

Final Transcript

US Chemical Safety Board
Date: November 23, 2015

SPEAKERS

Amy McCormick
Vanessa Allen Sutherland
Kristen Kulinowski
Rick Engler
Manny Ehrlich
Kara Wenzel

PRESENTATION

Operator: Welcome to the CSB Business Meeting. My name is Danielle, and I will be your operator for today's call. At this time, all participants are in a "listen-only" mode. Later, we will conduct a question and answer session. Please note that this conference is being recorded.

I will now turn the call over to Amy McCormick. Amy, you may begin.

Amy McCormick: Thank you, Danielle. I'd like to welcome everyone to the CSB Business Meeting. Today we're going to go over a few investigative and organizational updates CSB is currently doing, and joining me here this morning, we have CSB Chairperson, Vanessa Allen Sutherland, Board Members Manny Ehrlich, Dr. Kristen Kulinowski, and joining by phone will be Board Member Rick Engler, and we also have our [Acting] General Counsel, Kara Wenzel.

At this time, I want to take a few seconds to go over the agenda. We're going to have opening statements from all of our Board Members, followed by Chair Vanessa Allen Sutherland, who will provide

an overview of our investigation and operational activities from the last quarter and through the end of the year.

Moving forward, Member Kristen Kulinowski will give an overview from our outreach efforts that were recently done, and then going into a status update of our open EPA IG investigations, and then we'll move into two discussions with Members Rick Engler and Manny Ehrlich on two potential public meetings on worker fatigue and Process Safety Management, and, finally, we'll discuss a recommendation that's related to BP Global Executive Board of Directors, and then we will open the room for public comment.

Before we get started, just so that everyone knows in the room, the exits for this building, just come out the way you came through the side door here, and in the back, and then we also have...I just want to make sure everyone has their cell phones muted before we get started, that we don't have any interruptions.

And with that, I will turn it over to our Chairperson, Vanessa Allen Sutherland.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Thank you, Amy. I'd like to open today's business meeting with a very short summary of the items that happened at our October 2015 meeting that was on October 21st. The Board approved the Caribbean Petroleum Investigation Report. We heard updates on the Board's open investigations, information about our FY 2015 Action Plan, and many of my and the Board Members' activities over the preceding couple of months.

We will now continue today's meeting with any opening statements from my Board Members, should they wish to provide them, and any comments that they may have.

I will start with Dr. Kulinowski.

Kristen Kulinowski: I have no opening statement, thank you.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Member Ehrlich.

Manny Ehrlich: Just that we're glad you're here and thank you for coming, and we hope that it's beneficial to you all. [Indiscernible] I spoke for her as well.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: And Member Engler.

Rick Engler: Welcome and no comments.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Thank you. At this time I'd like to provide an overview of the CSB's investigation and operational activities through the end of year, December 31st. As Amy mentioned, these are just high level updates, so if you do have questions, at the end we'll be doing a Q&A period on several of the items or categories that I discuss today.

I will start with our investigations overview. Our investigation staff continue to work very hard toward the completion of four investigations that we plan to present for Board consideration before the end of the first quarter of 2016.

The West Fertilizer investigation is currently in the final review, and editing stages, and will be presented at a public meeting in Waco, Texas, probably in the next couple of months for Board consideration.

After the completion of the West Fertilizer investigations, the Board will focus on the completion of the final two volumes of the Macondo/Deepwater Horizon investigation, which may be presented to the Board for consideration as early as February 2016, or a subsequent public meeting [indiscernible].

There are two additional investigation products related to the February 2014 release of sulfuric acid at the ExxonMobil refinery in Torrance, CA, and the June 2013 fire and explosion at the Williams Olefins plant in Geismar, LA. Those are anticipated for release also in early 2016, and we're going to continue to work on the ExxonMobil and DuPont LaPorte active investigations, which are currently underway and in the scoping process.

I'm sure the investigation team will be focused on those items throughout the remainder of the year, assuming that we don't have any other priorities that may have a shift of those tentative timelines.

