HEALTH SAFETY ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE GENERAL MEETING Houston, Texas 16 April 2009



Agenda Item: Welcome and Opening Statements:

John Karish, Director SHE, Ensco International and HSE Committee Chairman opened the meeting. John thanked Farell Moughon, Pride International, for hosting the meeting and for providing lunch. Farell then gave general information on the building and emergency instructions.

John then asked everyone to introduce themselves-see the attached attendance sheet.

Joe Hurt then reviewed the IADC Antitrust guidelines.

Agenda Item: Open Discussion - Safety Minute

John asked the group if they had any issues they wanted to share with the attendees. One attendee discussed an incident and reported that they will issue an alert to IADC for distribution. John then instructed the group to spilt up in four groups and discuss how we can get beyond the 1.1 Recordable Incident rate the industry seems to be stuck on. After fifteen minutes of group discussion, the groups had one person report on their discussions.

Group A:

- 1. Inconsistent incentives for to push employees forward. For example the peer pressure is inconsistent. One time an employee gets ataboys for doing a task safely, but when deadlines come up, the employee who gets the task done quickest, even though he by passed safety procedures will get the ataboys.
- 2. Are we really to the Root Cause???
- 3. One suggestion was surveillance of workers. One member of the group reported that a worker was witnessed falling on his right shoulder, but later had surgery on his left shoulder.
- 4. Need to get employees to aggressively use the "Stop-Work-Authority" when they see a worker (or supervisor) doing something incorrect.

Group B:

- 1. Workers taking short cuts.
- 2. Breakdowns in communications, especially with multicultural crews.
- 3. There is a lack of supervisors getting to really know their workers and the workers attitude while at the worksite due to personnel problems at home and the worker does not feel comfortable to discuss them with anyone at work.
- 4. Supervisors not making workers feel that they (the supervisors) are approachable with personnel issues.
- 5. Workers make personal choices to take short cuts based on what they observe. Similar to # 1 in Group A. One crew takes time to go through the safety procedures and takes three hours to get a task done safely. Another crew does not follow proper safety procedures and gets the job done in an hour and a half. Since no-one was hurt, the second crew got all the praise, but this sets a pattern of thinking by the workers that it is ok to take short cuts.

Group C.

- 1. Workers are not holding themselves accountable for their own safety.
- 2. Structured improvement = people to learn to give pat answers that they realize supervisors expect.

- 3. Supervisors are not getting personal with their employees. So that when they receive negative feedback, they may resent it or if they get positive feedback, they don't think the supervisor is being sincere.
- 4. It is how the men in the field view the attitude of management. 1. Get the job done fast. 2. Get the job done safe. Which does management demonstrate they really want?
- 5. Companies do drills for all emergencies, why don't they test the worker's attitude toward safety. One member stated that he will stand in a safe area of the work site and take his hard hat off or safety glasses and observe if employees feel comfortable to come up to him and advise him to put on his safety gear.

Group D: This group discussed the barriers to safety improvement.

- 1. Experienced personnel not using the safety tools given them. New employees use the tools, but after a time follow the experienced workers bad example.
- 2. There is a lack of attentiveness by the workers.
- 3. There are cultural issues. Some workers are reluctant to wear PPE due to cultural issues.
- 4. Poor management of change.
- 5. Accountability lacking.
- 6. Supervisors need to learn how to talk to employees.

At the end of this exercise, one operator asked how contractors handle situations when the company man on location is asking the crews to do something that is against safety procedures. One contractor commented that their rig site supervisors know that if there is a conflict with their company's HSE standards, they are to push it up the ladder to their supervisor. Another attendee commented that they call a "Time-Out" and review the company and operator HSE Policy / Procedures. If there is still a problem it is sent to the shore base supervision. In general the contractor attendees felt that the contractor supervisor on site must know that he has the support of the company management.

One of the attendees asked how we can carry the exercise forward. The group agreed to carry the topics back to their companies and at the next meeting make a brief presentation on how their company sees the issues brought forth. There was also a request to continue this type of activity (and expand it) at the next Committee meeting.

