with EH&S and make changes when it is presented as a resource and consultation agency (rather than an enforcement agency)

Recent events

- *Chemical Hygiene Expo* to promote best practices and resources available for hazardous chemical management: October 27
- *Lab Safety Dashboard* enhancements: November 14
- *Innovation Event* for pilot labs to share safety tools and best practices they have developed: December 11

Future projects (6-9 months)

- New online *Laboratory Safety and Compliance* training (in lieu of a classroom course)
- *Chemical Waste Collection Request* tutorial video (orientation/training)
- Focused assistance visits to provide pilot labs with significant barriers to safety additional consultation services and hands-on help from our compliance analysts
- Discuss refresher training expectations for *Managing Lab Chemicals* course.
- New interactive classroom training for Chemical Hygiene Officers
- *PI Identification* process through job codes and *PI Welcome Packet* from EH&S
- Solicit central funding to have a bi-annual lab waste pickup events
- An online orientation for use of the Laboratory Safety Manual

National collaborations

- Chemical safety level control banding (to more effectively deploy EH&S oversight/support services)
- Shared lab spaces and safety (CSHEMA community of practice work group)
- International Fire Code – Chapter 38 - Higher Education Laboratories, new in 2018!
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Mark D. Murray, PE
Assistant Director,
Environmental Health and Safety Department
Nationwide Attention on Adverse Laboratory Safety Outcomes

> Recent deaths/injuries of faculty, students, and lab staff at:
  - UCLA, Texas Tech, Texas A&M, Dartmouth, Duke, Yale, U. Hawaii

> Results: Adverse outcomes - fiscal, research, operational, legal, reputational, and researcher health
The LSI Goal to Improve Safety  (July ‘16 – June ‘18)

> Work directly with 90 pilot labs to immediately improve safety
> Engage leadership support
> Develop and share best practices
> Identify barriers to safety practices
> Remove the identified barriers to safety by:
  > Increased service
  > Mentoring
  > New tools
  > Streamlined processes to decrease administrative burden
Pilot group (of 90) selection criteria (N=1011 labs)

- Lab survey rating < 75% (Range 27 – 74%)
- Significant chemical inventory
- Hazardous chemicals in inventory

Outcome of selection criteria
- Diverse representation of campus
  - 35 scientific departments (of about 80 total)
LSI focus: *It’s the Chemicals*

> Biological and radiological hazards have institutional oversight and national requirements
  
  • Biologicals and recombinant DNA governed by NIH/OBA, University’s Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC)
  
  • Radiological hazards governed by license by DOH, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), and University Radiation Safety Committee (RSC)

> Chemical use in research has less governance
Laboratory safety rating

> Why 30 questions?
  - Commonly asked among national peers
  - Accepted as reasonable expectations from lab community
  - Higher risk issues
  - Represents broad subject areas (admin, chem, bio, rad, fire, ppe, training,)
  - Other

> Score Calculation:

Rating = Y / (Y+N)
Questions that are NA don’t affect rating
# LSI Advisory Task Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Bidwell</td>
<td>Research Technologist</td>
<td>School of Environmental &amp; Forest Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Lutz</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Berg-Rood</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Division of Medical Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Lee</td>
<td>Lab Manager</td>
<td>Genome Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Adams</td>
<td>Building Manager and Safety Officer</td>
<td>Molecular Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Gallucci</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Pedersen</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude Van Buren, Chair</td>
<td>Senior Director</td>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Hajjar</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Comparative Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Murray</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hopkins</td>
<td>Chair Emeritus</td>
<td>Department of Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Honeydew</td>
<td>Facilities Specialist</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Harrington</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>College of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sungwoo Hong</td>
<td>Research Scientist III</td>
<td>Environmental and Occupational Health Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Harvey</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Davis</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laboratory Demographics
Catalyst Survey – Control Group vs. Pilot Group

# Years RP Has Been a PI

Control Average = 16.19 years
- 0-5 yrs. 10%
- 6-10 yrs. 27%
- 11-20 yrs. 39%
- >20 yrs. 24%

Pilot Average = 16.77 years
- 0-5 yrs. 19%
- 6-10 yrs. 14%
- 11-20 yrs. 32%
- >20 yrs. 33%

Has a Lab Manager?