For our financial overview, in addition to ongoing investigations, the CSB has been working on a variety of operational activities last week. The Board submitted the annual Performance and Accountability Review Report, or PAR, to the Office of Management and Budget, to describe the agency's performance measures, results and accountability for FY 2015.

During FY 2015, that report indicated that we completed 12 safety products, including 7 reports and 5 safety videos. CSB investigations from FY 2015 included a total of 32 new recommendations to improve chemical safety and reduce hazards.

The CSB deployed to two incidents, including a chemical release at the previously mentioned DuPont LaPorte facility in Texas, where four workers were fatally injured, and a series of releases at the ExxonMobil refinery in Torrance, CA.

We can also very proudly claim that we closed 24 recommendations from prior years during FY 2015, bringing the cumulative total of successfully implemented recommendations to 76% of those issued. These closures demonstrate that CSB recommendations continue to impact safety in American workplaces and communities.

An independent accounting firm has audited the CSB's consolidated financial statements from FY 2015 and has issued an unmodified opinion, the highest level of assurance, which states that the financial statements presented fairly and materially reflect the financial positions of the CSB as of September 30, 2015. And its net cost changes, changes in net positions and budgetary resources, for the years 2014 and 2015, conformed to accounting principles generally accepted in the United States. This achievement demonstrates both our continued dedication to sound financial management and reliability of the financial data upon which the CSB bases our critical decisions.

And I'd like to commend...I see Bea Robinson in the back, but I do not see Dai. I'd like to thank them for their ongoing efforts and continued success in receiving satisfactory financial audits.

In addition to this update on the agency's financial statements, the CSB continues to monitor its Continuing Resolution budget that will fund the agency through December 11th. At this time, the CSB has sufficient resources to complete mission-critical activities through the end of [indiscernible].

Governance overview. The CSB continues to address a variety of governance issues that have been raised by the EPA, Office of Inspector General, and other stakeholders. CSB staff continue to review and edit outdated Board Orders to accurately reflect the agency's current and best practices in a variety of critical areas, including agency governance, acquisition procedures, human resources policies, information security programs, and other, statutorily-required programs.

As part of it, and my dedication to transparency, the CSB has held two public business meetings in Washington, DC, in the first quarter of FY 2016, including today's meeting, and the meeting we had on October 21st. The CSB will also hold a public meeting in Waco, as I mentioned, and our next public business meeting will be on January 19, 2016. In addition, I am handling a variety of administrative matters that relate to general governance, including procurement decisions, and day-to-day operational activities.

Now, a little bit about our ongoing initiatives and projects. As a result of several recommendations from both the EPA, Office of Inspector General, and congressional oversight committees, the CSB will be engaging a consultant to provide organizational assessments, to include a review of the CSB's current organizational structure and employee position descriptions, to determine how the agency can both improve its effectiveness, and be better positioned to execute its mission.

The consultant would be hired to deliver a report and recommendations for further consideration. I anticipate these activities will be completed in the spring of 2016. The Statement of Work has been shared with the Chemical Safety Board's subject matter expert and the Board for its informational purposes, as well.

And then outreach and advocacy is our last category. On October 30th, a flash fire at a high school in Fairfax, Virginia, injured five students. Dr. Kulinowski, immediately after this presentation, will discuss one of our recent successes with outreach and advocacy as it relates to that incident.

In addition to that report, which you will hear in a moment, the CSB's safety video program was recently honored at the annual Television, Internet and Video Association of DC. The CSB's safety video, "Shock to the System," received a Silver Award for its portrayal of key lessons for preventing hydraulic shock in ammonia refrigeration systems, and the computer animation of the massive explosion and fire at the Caribbean Petroleum terminal facility in Bayamón, Puerto Rico, also received the Silver Award.

