

Confined Space in Construction meeting

Friday 11/13/09 9:00-12:00

| | | |
|----------|----------------|----------------------|
| Present: | Peggy Munsell | Oregon OSHA |
| | Ron Haverkost | Oregon OSHA |
| | Eliot Lapidus | AGC |
| | Mark Maguire | EWEB |
| | Tom McCullen | Slayden Construction |
| | David Davidson | HBA |
| | Dave Kaiser | NECA |
| | Mark Hopkins | EC Company |
| | Doug Jenkins | PGE |
| | Thomas Pruce | SH T2 Works |

The meeting started a paragraph (9) of the current proposed draft Alternate Entry. Suggestion were made to change the heading:

Non-permit Entry
Non-permit Entry Practices

Peggy compared the Division 2, C5 and C7 allowances in 1910.146 with the proposed language.

Members suggested:

Relocating the entire paragraph prior to paragraph (5) Permit Required Confined Space Entry Program and Permits.

Adding a definition of control.

Adding “ for the duration of work “ to the end of the Note that gives the meaning of “hazard elimination”

After some discussion, most of the members lean on the side that most atmospheric hazards are normally controlled not eliminated.

Removing or condensing (9) (b) with (9) (f) because of some potential redundancies.

The meeting shifted into a discussion on creating a flow chart that is more commonly used in the construction industry. Once the chart is developed, suggestions were made to have the proposed rule reflect the flow chart.

Construction companies struggle in the explanation of how to determine the necessary methodology for the employees that enter these spaces. More often than not the spaces in construction can often be declassified similar to those allowed in C5 and C7 of the Division 2 rule.

Mark from EC Company in conjunction with Peggy agreed to develop a useable flow chart that Oregon OSHA and the group can consider using as a tool to simplify the confined space construction rule.

