

<b>CAMPUS SELF-ASSESSMENT PLAN</b>	<b>(1) CURRENT DEPLOYMENT STATUS 0-100%</b>	<b>(2) CURRENT PERFORMANCE 0-100%</b>		
			<b>Score</b>	<b><u>Current Deployment Status (1)</u></b>
<b>PROGRAM: IIPP</b>			0%	- No systematic approach
<b>Elements:</b>			10-30%	- Beginning of a systematic approach
▪ Written campus plan -- reviewed annually				- Major gaps in deployment that inhibit progress in achieving objectives
▪ Written department plans				
▪ Hazard identification and mitigation			40-60%	- A sound, systematic approach, responsive to primary objective
▪ Accident investigation and mitigation				- No major gaps in deployment, though some areas in very early stages
▪ Training and documentation				
			70-90%	- A sound, systematic approach, responsive to overall objectives
<b>PROGRAM: CHP</b>				- Approach is relatively well-deployed, with no major gaps
<b>Elements:</b>				
▪ Written campus plan -- reviewed annually			100%	- A sound, systematic approach, fully responsive to all requirements
▪ Written lab specific (PI) CHPs				- Approach is fully deployed without any significant weaknesses or gaps
▪ SOPs included in lab CHPs				
▪ Emergency contacts and procedures				
▪ Training and documentation				
▪ Inspection of EW/DS/ documentation/frequency				
			0%	- No results or poor results
<b>PROGRAM: Waste Management</b>			10-30%	- Some improvements or early good performance levels in a few areas.
<b>Elements:</b>				- Minimal reporting of results
▪ Written contingency plan -- reviewed annually			40-60%	- Improvement trends and/or good performance levels reported for many to most areas of importance to key business requirements
▪ Written SOP's updated and reviewed annually				- No pattern of adverse trends and/or poor performance levels
▪ Employee training and documentation reviewed annually				
▪ Training program in place for lab personnel			70-90%	- Current performance is good to excellent in most areas of importance to key business requirements
				- Most improvement trends and/or performance levels are sustained
<b>PROGRAM: Biosafety</b>				
<b>Elements:</b>			100%	- Current performance is excellent in most areas of importance to key business requirements
▪ Written campus exposure control plan -- reviewed annually				- Excellent improvement trends and/or sustained excellent performance levels in most areas
▪ Written lab specific exposure control plan -- reviewed annually				
▪ BBP program in place -- reviewed annually				
▪ Lab inspections-annually for BL-3 and BL-2				
▪ Review Approval Process				

CAMPUS SELF-ASSESSMENT PLAN (Page 2)	(1) CURRENT DEPLOYMENT STATUS 0-100%	(2) CURRENT PERFORMANCE 0-100%	
			<b>Score    Current Deployment Status (1)</b>
<b>PROGRAM: Emergency Preparedness</b>			0%    - No systematic approach
<b>Elements:</b>			10-30%    - Beginning of a systematic approach
▪ Written campus plan -- reviewed annually			- Major gaps in deployment that inhibit progress in achieving objectives
▪ Written department evacuation plans -- reviewed annually			40-60%    - A sound, systematic approach, responsive to primary objective
▪ Department training provided (all employees)			- No major gaps in deployment, though some areas in very early stages
▪ Drills -- at least annually			70-90%    - A sound, systematic approach, responsive to overall objectives
<b>PROGRAM: Fire and Life Safety</b>			- Approach is relatively well-deployed, with no major gaps
<b>Elements:</b>			100%    - A sound, systematic approach, fully responsive to all requirements
▪ Construction plan review and inspection program			- Approach is fully deployed without any significant weaknesses or gaps
▪ Campus specifications in place for fire protection/prevention devices			<b>Score    Current Performance (2)</b>
▪ Inspection and documentation of fire protection equipment			0%    - No results or poor results
▪ Inspection of general campus and high hazard facilities on an annual basis			10-30%    - Some improvements or early good performance levels in a few areas.
Status of training program			- Minimal reporting of results
<b>PROGRAM: Employee Exposure Control</b>			40-60%    - Improvement trends and/or good performance levels reported for many to most areas of importance to key business requirements
<b>Elements:</b>			- No pattern of adverse trends and/or poor performance levels
▪ High hazard areas identified and employees monitored as needed (e.g., noise, chemicals, gases, RF, etc.)			70-90%    - Current performance is good to excellent in most areas of importance to key business requirements
▪ Respiratory Prot. Program in place and monitored annually			- Most improvement trends and/or performance levels are sustained
▪ Carcinogen registration in place and monitored as needed			100%    - Current performance is excellent in most areas of importance to key business requirements
▪ Employee training and documentation			- Excellent improvement trends and/or sustained excellent performance levels in most areas
Instruments calibrated as appropriate			
<b>PROGRAM: Ergonomics</b>			
<b>Elements:</b>			
▪ Campus ergonomics program in place and reviewed annually			
▪ Train-the-Trainer program in place and documented			
▪ Integration with Workers' Comp. Program			
▪ Staff training and development program			

