

---

**From:** Valentine, Lee L  
**To:** Ralph, William H.  
**CC:**  
**BCC:**  
**Sent Date:** 2002-11-14 01:44:19:827  
**Received Date:** 2002-11-14 01:44:19:000  
**Subject:** RE: Pre-Read PSM Organization Meeting  
**Attachments:**

\*Bill\*

Excellent note. I raised this with Norine yesterday. She listened and expressed concern. Her understanding of the issues started yesterday. We could probably help develop her background around PSM. Depending on how the talk went with Rick (please educate me on it), scheduling some time with her to go over our plans in more detail is probably of value. I shared the PSM and PSCOP business plans with her. She was interested. Let me know what you think - Lee

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Ralph, William H.

> Sent: Tuesday, November 12, 2002 12:20 PM

> To: Hale, Rick D

> Cc: Valentine, Lee L

> Subject: Pre-Read PSM Organization Meeting

>

> Rick ... Thanks for taking a few minutes to meet with me. I want to provide this pre-read to ensure our time together is as productive as possible. I also want to say that these are my personal views.

>

> The problem as I see it is that we have not been intentional about our placement of the PSM organization within BPSH. The current placement relies upon the strength and integrity of individuals to ensure that process safety issues are raised and addressed. The current placement does not establish visible alignment and value recognition for process safety to the wider BPSH organization. The current placement is understandable and even logical if you know the chronology of events, but I contend the placement has been an afterthought rather than a conscious reflection of our long held beliefs.

>

> The BPSH heritage rightly separates personal safety and process safety. They are different; a strong and successful personal safety program does not guarantee a strong and successful process safety program. Esso Australia learned this lesson (Longford Australia Gas Plant Explosion, 1998). Process safety incidents contain the greatest potential for multiple injuries/deaths, environmental damage, property damage/business interruption, and damage to

reputation. Preventing catastrophic events must permeate every discussion held and decision made if these events are to continue to remain rare. Process safety must have a clear and visible "seat at the table." BPSH heritage has long held that process safety is a line organization responsibility. It is time for the PSM Group to return to the line organization.

>

> An open action exists from the organizational change MOC for the most recent BPSH changes to assess the placement of the PSM organization. I believe there are several options to resolve the action item:

>

> \* Do nothing ... Leave the PSM Group reporting to Lee Valentine in his role as BPSH Leadership Team Tag to the Process Safety Network. Lee certainly has the strongest credentials for the role and the appropriate issues will be raised in every forum where Lee is present. This option is highly dependent upon Lee as an individual and does not address the issues I've attempted to raise. Also, since Lee is no longer assigned to the line organization he is not present in every forum where process safety could or should be a concern.

> \* Have the PSM organization report to Don Parus. This option would provide highly visible organizational alignment and value recognition. The most recent decision to have the Diversity & Inclusion Manager (Aretha Preston) report to Don leaves no doubt in the mind of the workforce that D&I is a priority and value of the Leadership Team. In general I would argue that the workforce looks to the organizational chart to assess relative importance.

> \* Have the PSM organization report to Rick Hale with a dotted line to Terri Harlan. This option also provides highly visible organizational alignment and value recognition. It also clearly links process safety with the line organization. The argument in favor of the solid line reporting relationship to Rick is that approximately 75% of the BPSH covered processes report through Rick.>

> \* Have the PSM organization report to Terri Harlan with a dotted line to Rick Hale . This option also provides highly visible organizational alignment and value recognition. It also clearly links process safety with the line organization. The argument in favor of the solid line reporting relationship to Terri is to fend off any perception that CBW is being excluded or counted as secondary

> \* Have a solid line reporting relationship to both Rick and Terri. Some complication for the PSM manager in "appeasing two masters," but not insurmountable.

>

> I look forward to our discussion.