Systemic Safety & Operational Health Checklist

A Diagnostic Framework for Evaluating Safety Processes, Roles & Risk Controls

Most recurring workplace incidents, operational friction, and compliance gaps are rarely simple individual failures; they are symptoms of underlying organizational process gaps. This diagnostic checklist helps business owners, operations managers, and safety directors evaluate their internal safety set-up by examining worker engagement, safety lead coordination boundaries, hazard-evaluation frameworks, and operational risk controls.

PART I: ORGANIZATIONAL APPROACH, COLLABORATIVE ENGAGEMENT, & HAZARD EVALUATION

1. Active Worker Engagement & Leading Indicators

Does your organization utilize safety processes that actively engage front-line employees in identifying both obvious and less-obvious operational hazards, using their feedback to drive safety as a leading indicator of performance?

Self-Assessment Status: [ ] YES [ ] NO [ ] IN PROGRESS

Why It Matters: Relying solely on lagging metrics like injury rates (TRIR) or periodic compliance audits creates a dangerous blind spot. Front-line workers often have a deep, daily understanding of actual process bottlenecks, task workarounds, and emerging hazards. Failing to engage them can result in hidden, creeping risks going unrecognized until an incident occurs.

Recommended Systemic Considerations:

- **Establish participative scanning:** Implement simple, worker-led safety observation walks, routine pre-shift safety huddles, or interactive hazard-suggestion processes.
- **Differentiate hazard types:** Teach teams to scan not just for obvious physical hazards (like blocked aisles) but also less-obvious hazards (such as task-based bottlenecks, fatigue points, or changing field conditions).
- **Measure positive actions:** Track leading indicators such as 'percentage of worker safety suggestions resolved' rather than just counting incidents, reinforcing a positive safety culture.

2. Safety Lead Boundaries & Expectation Setting

Is the role of your designated safety lead structured and communicated as that of an organizational facilitator and coordinator, rather than a 'solo doer' who is expected to execute every safety task alone?

Self-Assessment Status: [ ] YES [ ] NO [ ] IN PROGRESS

Why It Matters: When organizations treat safety as a 'one-person department,' the safety program becomes siloed from daily operations. The designated lead—especially one wearing multiple corporate hats—quickly gets buried in administrative paperwork. This administrative overload leads to systemic stagnation, coordinator burnout, and positioned blame when things go wrong.

Recommended Systemic Considerations:

- **Consider a collaborative reframe:** Rather than trying to unilaterally announce or enforce boundaries (especially if you have limited direct leverage), work with your organizational team to evaluate how safety responsibilities are shared. A more effective way is often to discuss how the safety lead can serve as an advisor, facilitator, and coordinator, while daily safety execution is recognized as a shared, operational line management responsibility. This approach encourages collaboration rather than top-down mandates, which rarely lead to immediate or lasting change.
- **Establish shared performance expectations:** Work with leadership to set safety performance goals for line managers and department heads, ensuring they are active partners in running the program.
- **Protect coordinator capacity:** Ensure the lead has a clear onboarding pathway, access to peer resources, and structured time dedicated solely to safety coordination, preventing dual-role overload.

3. Practical, Phased Hazard & Risk Assessment

Are your hazard identification and risk assessment processes structured to evaluate risks at an appropriate level (such as broad processes, specific equipment, or selected tasks), with deeper evaluations performed on a phased, prioritized basis where hazards are present, and key controls built directly into work instructions or SOPs where feasible/appropriate?

Self-Assessment Status: [ ] YES [ ] NO [ ] IN PROGRESS

Why It Matters: While not all risk assessments need to be complex, organizations do not necessarily need an expansive risk analysis and evaluation for every single task; where formal risk assessments are completed should match the actual and potential hazards present. A phased approach allows a company to assess broad processes or specific machinery first, applying deeper, task-specific reviews only when warranted. Many serious workplace injuries occur when there is a gap between 'work-as-imagined' (the written rule) and 'work-as-done' (the real-world shortcut). Incorporating key risk controls directly into daily work instructions or Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) is one way to have integrated safe work methods into actual workflow.