CAMPUS SELF-ASSESSMENT PLAN (Page 3)	(1) CURRENT DEPLOYMENT STATUS 0-100%	2) CURRENT PERFORMANCE 0-100%		
			<b>Score</b>	<b><u>Current Deployment Status (1)</u></b>
<b>PROGRAM: Asbestos/Lead</b>			0%	- No systematic approach
<b>Elements:</b>			10-30%	- Beginning of a systematic approach - Major gaps in deployment that inhibit progress in achieving objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Campus asbestos management plan in place and reviewed annually</li> </ul>			40-60%	- A sound, systematic approach, responsive to primary objective - No major gaps in deployment, though some areas in very early stages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Campus Pb management plan in place and reviewed annually</li> <li>• Staff training and certifications current</li> <li>• Asbestos inventory maintained</li> </ul>			70-90%	- A sound, systematic approach, responsive to overall objectives - Approach is relatively well-deployed, with no major gaps
			100%	- A sound, systematic approach, fully responsive to all requirements - Approach is fully deployed without any significant weaknesses or gaps
<b>PROGRAM: Environmental Issues</b>				
<b>Elements:</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ U/G tanks removed and/or upgraded by 12/22/99</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Annual review of compliance plans for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Air quality district</li> <li>▪ Water quality district</li> <li>▪ Stormwater management plan</li> <li>▪ NPDES permit</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				
			0%	- No results or poor results
<b>PROGRAM: Radiation Safety</b>			10-30%	- Some improvements or early good performance levels in a few areas. - Minimal reporting of results
<b>Elements:</b>			40-60%	- Improvement trends and/or good performance levels reported for many to most areas of importance to key business requirements - No pattern of adverse trends and/or poor performance levels
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Written overall lab surveillance plan in place and reviewed annually</li> </ul>			70-90%	- Current performance is good to excellent in most areas of importance to key business requirements - Most improvement trends and/or performance levels are sustained
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Isotope receipt and distribution -- reviewed annually</li> </ul>			100%	- Current performance is excellent in most areas of importance to key business requirements - Excellent improvement trends and/or sustained excellent performance levels in most areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dosimetry records/Leak tests/Bioassay records reviewed annually</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Staff training and development -- reviewed annually and documented</li> </ul>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Employee (RAD worker) training and documentation</li> </ul>				

CAMPUS SELF-ASSESSMENT PLAN (Page 4)	(1) CURRENT DEPLOYMENT STATUS 0-100%	(2) CURRENT PERFORMANCE 0-100%	
<b>PROGRAM: Medical Surveillance</b>			<b>Score    <u>Current Deployment Status (1)</u></b>
<b>Elements:</b>			0%    - No systematic approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identification of F/S/S requiring at least annual medical evaluation, e.g. animal users, respirators, divers, asbestos and lead workers, etc..</li> </ul>			10-30%    - Beginning of a systematic approach - Major gaps in deployment that inhibit progress in achieving objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enrollment (or waiver) documented</li> </ul>			40-60%    - A sound, systematic approach, responsive to primary objective - No major gaps in deployment, though some areas in very early stages
<b>PROGRAM: Environmental Health</b>			
<b>Elements:</b>			70-90%    - A sound, systematic approach, responsive to overall objectives - Approach is relatively well-deployed, with no major gaps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Written PPM's on water, housing, food, pest control and pools reviewed annually</li> </ul>			100%    - A sound, systematic approach, fully responsive to all requirements - Approach is fully deployed without any significant weaknesses or gaps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Training programs and documentation</li> <li>▪ Facilities evaluated periodically in accordance with local regulatory guidelines.</li> </ul>			
<b>PROGRAM: Risk Management/Workers' Compensation</b>			<b>Score    <u>Current Performance (2)</u></b>
<b>Elements:</b>			0%    - No results or poor results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Risk Management:</li> <li>▪ Litigation management/cost reductions</li> <li>▪ General claims activity review</li> <li>▪ Evaluation of funding</li> </ul>			10-30%    - Some improvements or early good performance levels in a few areas. - Minimal reporting of results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Workers' Compensation:</li> <li>▪ Integration with related programs within/outside EH&amp;S</li> <li>▪ Department specific review/Activity reduction</li> <li>▪ General claims activity review</li> <li>▪ Review case management activities for efficiency/effectiveness</li> </ul>			40-60%    - Improvement trends and/or good performance levels reported for many to most areas of importance to key business requirements - No pattern of adverse trends and/or poor performance levels
			70-90%    - Current performance is good to excellent in most areas of importance to key business requirements - Most improvement trends and/or performance levels are sustained
			100%    - Current performance is excellent in most areas of importance to key business requirements - Excellent improvement trends and/or sustained excellent performance levels in most areas