Thank you to Amy, and Shauna, and, in her absence, Hillary Cohen, for continuing to work on those safety videos, which, as many of you have heard, and many of the stakeholders have continued to tell me, are of tremendous value across industries and academic institutions in promoting safety and training. So I applaud our team for creating such valuable work.

Finally, last week the CSB announced a new initiative to offer Spanish language safety products, including news releases related to ongoing investigative work, and, eventually, safety video animations with Spanish subtitles. The CSB hopes that this initiative will ensure that the CSB's tremendous wealth of chemical safety knowledge reaches and affects as many stakeholders as possible.

This concludes the Board's update on investigational and operational activities. I will now move to the next section of our agenda, which will be Dr. Kulinowski's overview of the Woodson fire event, and the EPA OIG on its status.

Dr. Kulinowski.

Kristen Kulinowski: Thank you, Chair Sutherland. As Chair Sutherland mentioned, on October 30th of this year, five students and one teacher were injured after a fire broke out during a chemistry demonstration at the W.T. Woodson High School in Fairfax County, Virginia, not far from here. I took a personal interest in this incident for a number of reasons; as a chemist and former chemical educator, I know what's involved in performing chemical demonstrations, and I understand the importance of safety in doing them.

I'd like to give you just a little bit of facts on the incident, how the CSB responded, and where the incident stands today. As a result of the incident, two students were airlifted to the Washington Burn Center and three others were treated for minor injuries at a local hospital.

The CSB became aware of the incident the day it occurred, and began gathering information from school officials and from the Fairfax County Fire Marshal's office. Preliminary information we received on the date of the incident indicated that it involved the so-called "Rainbow Demonstration," which the CSB has investigated before.

While there is no standard protocol for the demonstration, it typically involves pouring a small amount of flammable liquid into a series of small dishes with different metals in them, or even onto an open bench, then lighting the liquid on fire. When done properly, the demonstration can create a rainbow of colored flames, since each metal burns with a different color.

A prior incidence investigated by the CSB revealed a hazard associated with the demonstration when additional flammable solvent is poured near the open flame to reignite one of the colors. This results in a flashback to the bottle of solvent, which causes a large jet of flames to shoot out of the bottle and burn people nearby.

In response to the Woodson incident, and in accordance with our internal procedures, the CSB held a deployment meeting to determine if we would send investigators. In that meeting, the prior work of the CSB on this issue was discussed, namely, as the CSB investigated three prior accidents of a similar nature, and has a database of several more that occurred around the country.

Those investigations led to the issuance of a Safety Bulletin: “Key Lessons for Preventing Incidents from Flammable Chemicals in Educational Demonstrations,” which is out on the table outside for you to take home, and also on our website. And we have, also, a safety video featuring the story of a victim of this type of demonstration—a very powerful and moving account of what she went through.

The Safety Bulletin had four key lessons for educators considering demonstrations involving both flammable solvents and open flame. These included a call to consider safer alternatives, effective teacher training, appropriate use of personal protective equipment, comprehensive hazard review prior to conducting the experiment or demonstration, and safety barriers between the demonstration and the audience.

Given the prior learnings and the facts involving this case, the CSB decided to focus on increasing its outreach and advocacy on the four key lessons in our safety bulletin. Toward this end, we issued a statement on the website authored by myself, conducted radio and television interviews to get the word out, and perhaps most importantly, engaged in discussions with other organizations that have greater reach into the educational community than we do at the CSB.

And I'm pleased to report that there is a great alignment among these organizations on our key messages. The CSB's prior work on this issue, and our current outreach, has reached tens of thousands of television viewers in the local area alone, and untold numbers with print media consumers. It's true that, regardless of whether or not we were quoted in the story, our materials were usually mentioned, particularly the safety video.

So, what's happening right now is that there's a heightened awareness of this type of incident that has resulted in changes, already, to the Fairfax County Schools system. There was an immediate ban on the use of open flames, intended to be temporary, until all teachers received updated safety training, and that is reported to be expected to wrap up by the end of the month. The County is also considering creating a Chemical Safety Liaison position to assist teachers in safe practices in the laboratory.

