



## Clamp Separates from Rotating Gear

### Purpose

To share “lessons learned” gained from incident investigations through a small group discussion method format.

To understand “lessons learned” through a Systems of Safety viewpoint.



This material was produced by the Labor Institute and the United Steelworkers International Union under grant number SH-17045-08-60-F-42 Susan Harwood Training Grant Program, for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. It does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Labor, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products or organizations imply endorsement by the U. S. Government.

**Lessons Learned**

**Volume 08, Issue 44**

**© 2008 The Labor Institute**

## Background Information

Before beginning this Lessons Learned, please review this and the next page which contain information that will introduce the concepts of Lessons Learned and Systems of Safety.

Creating a safe and healthy workplace requires a never ending search for hazards that sometimes are not obvious to us. These hazards exist in every workplace and can be found by using various methods. Lessons Learned are just as the name suggests: learning from incidents to prevent the same or similar incidents from happening again.

**Systems Are Not Created Equal: Not equal in protection and not equal in prevention.**

Using our Systems Focus to uncover system flaws or root causes is only one part of controlling hazards. We also need to look at the systems involved to decide on the best way to deal with the problem. The most effective way to control a hazard is close to its source. The least effective is usually at the level of the person being exposed. The system of safety in which the flaw is identified is not necessarily the system in which you would attempt to correct the flaw.



Major Safety System	Design & Engineering	Maintenance & Inspection	Mitigation Devices	Warning Devices	Training & Procedures	Personal Protective Factors
Level of Prevention	Highest—the first line of defense		Middle—the second line of defense			Lowest—the last line of defense
Effectiveness	Most Effective		←————→			Least Effective
Goal	To eliminate hazards	To further minimize and control hazards				To protect when higher level systems fail
<b>EXAMPLES OF SAFETY SUB-SYSTEMS**</b>	<b>Technical</b>	Inspection and Testing	Enclosures, Barriers Dikes and Containment	Monitors	Operating Manuals and Procedures	Personal Decision-making and Actions HF
	Design and Engineering of Equipment, Processes and Software	Maintenance	Relief and Check Valves	Process Alarms	Process Safety Information	Personal Protective Equipment and Devices HF
	Management of Change (MOC)**	Quality Control	Shutdown and Isolation Devices	Facility Alarms	Process, Job and Other Types of Hazard Assessment and Analysis	Stop Work Authority
	Chemical Selection and Substitution	Turnarounds and Overhauls	Fire and Chemical Suppression Devices	Community Alarms	Permit Programs	
	Safe Siting	Mechanical Integrity	Machine Guarding	Emergency Notification Systems	Emergency Preparedness and Response Training	
	Work Environment HF				Refresher Training	
	<b>Organizational (must address a root cause)</b>				Information Resources	
	Staffing HF				Communications	
	Skills and Qualifications HF				Investigations and Lessons Learned	
	Management of Personnel Change (MOPC)				Maintenance Procedures	
	Work Organization and Scheduling HF				Pre-Startup Safety Review	
	Work Load					
	Allocation of Resources					
	Buddy System					
	Codes, Standards, and Policies**					

HF - Indicates that this subsystem is often included in a category called Human Factors.

\* There may be additional subsystems that are not included in this chart. Also, in the workplace many subsystems are interrelated. It may not always be clear that an issue belongs to one subsystem rather than another.

\*\* The Codes, Standards and Policies and Management of Change subsystems listed here are related to Design and Engineering. These subsystems may also be relevant to other systems; for example, Mitigation Devices. When these subsystems relate to systems other than Design and Engineering, they should be considered as part of those other systems, not Design and Engineering.

**Revised October 2006**



**Title:** Clamp Separates from Rotating Gear

**Identifier:** Volume 08, Issue 44

**Date Issued:** December 28, 2008

**Lessons Learned Statement:**

Failure to maintain a full staff of mechanics and the lack of a preventive maintenance program led to an equipment failure which could have caused a serious accident.

*Systems of Safety* are utilized to prevent this kind of failure. Maintaining adequate staffing is applying the *Organizational* side of the **Design and Engineering System of Safety**.

A well-defined preventive maintenance program is a way to ensure equipment integrity and is applying a fix in the **Maintenance and Inspection System of Safety**.

Proceduralizing the preventive maintenance program and training workers on the procedure is applying the **Training and Procedures System of Safety**.

