

Asbestos Liaison Group Technical Sub Committee (ALGTSC)	
Minutes of the meeting of the ALG TSC held on the 6th February 2013 Hertel offices Preston Brook	
Present: Martin Gibson (HSE), Colette Willoughby (BOHS), Steve Sadley (ARCA), Steve Watkins (UKATA), Terry Slater (ACAD)	
Apologies for absence: None	
1.0	Introductions, apologies and welcome: Martin Gibson welcomed all attendees to the meeting and thanked Hertel for their continuing assistance with providing the venue for these meetings.
2.0	Minutes of ALGTSC meetings (No.6 & 8) and acceptance: The minutes of the ALGTSC meeting (No.6) held on the 27th January 2012 to be finalised and circulated by Steve Watkins to allow them to be uploaded onto the ALG Website. The minutes of the ALGTSC meeting (No.8) held on the 30th May 2012 were accepted as complete and would be uploaded to the ALG Website along with those from meetings No.6 & 7 Action: Steve to circulate finalised minutes for meeting No.6.
3.0	Matters Arising from the minutes: Section 3 The entry into live enclosures by other trades The Memo needs to consider the following topics: Employment status, Who it's aimed at, who is allowed entry, what they are allowed to go into, preparation for entry, training, record keeping with references to face fits, medicals (where/if appropriate) plus planned & reactive works, requirements for work to stop, insurance requirements. Update required from Greg Hayward to see if any changes likely which may affect the memo plus whether it will be included/referenced within the Licensed Contractors Guide or the new ACoP. Action: (1) Steve (S) to produce a draft memo for circulation to the group – timescale, end of February (2) Martin to liaise with Greg Section 3 – Enclosure Ventilation Study The work is now complete. An initial draft report has been produced which will ultimately be released as an HSL document. This process is likely to take some time due to the authorisation required. Action:

	<p>No action required by the group.</p> <p>Section 4 – Soffit Guide – see main agenda</p> <p>Section 5 – Gas and electrical safety in DCUs – see main agenda</p> <p>Section 7 – Asbestos Paper – action complete</p>
<p>4.0</p>	<p>Gas and Electrical Safety in DCUs - Also Incorporates Agenda Item No.6</p> <p>The HSE specialist involved with looking at and providing guidance on the memo has recently retired. Another copy will be sent to a new specialist inspector. Additional items to be included within the memo are:</p> <p>Earthing, storage for LPG, frequency for checks (this differs depending upon whether the unit is considered as a caravan or used for construction purposes), the information the hirer should provide at the time of hiring.</p> <p>Carbon Monoxide Meters – many companies are now including these within DCUs but these tend to be installed by the users rather than the manufacturers. The manufacturers have advised of a high expense to install the meters (circa £300) and are concerned with regards to humidity from the shower section causing problems with the meter. The committee did not feel that humidity should be an issue as the meters would be located in the clean end and the air flow would be from clean through the shower into the dirty end. The moisture from the shower area should therefore not be an issue. The meters installed by the users only have a limited lifespan (circa 1-2 years) but are considerably cheaper (around £30).</p> <p>Possible problems were discussed with fumes from self-contained DCUs which have petrol driven or gas powered generators.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Steve (S) to update the memo and circulate to the committee for comments, with a view to having a draft memo ready for the next committee meeting. (2) Terry to look at self-contained DCUs which are petrol driven or have gas powered generators to identify any issues which there may be with them.
<p>5.0</p>	<p>Soffit Guidance Feedback</p> <p>There have been mixed reviews and concerns with regards to enforcement. The guide is intended to be an industry standard and should be used as a bench marking tool. Various industry stakeholders were involved with its production and the consultation process. A letter was circulated a number of years ago by an HSE inspector (A Kingscott) which set out appropriate situations where full enclosures and/or partial enclosures would be required. This letter did not directly relate to soffit removal but was believed to give a good summary which was relevant to soffit works.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Steve (S) to locate and circulate the letter from A Kingscott to the committee. (2) Terry to put together a list of comments received and circulate to the committee.