More broadly, there has been renewed advocacy efforts among the American Chemical Society, the National Science Teachers Association, and other organizations, to get the word out about the dangers of using open bottles of a flammable solvent and flames in the chemistry classroom.

The CSB's messages in our Safety Bulletin and safety video remain relevant, and we're pleased that our Safety Bulletin and safety video were so widely cited. With greater national awareness, in conjunction with our partners, we may be able to help educators avoid these types of incidents in the future, which, of course, we all want to have.

So, with that, I'll change gears and switch to the Chemical Safety Board's status of our Office of Inspector General audits. The EPA Office of Inspector General has jurisdiction over the CSB, and as of November 19th, we are currently working with them on six different audits, and I will summarize the status of these now.

The CSB reviewed and provided comments on October 16th of 2015 to the IG's draft report of CSB's compliance with the Federal Information Security Modernization Act, or FISMA, for fiscal year 2015. There are a total of seven recommendations, which the CSB will work to close by March 30th of 2016.

On November 10th the CSB was notified by the IG that work will begin to complete an additional objective associated with the mandated FY 2015 IG FISMA reporting metrics. A copy of these metrics and formal documented procedures and policies were provided to the IG on November 16th of this year.

A second audit is the CSB governance project. CSB staff met with the Inspector General's office on October 7th to discuss the issues expected to be in this draft report, and the OIG met with Board Members on October 28th to present and discuss its findings. A discussions document is expected in early 2016.

The third item is the Vantage hotline results. The CSB met with the Office of Inspector General on October 7th and 28th, and also discussed this particular issue. A discussions document is expected from the Inspector General in early 2016.

The fourth item is a semi-annual review to identify unimplemented recommendations. The CSB received the draft OIG semi-annual report table of unimplemented recommendations on Monday, October 9, 2015. We provided comments on the table the next day. The semi-annual report was issued to the EPA's Administrator to review and [send] to Congress.

Regarding the Improper Payment Act audit, CSB received notification from the Office of Inspector General on November 17, 2015, that it would conduct this audit. The objectives of the audit are to determine compliance with the [Federal] Improper Payments [Coordination Act of 2015] for fiscal year 2015, follow up on the prior year Improper Payment Act audit finding and recommendation, and we await contact from the Office of Inspector General to schedule an entrance meeting on this topic.

Finally, the CSB received notification from the Office of Inspector General on November 19th about an audit of CSB's purchase card. The audit objective is to determine CSB's compliance with the Government Charge Card Abuse Prevention Act of 2012, and we are currently awaiting contact from the OIG to schedule an entrance meeting.

And that concludes the wrap-up of the status of our pending open OIG audits.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Thank you, Dr. Kulinowski. We will now hear from Board Members Engler and Ehrlich, who will each provide an update on two public meetings that have been proposed by previous leadership at business meetings held the last year and earlier this year.

These public meetings would address two important chemical safety topics. The first is worker fatigue, which Member Engler will discuss in a moment, and prompted safety management or PSM reform, which Member Ehrlich will discuss.

We will start, Rick, with you. Member Engler, if you could give an overview of the commitment that was made regarding worker fatigue and our status.

Rick Engler: Yes, thank you very much, Chairwoman Sutherland. Can you all hear me? Thank you.

On May 12th of 2015, earlier this year, the Board approved notation item 215-27, which designated one of our recommendations—and I'll say this slowly, 2005-4-1-TX-R7A—to the American Petroleum Institute, with the status of “Open—Unacceptable Response,” and agreeing to schedule a public meeting on fatigue within one year from the date of that Board meeting. In other words, one year from May 12, 2015.

So, as a matter of background, I think there is widespread agreement in the petroleum industry, as well as in the collective bargaining representatives, those petroleum workers, that fatigue is an important subject, and it can be a contributing factor to process safety and workplace health and safety problems.