Offshore - Alan Spackman: Discussed the following:

- IADC Guidelines for NPDES General Permit for MODUS while not on location. The draft will be circulated to the Committee for review and comment. When a final draft is complete, members will be asked to consider whether the guidelines should be formally adopted by IADC, and if adopted, whether IADC should ask for EPA review or endorsement
- 2. API RP 70 & 71 relating to Security issues is open for review and comment. Persons interested in commenting should contact Alan Spackman.
- 3. IMO Bio-fouling. IMO is developing standards to control the spread of non-indigenous species by bio-fouling. IMO has not decided if the standards will be mandatory or voluntary. IADC is participating in an IMO Correspondence Group that will be developing the standards.
- 4. IMO ECA. The US and Canada had submitted a paper to IMO requesting that most of the US and Canadian coastline out to a limit of 200 miles be designated an Emissions Control Area, mandating the use of 200 miles for low sulfur fuel. In a related matter, Alan Spackman reminded companies that MODUs need to obtain bunker delivery notes with each fuel delivery to comply with MARPOL Annex VI requirements.
- 5. IMO MODU Code IMO's Maritime Safety Committee is expected to approve a new MODU Code in early June and it will then be adopted by the Assembly in November. The new Code will directly impact new rigs, likely those for which construction begins in 2012 and later.

Land – Joe Hurt: Discussed the following:

1. MMS issue on lifting incidents on the OCS. Joe explained what the Lifting Stakeholders Data review group found. The data was provided to the Training Committee, API, OOC and MMS.

Bob B. explained that the Training Committee is looking at various standards companies to use to develop crane operator competency training. BB also discussed NCCCO testing. Joe H. explained the IADC Guidance for Packaging and Transportation of Cargo for US Offshore Operations. John Karish asked the group that in light of MMS's emphasis on lifting incidents is there an interest in revisiting the document? It was issued in 2001 and could use updating. The attendees chose not to revisit the document.

Agenda Item: Crew Safe - A presentation was given by Oscar Scott, of Red Dog International explaining the development and design of the Mobile Tornado Shelters they provide the industry.

Agenda Item: Prevention of Dropped Objects – Alerts and Actions from National Oilwell Varco (NOV). Bill Braman and Hyoung Lim, of NOV made the presentation and discussed issues for the attendees.

Agenda Item: Health

- Joe Hurt explained that the position letter was presented to the Executive Committee at the annual meeting and the vote was to hold off on sending the letter to EEOC until additional information can be gathered and a better understanding of what the affects would be on the industry.
- 2. Richard Grayson, Nabors Offshore presented a review of their incidents in regard to fitness of employees.

Agenda Item: new Innovative Technologies for Safety Footwear:

Kim Rydmark, Lacrosse Footwear, Inc. presented a number of special types of footwear that they developed for various industries. She also explained how Lacrosse Footwear conducts joint projects to determine the needs of an industry.

Agenda Item: Dropped BOP's - Industry Trends and Implications

Frank Gallander, Chevron presented the results of a study of "Dropped" BOPs that Chevron conducted.

Agenda Item: Next Meeting

The host for the Second Quarter 2009 is Hess Corporation. It will be held 16 July at Hess Corporation Office 500 Dallas Street Suite 1942, Houston, TX 77002.

International Association of Drilling Contractors HSE General Committee Meeting Houston, TX 16 April 2009

Name		Company Name
William	Reynolds	American Steel
Frank M.	Bologna	American Claims Services, Inc.
Dustin	Campbell	Atwood Oceanics, Inc.
John	Auth	Auth-entic Safety Services, Inc.
Keith	Stratton	BassDrill
Chuck	Price	ВР
Philip	Cox	Diamond Offshore
Stephen	Fuchs	Diamond Offshore
Tim	Gibson	Diamond Offshore
Leo	Doran	Domatex
John M.	Karish	ENSCO International
Eric	Olson	ENSCO International
Larry	Swindle	Global Training & Environment
Bret	Parks	Helmerich & Payne IDC
Bob	Burnett	Hercules Offshore
Marvin	Guidry	Hess Corporation
Tim	Perkins	Hoist & Crane Service Group
Joe	Hurt	IADC
Alan	Spackman	IADC
Jon	Whitenton	Kennedy Wire Rope
Kim	Rydmark	LaCrosse Footwear Inc.
Nick A.	Bourdoumis	Larsen Oil & Gas
Josh	Minton	Maersk Drilling
Karsten	Fontenot	MI Swaco
Richard	Grayson	Nabors Offshore Corp.
Bill	Braman	National Oilwell Varco
Hyoung	Lim	National Oilwell Varco
Bill	Braman	National Oilwell Varco
Shannon	Caldwell	NuPhysica LLC
Doug	Jendrasheske	On Site Safety, Inc.

Eric	Steininger	On Site Safety, Inc.
Vicky	Daulton	On Site Safety, Inc.
Farell	Moughon	Pride International
Andy	Erwin	Randy Smith Training Solutions
Oscar	Scott	Red Dog International
Aaron	Mueller	Rowan Companies
Guy	Lombardo	Schulmberger
Bill	King	Scomi Group
Ken	Vogel	Sunbelt Steel Texas
Michael	Allen	The RAD Group
Tony	Johnson	Transocean
Edi	Gittenberger	Tritanium