Recommended Systemic Considerations:

- **Apply a phased evaluation model:** Use a tiered approach to match the evaluation to the risk. Assess broad processes or machinery first, and reserve deeper, task-based tools (like Job Hazard Analyses [JHAs] or Activity Hazard Analyses [AHAs]) for high-risk, complex, or non-routine tasks. For specialized chemical processes, such as those subject to OSHA Process Safety Management standard requirements (29CFR1910.119 or State equivalents) utilize acceptable Process Hazard Analyses (PHAs) based on engineering practices and operational flows rather than simple task lists.
- **Embed controls directly into daily work instructions:** Standalone assessment sheets are valuable, but they are not the only way to describe safe methods. Consider integrating key risk-mitigation steps directly into Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) or work instructions so that safe methods are described within the primary operating document where the employees read them.
- **Engage operators and "the do-er's":** Involve mechanics, maintenance techs, and operators directly in identifying hazards and shaping these work instructions. Include both more and less experienced people for different perspectives. Their expertise and firsthand experiences can provide some of the best information for realistic risk controls.

PART II: SPECIFIC OPERATIONAL HAZARDS, EXPOSURE CONTROLS, & COMPLIANCE ALIGNMENT

[CONDITIONAL EVALUATION: If operations involve work where there is potential for the unintended release of hazardous energy]

4. Task-Based Control of Hazardous Energy

Are your energy control procedures (such as Lockout/Tagout) designed to prevent the unintended release of hazardous energy during specific operational and maintenance tasks (including tooling setups, and servicing), and verified through the active involvement of the workers who perform those tasks? Are the right safeguards in place for energy control where the work is routine, repetitive and part of normal production processes?

Self-Assessment Status: [ ] YES [ ] NO [ ] IN PROGRESS

Why It Matters: Static, equipment-level energy audits often miss the task-specific realities of day-to-day operations. Workers may be tempted to bypass energy controls when they shouldn't if they feel a procedure is too slow or poorly designed for that specific task. Effective energy control programs must prevent the unintended release of hazardous energy during servicing, setups, or maintenance.

Recommended Systemic Considerations:

- **Adopt task-based LOTO:** Evaluate and document energy control procedures for specific, highly repetitive tasks to ensure they are practical, safe, and integrated into normal operations.
- **Engage senior maintenance and operators:** Utilize maintenance and operations technicians to walk through LOTO procedures, ensuring that energy isolation points are accessible and logical for the actual work being performed.
- **Implement verification:** Train authorized workers to apply 'Lock, Tag, and TRY'—physically trying to start a process that would normally have hazardous energy release potential, after isolation, to ensure zero energy state before relying on the intended energy control.

[CONDITIONAL EVALUATION: If purchasing, installing, or modifying machinery or facilities]

5. Prevention through Design (PtD) & Equipment Safeguarding

Does your organization have a formal pre-purchase and installation review process (Prevention through Design) to ensure safety, safeguarding, and ergonomics are built into the design of equipment and facilities, rather than retrofitted as an afterthought?

Self-Assessment Status: [ ] YES [ ] NO [ ] IN PROGRESS

Why It Matters: While Prevention through Design (PtD) is a proactive risk-management concept rather than a specific OSHA standard, implementing PtD principles is highly effective in helping organizations achieve OSHA compliance and align with industry best practices. Believing a sales assertion that new commercial machinery is 'OSHA-approved' out of the box can be a compliance

risk because the employer is responsible for ensuring safe conditions exist. Addressing physical hazards, ventilation needs, or safeguarding during design or procurement avoids the costly 'retrofit premium' (which can be up to 10 times more expensive), minimizes operational downtime, and prevents poorly integrated controls that operators might otherwise bypass.

Recommended Systemic Considerations:

- **Establish pre-purchase specs:** Create standard purchase specifications that require vendors to supply processes, equipment and tools (as applicable) that meet the organization's requirements. This could pertain to types of controls, ergonomics considerations, noise levels, required safeguarding, and maintenance access requirements.
- **Run multidisciplinary reviews:** Involve safety representatives, maintenance techs, and engineering planners in reviewing new equipment specs or facility layouts before contracts are signed.
- **Implement a safety buy-off process:** Conduct team-based safety assessments during equipment installation and process trials, ensuring that physical guards, emergency stops, and access catwalks are fully validated before handoff to operations.