The point of the motion was to continue this discussion about the issue of fatigue through a public meeting, and there's some significant background that's important for why we want to do that, and why we haven't announced this earlier. One is that the industry, and particularly some specific companies, agreed on new fatigue management practices and reporting with the United Steelworkers, the collective bargaining agent representing many refinery workers in the United States. And so, at specific companies there were new agreements a number of months ago, in terms of how to address fatigue, reporting, information gathering, etc., and it would be quite valuable to hear this new information as a result of this recent agreement between the industry and the United Steelworkers.

At the same time, the American Petroleum Institute has “Recommended Practice 755” on fatigue risk management systems, and then maybe—and we think it's worthwhile to hear from them on what new information might have been gathered on this issue in light of that standard.

So, the motion directs CSB to do this. The motion did pass previously by a majority vote, to do this by mid-May of 2016. There's a number of options to consider in terms of where to hold the meeting and when to precisely hold the meeting. And that will be a focus of discussion that we can have, and we welcome public comment about any of the issues related to fatigue, including how best the Board might address it.

But the specific commitment that was made was to hold a public meeting on the subject. It's possible that, in light of developments in California on Process Safety Management, that that's one possible option.

Another would be, since it's of national significance, to hold a discussion in Washington, and the Board, with staff, will be discussing this in the weeks ahead. We'll incorporate the results of this discussion in a future public meeting, but also, importantly, in a clear commitment in our new operational plan.

And that's my report, and I welcome public comments, if there are any on this issue, later, in the public comment period.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Thank you, Member Engler. Member Ehrlich?

Manny Ehrlich: Thank you, Madame Chairwoman.

With regard to process safety coming out of the Chevron report in 2014, [Audio disruption] to hold public hearings, to discuss the need for Process Safety Management at the federal level, which would include EPA and OSHA. That has not taken place.

In addition to that, when the issue, Process Safety Management, was added to the Most Wanted List, again, we reiterated the fact that we were going to have further study and further need to discuss process safety regulatory reform. Basically, that's where we are now, and we're looking for input in terms of how we go forward, if we go forward, and [indiscernible].

Thank you, Madame Chairwoman.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Thank you, Member Ehrlich.

On the latter, of the Process Safety Management reform, I would just add that one of the things during that process we agreed to do was to issue a webpage featuring PSM recommendations, and as Member Ehrlich mentioned, we set that up by the Most Wanted List link, so that there is information available about PSM, and an update on the reform.

But it did not necessarily go as broad—or was not as broad—as the regulatory report suggestions, and so there may be additional information that we can post on the website after revealing the previous commitment that we made. And, feel free to ask questions about that, as well, during the public comment period.

We will now discuss a recommendation to BP Global Executive Board of Directors, which was previously discussed at the July 2015 Board meeting, at which time it was agreed that it would be raised at a subsequent public meeting. At our October 21st meeting, this was not on the agenda. We wanted time to review, take a look at the recommendations, and it is on the agenda for today for the Board to discuss, for the Recommendations team to address any questions, and then for us to possibly vote on.

So...and Rick, I know you're not able to see us because we're not webcast, so feel to jump in if there's anything that we cover that you want to say about a particular recommendation.

I'd like to now share, on behalf of the staff, what the draft recommendation evaluation to the BP Global Executive Board of Directors from the 2005 BP Texas City incident is. On March 23rd, 2005, I'm sure many of you know, the BP Texas City refinery experienced severe explosions and a fire in an ISOM [isomerization unit], that resulted in 15 deaths, 180 injuries, and significant economic losses.

The accident occurred when a raffinate splitter tower overflowed during startup. The overflowing caused pressure release devices to open, dumping flammable liquid into a blowdown drum and stack that vented directly into the atmosphere. When the drum and stack also subsequently overflowed, flammable liquid and gas were released into the surrounding area, contacted an ignition source, and ignited, resulting in the explosion and fire.