Control group (2016)
- No 24%
- Yes 76%

Pilot group (2016)
- No 46%
- Yes 54%

Pilot group (2017)
- No 26%
- Yes 74%
## Catalyst Survey: What poses the greatest barrier to safety in your laboratory? (top choice = 3pts, second choice = 2pts, third choice = 1pt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey #1, Sept. 2016 (N= 75 of 90)</th>
<th>Survey #2, Sept. 2017 (N= 60 of 86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 - Unclear roles and responsibilities (109 pts)</td>
<td>#1 – Lack of resources or tools (85 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 - Lack of resources or tools (98 pts)</td>
<td>#2 – High turnover of staff/students (61 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 - Inadequate facilities/maintenance (90 pts)</td>
<td>#3 – Shared spaces (54 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 - Unclear roles and responsibilities (47 pts)</td>
<td>#5 - Inadequate facilities/maintenance (44 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 - Inadequate training, education, or safety strategies (28 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies to Address Barriers to Safety

Clarifying Roles and Responsibilities for PIs - Training

**Barrier issue identified:** 86% of the PIs in the pilot group had not taken the Lab Safety & Compliance class required by EH&S for PIs and lab supervisors

**Strategy:** Personally invite pilot group PIs to attend the Lab Safety & Compliance class
## Responsibility Matrix

### UW Laboratories Safety Responsibility Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTITUTIONAL</strong>&lt;br&gt;(President, Chancellors &amp; Provost)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Demonstrate safety as a core value to the institution; encourage public discussion, provide adequate resources, and develop effective policies (Executive Order 58 and Institutional Policies).  
  - Appoint a leadership team responsible for building a culture of safety.  
  - Align rewards and recognition systems with efforts to promote safety.  |
| **COLLEGE / SCHOOL**<br>(Deans) |  
  - Lead to promote a culture of safety in laboratories; emphasize training, PPE, and chemical safety.  
  - Require review of safety policies, procedures, and guidelines for laboratories.  
  - Be informed of serious accidents/incidents and follow up to prevent recurrence.  
  - Maintain awareness of teaching and research activities and the risks they present to the institution.  
  - Manage college resources considering safety oversight, facility improvement, and safety goals.  |
| **DEPARTMENTAL**<br>(Chairs & Directors) |  
  - Foster a positive culture of safety as criteria for faculty promotion, tenure, and salary.  
  - Motivate responsible parties to improve safety and achieve institutional goals.  
  - Appoint a safety officer to promote and ensure safety procedures department-wide.  
  - Remind PIs to take safety training and require use of PPE prior to conducting work in a laboratory.  
  - Promptly address issues identified in lab safety surveys; review accident reports, and assure preventative actions and SOPs are in place.  |
| **PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS & FACULTY** |  
  - Assume ultimate responsibility and set expectations for safety within their laboratory.  
  - Facilitate open dialogue regarding safety standards (labs and field sites), develop clear written procedures for lab operations, and oversee safety responsibilities delegated to personnel working in the laboratory.  
  - Conduct a hazard analysis prior to conducting any experimental procedures; address issues regarding inadequate or compromised equipment in their laboratory.  
  - Manage chemicals correctly in accordance with written procedures and best practices; maintain an orderly and well-organized laboratory to provide sufficient space for safe practices.  
  - Ensure everyone in the lab receives proper safety training and is provided with adequate PPE; wear appropriate PPE for personal protection to model a culture of safety.  
  - Report accidents/incidents/near misses in OARS; discuss lessons learned with supervisor and co-workers.  |
| **RESEARCH STAFF**<br>(Lab Members) |  
  - Be mindful of potential risks to their own safety and safety of others in the lab, classroom, and field.  
  - Teach awareness and promote behavior that is consistent with safe and effective practices.  |
Collection of Hazardous and Unknown Chemicals (CHUC) Event

59 drums of chemicals were collected for a total of 1,427.10 kgs (3139.62 lbs. or 1 ½ tons of waste)
Lab Safety Recognition Awards

In Recognition of

Olusegun Soge and Fellow Lab members of Global Health Department

For their commitment to Laboratory Safety & Promoting a Culture of Safety

This Award is issued on July 11, 2017 by Environmental Health & Safety

[Signature]

Sara Van Buren, Dr.PH, MPH
Senior Director
Environmental Health & Safety
Data Trends
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November 5, 2017

Exhibit 2
Preliminary Findings

- Executive leadership is essential
- Safety training is a key factor in clarifying roles and responsibilities
- Additional EH&S trainings are in demand
- EH&S services and resources are not as well known as they need to be
- Some labs engage better with EH&S when we use a partnering style
- The lab award is incentivizing
- The safety rating is incentivizing
- The dashboard is an effective way to communicate with the labs
- EH&S cannot favorably influence all labs
Focus assistance for the pilot labs not yet meeting expectations
Applying what we have learned to all labs (persistence, training, collaboration)
Innovation event to share lab successes
Improve existing EH&S training and build new trainings
Released Lab Safety Dashboard enhancement
Begin collecting data for chemical control banding of the laboratories
Final round of surveys of Pilot lab - Spring, 2018
Questions

Contact Information:

Mark D. Murray
206-616-6261
mmurray@uw.edu

Link to Lab Safety Dashboard