



Campus-Wide Health and Safety Committee
January 29, 2021 - 10:00 am
Minutes

Welcome and Introductions

- Meeting began at 10:00 am. Members present: M. Williams, J. Scheffler, O. Faynor, S. Milton, D. Evans, K. Boisselle, R. Montoya for D. Routtenberg, L. Broussard.

Minutes Review

- The minutes were approved from the last meeting in September. Meetings are normally held on the 4th Thursday of the month. The minutes can be found on the EHS website.

Review of CHSC Locations and Members

- Mike updated the member roster for the committee. Kyle Boisselle is the new Unit 2 Rep and Lee Broussard is the new Unit 7 Rep. The committee members introduced themselves.

Covid – 19

- Lee mentioned that a student inquired if there is Covid testing for dorm residents and Mike said that testing is required and performed on a weekly basis on Wed. 8 am – 4 pm and Mike and Nora in Emergency Management receive the results. The testing is required for students coming to campus and strongly encouraged for employees.

Protexus Electrostatic Sprayers

- Unit 5 wanted to change up some sanitation practices for disinfecting and sanitizing of common spaces using these electrostatic sprayers. The sprayer is made by Waxie and uses a chlorine-based tablet that dissolves in water and mists areas. A total of 6 of these units were ordered and the company Waxie is performing the training today. When the unit is sprayed droplets cling to contents in the room for disinfection and no PPE is required. This is not a substitute for cleaning and will be used for high touch surfaces and areas without having to wipe. The electrostatic sprayers were paid for by the Covid account. These sprayers are light weight and easy to move around and a very safe product. Kyle said they have one in the athletic training area and are having great success, but it is an older model and can get clogged and must be cleaned on a regular basis every time it is used. In the training today the question will be asked if the new model also becomes clogged.



W/C Claims

- Shaun said in September there were 3 claims from Unit 5 with 1 from custodial and 2 from grounds. Custodial was a right wrist injury from moving a carpet extractor and for the future there was equipment purchased to assist with the extractor to roll up onto the truck rather than trying to lift it onto the truck. The 2nd claim was a grounds worker who noticed a sprinkler not working and drove the cart looking for the worker in the area and fell down 4 steps causing injury to the back and shoulders. The 3rd was a grounds worker working around a fire stick plant and he brushed up against it causing a reaction.
- In October there were 4 claims with 3 from Unit 5 and 1 from Unit 3. The Unit 3 claim was from internal issues and nothing specific from a safety aspect. For Unit 5 there were 3 claims and 2 were from grounds workers. One of the grounds workers indicated illness as a result of heat exposure from working outside. The other grounds worker was using a weed wacker and slipped and fell while working on a slippery slope. The last one involved a light equipment operator stepping off the tractor and landing on their left foot while twisting the ankle and fell injuring the left shoulder and straining his back.
- In November there were 4 incidents with 3 from Unit 5 and 1 from Unit 3. A Unit 3 person slipped but did not fall resulting in pain to the knee and back. For Unit 5 a grounds worker indicated pain while doing usual work to the back and shoulder. Also a custodian had an injury to the hand, wrist and fingers doing normal custodial duties.
- In December a custodian was cleaning a toilet and struck the left hand on the edge of the toilet causing a sprain to the hand.
- There were no ergonomics claims and providing the ergonomic equipment is helping.

Metrics

- Mike creates monthly metrics based upon the numbers provided by Shaun. He receives the loss run report from Shaun and gets work hours from HR for each bargaining unit for hours worked to come up with a normalization report like an OSHA recordable rate. It is normalized for example there are more employees in bargaining Unit 3 than Unit 5 so you want to normalize that with the number of injuries based upon the number of hours worked so it does not look skewed. It is done by FY so starting on July 1st we look at the 9 bargaining units and the graph shows where we were as of December FY 19 is in blue. Where we ended up the year in June 2020 is in red and the green is through December of 2021. So the idea is that the blue is where you were a year ago and the green is now so it is better a year ago. Looking at Unit 4 a year ago they had an injury rate of 9% and ended the year at 3% meaning they had less injuries as they went through the rest of the FY and as of this FY they have not reported any injuries so that is trending the right way. For Unit 5 the custodial and grounds a year ago they had no injuries and ended the year at 9.5% and currently at almost 20%. So this shows Unit 5 is concerning and Mike wants to work with the new Grounds Manager Scott and Jon's team to get in front of these injuries because this indicator is concerning that we are seeing a spike in injuries. A year ago was the start of the pandemic so other



bargaining units that were on campus more often maybe had more risk in their jobs like Unit 4 and now they are home so maybe that is an indicator. Unit 5 stayed on campus and continued to maintain the grounds and clean the facilities and resulted in an increase of risk and injuries there and the graph shows that. All the metrics never have any names on it and the information can be shared without pointing fingers at anybody. The information Shaun gets from Sedgewick the 3rd party workers comp. administrator does show names so Mike removes the names and puts it into the data. You will see each bargaining unit and every month it is updated and you will also see injury by job class so the largest group is Grounds at 44% followed by custodial at 22% so they both make up 2/3 of all injuries reported. Looking at injury by type the slips, trips and falls is the leading injury by type. We have seen some ergonomics injuries for people working at home in static positions causing pain and discomfort. The OSHA frequency rate at the bottom is 19.92% and the chart for Unit 5 shows 19.92%. Also MPP's are included too. CSUDH as a whole campus has an incident rate of 1.025 which is good so an incident rate of under 2.0 as a campus whole is where you want to be. If we start to see this spike then we need to start putting some measures in place to mitigate that. Currently our area of concern is Unit 5 so we need to work on training and making sure they have the equipment they need and we discussed the protective sprayer that will be helpful for cleaning and disinfecting. These are some of the things that these metrics help us determine. Each month for the OSHA recordables this chart populates the injury by type and injuries by job class so you can see in July we had a grounds injury that was a slip, trip and fall so we will go back to the pie chart that shows slips, trips and falls. So the ones by month's July, August and September will go back and populate these 2 pie graphs. Also we look at what body parts are getting injured so we can determine if there are things we can put in place to help like engineering controls by using a scissor lift or a material handling cart or PPE if there are a lot of head injuries. It helps indicate what we do to put protective measures in place. We want to be transparent so that the committee is aware of where the injuries are on campus and what we are trying to do to mitigate them. Jon said it is good to see the statistics in this type of format right now and is a lot easier to read too. We can track it monthly to see what is going on. Jon appreciates it and is very helpful and Mike and Shaun put a lot into this.

Open Forum

- Lee got a text from Benjamin and he wanted to know if the Clorox 360 machine will be used in housing. Mike said it is another type of electrostatic sprayer and it is on a cart and Benjamin likes it. The issue is that it is more hazardous than the protexus electrostatic sprayer as an inhalation hazard. Over time if you are spraying and breathing it in respiratory damage can result so the manufacturer recommends a respirator and the protexus type does not have this issue. Mike will review what the manufacturer sent as far as the time weighted average meaning how long can it be used before requiring a respirator and determine if the tasks do not exceed those time frames. The analysis has not been done so the sprayer is not being used yet. Mike wants to be sure if it is safe to use and we do not really know if we want to fit test our custodians to wear respirators but for this task we can



use the protexus. Mike realizes Benjamin likes the Clorox device but as of today the Clorox 360 machine is not able to be used pending the findings of the research.

Next Meeting: TBA