The CSB concluded that the disaster was caused by organizational and safety deficiencies at all levels of the BP Corporation. The CSB issued recommendations to BP and several other institutions. This evaluation addresses a recommendation issued to BP Global Executive Board of Directors concerning the need to improve the incident reporting and learning programs for its refinery organization.

In the CSB's Final Investigation Report of the BP Texas City accident, the following recommendation, numbered—I may not read it as slowly as Rick—2005-04-I-TX-R12, was issued. It's not very long, so I'm going to read it, in case anyone needs a reminder.

The recommendation was: "Ensure and monitor that senior executives implement an incident reporting program throughout your refinery organization that: a. encourages the reporting of incidents without fear of retaliation; b. requires prompt, corrective actions based on incident reports and recommendations, and tracks closure of action items at the refinery where the incident occurred and other affected facilities; and c. requires communication of key lessons learned to management and hourly employees, as well as to the industry."

The CSB issued this recommendation to the Global Executive Board of Directors on March 20, 2007. Following several exchanges between BP and CSB, BP provided substantial supporting documentation of their response to this recommendation in April of 2010.

The information in documents provided by BP constitutes evidence that the company had successfully implemented the recommendation. As a result, CSB staff suggest that this recommendation be designated with the status, "Closed—Acceptable Action." At this time, I would like to invite my fellow Board Members to discuss the designation of recommendation 2005-04-I-TX-R12 as Closed—Acceptable Action.

I will invite my Board Members now to comment or share any remarks.

If there are none, is there a motion to designate recommendation 2005-04-I-TX-R12 as Closed—Acceptable Action?

M: [Indiscernible] moved.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Is there a second to the motion?

W: Second.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Is there any further debate? And Rick, just to make sure—

Rick Engler: I'd like to make one comment. In general, across the industry the issue of appropriate reporting and whistleblower protection is one that I think we should be deeply concerned about.

OSHA recently issued additional data on this, and there's extensive information documenting the number of whistleblower issues that come before their attention. Now, just to be clear, I'm not talking about it in reference to BP in specific. I'm talking about it as an issue across industry, and I would encourage Board Members to pay close attention to this issue moving forward, on all of our investigations.

But, that said, I'm prepared to vote in favor of the proposed motion.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Thank you, for those comments, Member Engler.

The question has been posed on the designation of recommendation 2005-04-I-TX-R12 as Closed—Acceptable Action. Hearing no further debate or discussion, we will now call the roll.

Acting General Counsel.

Kara Wenzel: Member Ehrlich?

Manny Ehrlich: Yes.

Kara Wenzel: Member Engler?

Rick Engler: Yes.

Kara Wenzel: Member Kulinowski?

Kristen Kulinowski: Yes.

Kara Wenzel: And Chairperson Member Sutherland?

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Yes.

Kara Wenzel: The motion passes.

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Thank you, Acting General Counsel Wenzel. The motion to designate the recommendation has passed. Thank you, all.

At this time, I'd like to open the floor for public comment related to the CSB's activities. Due to the number of people who want to comment, we will try to keep everyone's comments to three minutes. We will begin with any list of people who have signed up, and it appears that there is no one that has signed up prior to today.

Are there any comments from those in the room, or questions? For those listening on the phone, if you email your comments to meeting@csb.gov we will address those. Are there any comments [indiscernible]?

Operator: (Operator instructions.)

Operator: We do have our first question or comment from John Morawetz [ph].

John Morawetz: Two questions. One is, I understand the difficulty in a physical move, but I'm hoping that the webcast will be back into play shortly—just a question as to whether that's the plans of the CSB.

And number two, on PSM being placed on the Most Wanted List, are there plans to include an analysis of PSM for the DuPont incident, as to how it was implemented, or what were the potential problems? What happened there, and whether the standard needs to be improved?

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: Hello, John; thank you for both of those questions. Yes, we will continue to do webcasts to make it easier for people to participate by web. I think we are getting fully settled into our move, and the January meeting will actually be webcast, as well as available by phone with the same

setup that we had in October, which would include an ability to either call in with a question, or email. So, yes.