<p>6.0</p>	<p>DCUs and the electrical safety requirements including the need for earth spikes</p> <p>Refer to agenda item No 4 above</p>
<p>7.0</p>	<p>NNLW in Soils.</p> <p>Discussions were held with regards to removal of asbestos from soils and whether or not it would be notifiable or non notifiable work. The conclusion was that the criteria to be used when determining whether the works are licensable or not is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work will not be maintenance (as described within the NNLW guidance). • If when carrying out the work, ‘intact’ licensable products are visible then the works are most likely to be Licensable. • If there are easily identifiable non-licensed products such as asbestos cement and can remove these without them degrading then the work will be non-licensed and not notifiable. • If however the non-licensed products are degraded at the outset or will be degraded during the process then the work will be NNLW. • If there is dumped material which is clearly licensable but is mixed through the soil then this work is likely to be licensable. In those circumstances consideration needs to be given to the best method of removal which is likely to require the use of heavy equipment such as JCB’s. JCB drivers are unlikely to be from LARCs however they are best placed to use this type of equipment rather than a LARC but need to be managed by the LARC. <p>Action:</p> <p>Colette to provide this clarification back to the NORAC group.</p>
<p>8.0</p>	<p>Asbestos Paper Removal</p> <p>Additional queries have been received with regards to the issue of asbestos paper. The HSE view is that paper is not going to be the main form of insulation when applied to a product and it can generally be removed intact therefore rendering it as non-licensed material/work.</p> <p>If paper has to be scraped and damaged excessively to remove it (e.g. if large sections are stuck to steam pipes) and cannot be removed whole then this would be a licensed activity. It is accepted that small amounts may be stuck to pipework and require scraping but if the majority comes off whole then the work is non-licensed.</p> <p>Paper attached to boarding will not usually fall into licensed work. It may fall into the NNLW category if it is being worked upon which causes degradation and is not classed as maintenance work.</p>
<p>9.0</p>	<p>Quill Blast and Dry Ice Blasting Systems</p> <p>There is no specific guidance for the use of these types of aggressive techniques for removing asbestos. The committee will look at producing a memo to cover this type of work. These aggressive systems should only be used as a secondary technique when the residual material is stubborn and extremely difficult and in some cases impossible to remove with other manual techniques.</p>

	<p>The main areas of concern are: Excessive noise levels generated Excessive fibre levels The technique breaks the fibres down to a very fine size which cannot always be picked up using normal PCM analysis but can be identified with SEM Powered respirators may not be sufficient to protect against the fibre levels generated Additional controls required to protect enclosure sheeting and seals</p> <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Martin to circulate some initial information as the basis of the memo (2) Colette to contact LTHT to request copies of the PCM/SEM results from air monitoring carried out during trials she was involved with
<p>10.0</p>	<p>Ancillary license activities including Type H Vacuum cleaners, NPU and the requirement to have an ancillary licence to carry out DOP and maintenance activities</p> <p>Terry has undertaken audits on ancillary license holders (as identified above) and found that there was very little inspection relating to them when compared to LARCs. The audits highlighted problems such as return of equipment in poor condition/contaminated which can then lead to exposure of the staff from the hire company. Issues with equipment design such as the fasteners on vacuums opening easily which could be prevented if the ability to fit pins into the clips was there. There appears to be a lack of suitable procedures in place or guidance. Current training for licence holders doesn't cover this category in any detail.</p> <p>It was felt that guidance is needed to cover the facilities and also procedures for ancillary license holders in accepting and hiring equipment. Consideration needs to be given to: Receiving equipment, hiring/sending out equipment, testing of equipment, cleaning of equipment and also training.</p> <p>Action: Terry to produce some guidance and circulate to the committee for comment. The guidance may go into the licensed contractors guide. Timescale – within the next 2 months</p>
<p>11.0</p>	<p>'Worker Involvement' and what this should look like in the licensed asbestos removal industry</p> <p>There were discussions regarding how worker involvement could be demonstrated. Suggested ways were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings to obtain feedback to improve health & safety • Close out documents at the end of each job to see if anything could be done better for future jobs • Collecting feedback when jobs go wrong to see what could be improved <p>Action: Steve (W) to produce a list of headings as a starting point and circulate to the committee.</p>

	Timescale – circulate by mid-March with the committee to give feedback by mid-April.
12.0	<p>Electronic on Site Record Keeping</p> <p>With the popularity and availability of tablet PCs records are being kept on site electronically rather than as hard copies. Guidance as to what is appropriate to be held in this way needs to be produced. It was felt that the plan of work should be available as a hard copy document to allow staff to read it. Consideration needs to be given as to the readability of some documents, especially long ones along with how they are stored e.g. is an internet connection required to access the documents remotely or will they be held on the PC hard drive?</p> <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Colette to prepare some initial guidance and circulate to the committee. Timescale one month. (2) Terry to provide contact details to Colette of companies who currently use electronic recording so that she can find out how these systems are currently being used. Timescale – as soon as possible.
13.0	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>No items were raised however the topic of a combined ALG memo was discussed during the meeting. This would be a memo which incorporated a number of items which would be ‘too small’ to warrant a memo of their own. Suggestions for inclusion within a combined memo included:</p> <p>NNLW and Soils Asbestos Paper Removal Electronic on Site Record Keeping</p> <p>Action: To be included on the agenda for the next committee meeting</p>
14.0	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>Tuesday 30th April 2013.</p> <p>All meetings are scheduled to start at 10:30am</p>