This incident could have been avoided had these *Systems of Safety* been in place.


**Discussion:**

In this near-miss event, a clamp truck driver was loading rolls of paper. As he lifted another roll and backed up, the clamp assembly separated itself from the rotating gear in the clamp assembly. The investigators found that there had been many broken bolts prior to this incident. From looking closely at the assembly, it was very obvious that there were eight fresh bolt breaks. All (16) of the other broken bolts appear to have been broken before this event.

The driver was using a truck which has a rating of 8,000 lbs. The roll of paper he was attempting to move weighed 7,200 lbs. In the past, the clamp was serviced every 500 hours or so. This is no longer the case. The mechanic told the investigators that there was a time when there were four mechanics and that this part of the routine maintenance was getting done. He also stated that they routinely applied Lock-tite when they tightened the bolts and that no torquing procedure exists. The truck's hour meter read 5,638 hours on the day of the incident. The number of hours between servicing on the clamp is unknown. It should be noted that the investigators checked the daily safety check list and it had been completed the morning of the incident.

**Analysis**

**The Logic Tree** is a pictorial representation of a logical process that maps an incident from its occurrence, “the event,” to facts of the incident and the incident’s root causes.



**Recommended Actions**

1. Staff the mechanic workforce to ensure necessary preventive and routine maintenance is able to be completed.
2. Establish a maintenance procedure that requires preventive and routine maintenance to be performed per the manufacturers' recommendations.
3. Implement a Preventive Maintenance Program.
4. Add clamps as entities with serial numbers and servicing history.
5. Train mechanics on proper torquing procedures.

### Education Exercise

Working in your groups and using the Lessons Learned Statement, Discussion, Analysis and Recommended Actions, answer the two questions below. Your facilitator will give each group an opportunity to share answers with the large group.

1. Give examples of ways to apply the Lessons Learned Statement at your workplace.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

2. Of the examples you generated from Question 1, which will you pursue in your workplace? (**Note:** When we say something you may pursue, we mean a joint labor-management activity or a union activity rather than an activity carried out by you as an individual.)

## Trainer’s Lessons Learned Success Inventory

Following a Lessons Learned (LL) session, **the trainer who led the LL** should complete this form. This information will: 1) Help you reflect on the successes and challenges of the session; 2) Help USW with new curriculum development; and 3) Help USW as a whole better understand how the LL Program is supporting their workers.

By reviewing LL from different sites or from other areas of their workplaces, workers are able to analyze the information and apply these lessons to their own workplaces in order to make their workplaces healthier and safer.

1. Site name (if there are participants from more than one site, please list all).

---

2. Date of LL training \_\_\_\_\_

3. LL number used in today’s Training \_\_\_\_\_

4. Your name \_\_\_\_\_

5. **Summary of Education Question 1:** Please summarize participants’ examples of ways to apply this LL Statement to their workplace.

**Please continue on reverse side.**

- 6. Summary of Education Question 2:** Please summarize actions or recommendations participants discussed pursuing at their workplace(s).

**Thank you for completing this form.**

# EVALUATION

## Lessons Learned: Clamp Separates from Rotating Gear

Please answer the two questions below:

1. How important is this lessons learned to you and your workplace? (Circle one.) Rate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the most important.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

2. What suggestions would you make to improve this Lessons Learned?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**End of Training Trainer's Instructions**

Please complete the information below.

Trainer's Name \_\_\_\_\_  
(Please Print)

Date of training: \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Participants: Total \_\_\_\_\_ Hourly \_\_\_\_\_ Management \_\_\_\_\_

Location of Training: \_\_\_\_\_

USW Local # \_\_\_\_\_

Send:

1. This page;
2. The Education Exercise (page 8);
3. The Trainer's LL Success Inventory form (pages 9 and 10);
4. The evaluation for each participant (page 11); and
5. The Sign-in sheet (page 13) to:

<b>If you are a TOP Site (excluding DOE TOP Sites)</b>	<b>Send to: Steve Cable 2915 Gradient Drive St. Louis, MO 63125</b>
<b>All other sites (including DOE TOP Sites)</b>	<b>Send to: Doug Stephens United Steelworkers 3340 Perimeter Hill Drive Nashville, TN 37211</b>

Thank you for facilitating the sharing of this  
Lesson Learned with your coworkers.