On the second question, the DuPont LaPorte facility investigation is still underway. The investigation team and the Board are working through a scoping document, as well as monitoring the interim recommendations, which were issued back in September—the end of September. So, as part of that ongoing investigation, I suspect, yes, we will continue to look at PSM issues and organizational issues that may contribute, that may have contributed to the incident in November of 2014.

So, it's hard to give you a confirmed answer, because we are still reviewing documents and completing the final report, but thank you for both of those questions.

John Morawetz: Thank you.

Operator: (Operator instructions.) I am showing no further questions or comments at this time.

W: Thank you, operator. We have an email question.

What is the expected completion date of the Freedom Industry's chemical spill investigation from January 2014, from Andrew Wilson at Purdue University?

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: That is a great question. As I mentioned, we are working on several open investigations that we hope to complete in the first quarter of 2016. Freedom, which as many of you know, was the chemical spill in West Virginia, almost two years ago this January.

We are hoping to complete the investigation final draft for a Board review in the next couple of months after we complete West, and the others that I just mentioned: Macondo, aka Deepwater Horizon, and two other [indiscernible].

So our goal—and if we continue making sure that there are no snowstorms in DC in January or any other closures—is that we will stay on track to complete the Freedom investigation in early 2016.

Are there any other telephone or email questions?

Operator: (Operator instructions.)

Vanessa Allen Sutherland: It appears that we do not have any additional email questions. I'm going to share just a couple of closing remarks, so, if you do have a final question by email or phone, we still have a few more minutes before we are going to adjourn the meeting.

In closing, I would definitely like to share a couple of additional thoughts with our stakeholders. As I mentioned earlier, over the past 90 days, the CSB has been working to finalize 4 of the agency's 7 open investigations, which we anticipate will be presented for Board consideration during the first quarter of calendar year 2016.

The CSB also continues to undertake important organizational and operational improvements to increase the agency's overall effectiveness in transparency. I think that at this point, because we have many challenges, you will see us very focused on trying to prioritize...given the number of organizational, investigative reports, recommendations, outreach, advocacy, and other topics, that we are juggling at the same time, but, that said, we are all very excited about being able to identify and address previous commitments and promises that we've made, which was part of the reason we gave you an update on worker fatigue and PSM issue.

We know that there may be others. In previous meetings, and as the new Board, we are committed to making sure that we honor any of the outstanding commitments that have been made by previous leadership, or at a minimum, come back to our stakeholders and explain why we are taking a different route.

We, as you heard with our Spanish language press releases, we are still very focused, and I'm very committed, to trying to innovate our agency products, which could be HR recruiting packets. It could be language videos and press releases, or other items, to make sure that our information is [indiscernible] to stakeholders and is effective.

I want to thank the staff, in particular, for their dedication to the important work in this agency, and I want to thank my fellow Board Members for their contributions here today, and in all of the work, quite frankly, that leads up to these kinds of public meetings. The amount of time that we have to try to communicate and catch each other by emails, and make sure that we're informed and prepared is—operationally, as we move around—challenging, and they are always extremely responsive and very committed to their roles. All of us share a strong interest in preventing chemical accidents in the future, and I think that common bond is exciting for us and helps us propel the work forward.

I want to thank everyone who attended the meeting, both in person and over the phone, today. We appreciate the comments that you've shared about what the status is of our upcoming investigations, and I appreciate your interest and understanding when those are going to close. We are very committed to staying on course.

Our next public meeting, as I mentioned, is in Washington, DC, in January of 2016. Details about that location and agenda for the business meeting will be available on our website at www.csb.gov at a later

date, probably mid-to-late December, and some other information about that will be posted, as well, in a timely manner.

Thank you for your attendance, and, with that, if there are no other email questions or phone questions and comments, the meeting is adjourned.

Operator: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen; this concludes today's conference. Thank you for participating. You may now disconnect.