[CONDITIONAL EVALUATION: If operations involve potential noise, dust, chemical, or physical exposures]

6. Objective, Exposure-Based Risk Management

Are your personal protective equipment (PPE) requirements and environmental controls (such as respirator mandates, ventilation systems, or hearing conservation programs) predicated on objective information and quantitative exposure assessments?

Self-Assessment Status: [ ] YES [ ] NO [ ] IN PROGRESS

Why It Matters: Mandating PPE (like respirators or earplugs) based on guesswork can lead to severe liabilities. Under-protecting workers exposes them to chronic, irreversible diseases (like silicosis or occupational hearing loss), while over-specifying PPE adds unnecessary costs, creates user resistance, and can mask other hazards (like communication barriers or heat stress).

Recommended Systemic Considerations:

- **Conduct structured exposure monitoring:** Partner with qualified technical advisors to conduct formal industrial hygiene sampling (air and noise monitoring) to establish clear, documented baselines.
- **Apply the Hierarchy of Controls:** Use exposure data to evaluate if engineering controls (like local exhaust ventilation, enclosing noise sources, or material substitution) can reduce exposures below action levels, potentially eliminating the need for burdensome PPE programs.
- **Establish task-based PPE triggers:** Link PPE requirements directly to specific high-exposure tasks rather than implementing broad, site-wide mandates that degrade worker buy-in.

7. Beyond the Standards: Addressing General Duty Risks

Are your safety assessment processes designed to actively look beyond specific, written OSHA standards to identify and address broader, industry-recognized hazards that could pose serious risk to your workforce?

Self-Assessment Status: [ ] YES [ ] NO [ ] IN PROGRESS

Why It Matters: While complying with promulgated OSHA standards should be a fundamental objective for any safety program, industry and topic-specific regulatory rules may not address every unique operational risk. A comprehensive safety process evaluates both hazards intended to be controlled under specific OSHA standards, and also others that could be subject to the OSHA General Duty Clause (Section 5(a)(1)), to manage risk in a balanced, context-specific manner.

Recommended Systemic Considerations:

- **Monitor broader industry data:** Keep track of serious near-misses, industry-specific injury trends, and applicable consensus standard guidelines not otherwise incorporated into law (such as ANSI/ASSP, etc.)
- **Establish active feedback loops:** Use internal, daily feedback loops (like supervisor walk-throughs and daily hazard logs) to capture emerging risks, rather than relying on external, annual audits to find your gaps.
- **Evaluate under General Duty criteria:** When a hazard is identified that lacks a specific OSHA standard, evaluate appropriately to determine necessary company actions to protect workers and treat organizational risk.

PARTNERING WITH SIXTH SENSE SAFETY SOLUTIONS

40 Years of Real-World, Operational Perspective

Workplace safety is not a compliance checklist—it is an operational value that directly protects your people, your operating margins, and your commercial viability. Gregory G. Zigulis, MS, MBA, CIH, CSP, B11 LMSS™, leverages four decades of experience across manufacturing, construction, mining, and government sectors to help you build sustainable, internal capabilities. We do not believe in generic 'paper safety.' We specialize in helping organizations establish the practical, cross-functional processes needed to manage risk effectively:

- **Organizational Gap Analyses & Assessments:** Independent, systems-based evaluations of your safety culture and processes to build an actionable, margin-preserving roadmap.
- **Safety Lead Onboarding & Coaching:** Practical mentoring and boundary-setting strategies to help newly designated safety leads (especially those with dual-role responsibilities) succeed through facilitation.
- **Task-Based Hazard & Risk Assessments:** Designing participative processes that engage your workforce to map operational risks and build safe methods directly into standard work instructions and SOPs.
- **Specialized Technical Integration:** Providing targeted guidance to integrate Prevention through Design (PtD) into machinery purchasing, and conducting objective industrial hygiene monitoring (air, noise, silica) only when technically warranted.

Sixth Sense Safety Solutions
Website: www.sixthsensesafetysolutions.com | Email: gz@sixthsensesafetysolutions.com
Phone: 989-474-9303 | Rogers City, MI 49779

Gregory G. Zigulis is the author of the Routledge publication: ***Health and Safety Programs in Small and Medium-Sized Businesses: Setting Them Up and Making Them Work Effectively****. The book provides in-depth, practical guidance on establishing these organizational processes, selecting and coaching safety leads, and managing risks.*