Introduction – why focus on SIFP?

✓ A negative trend in the industry over the past several years is that while injuries in general have continuously declined, serious injuries and fatalities (SIFs) have plateaued.

✓ It has been assumed for generations that focusing on minor injury reduction would equivalently reduce incidents resulting in serious injuries and fatalities. Incident occurrence data and research disproves the theory (Fred Manuele)

✓ Injuries of differing severity have differing underlying causes. Reducing serious injuries requires a different strategy than reducing minor injuries. (Tom Krause)
Serious Injury and Fatality (SIF) Definition

- **A fatality**
- **A life-threatening injury or illness**, that if not immediately addressed, will lead to the death of the affected individual, and usually requires the intervention of internal and/or external emergency response personnel to provide life-sustaining support. Examples include, but are not limited to:
  - Laceration or crushing injuries that result in significant blood loss
  - An injury involving damage to the brain or spinal cord
  - An event which requires the application of cardiopulmonary resuscitation or an external defibrillator
  - Chest or abdominal trauma affecting vital organs
  - Serious burns

- **A life-altering injury or illness** that results in permanent or long-term impairment or loss of use of an internal organ, body function, or body part. Examples include, but are not limited to:
  - Significant head injuries
  - Spinal cord injuries
  - Paralysis
  - Amputations
  - Serious burns
Studies identified two primary reasons that reduction in less serious injuries does not necessarily correspond to reduction in SIFs:

- The causes of SIFs are often different from those for less serious injuries.
- The potential for serious injury is low for the majority (typically around 80%) of non-SIF injuries.

To impact SIFs, a safety initiative must target the exposures that have SIF potential.

Throughout the organization, avoiding low probability / serious consequence events must become part of the common language. (Fred Manuele)
At PECO, we analyze precursor events that are identified by our employees – field and back office - against SIF potential criteria and develop action plans to eliminate or mitigate the risk.
12 Screening Questions

1. Was the event a flash?
2. Was the event an electrical contact?
3. Was it a Line of Fire event involving a high energy projectile, or movement of heavy objects/ equipment or sharp tools, with life threatening/altering potential?
4. Was it a vehicle collision in an intersection, a sideswipe, a single vehicle rollover, head-on, or a rear-ender > 10 mph by a large vehicle?
5. Was it a physical attack by a member of the public, employee, or other person?
6. Was it an insect bite and an allergic reaction without an EPI pen?
7. Was it an injury by a grinder, cutting disk, chainsaw or other similar powered equipment?
8. Was it a violation of Safety For Life Rule (e.g. Test Before Touch, ZOP, MAD, PPE, etc. - See Definitions)?
9. Was it a fall from a height of 48" or greater, or as shorter distance but onto an impaling object?
10. Was it exposure to fire or explosion?
11. Was it exposure to harmful substances or environment such as a toxic or caustic chemical; oxygen deficiency; or excessive heat?
12. Unlisted event type where fatality or life altering / life threatening injury / illness could reasonably have resulted?

“Yes” to Any = SIF-P
# Historic PECO Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIF Category (12 Questions)</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Flash</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Electrical Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Line of Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vehicle Collision</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Physical Attack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Insect Bite/Allergic Reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Power Equip Injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Safety Rules Violation*</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fall From &gt; 48&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fire/Explosion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* OCC Self Identified ZOP issues in "13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PECO Process for SIFP – Multi Path Approach

✓ Programmatic
  • Company culture
  • Safety Meeting structure
  • Leadership engagement
  • SIF-P action planning
  • Hazard Recognition sites
  • A.C.T. Safe and Tailboard focus
  • Speaker series
  • Visuals and messaging
  • Communication and review strategy
  • Industry Event review

✓ Personal
  • Individual challenge and accountability
  • Safety assessments
Company Culture – there is no job or task so important that we cannot take the time needed to do it safely. If it cannot be done safely, STOP.

- Safety Culture Initiative
- Managing Your Culture Initiative
- Safety Assessments
- Leadership Engagement at all levels
- STRONG partnership between Company and IBEW Local 614
- Pervasive trust and belief in the objectives and support required to achieve – No One Gets Hurt
PECO Process for SIFP – Programmatic Focus

✓ Safety Meeting Structure

• Executive Safety Steering Committee – PECO and Local 614 Leadership

• PECO/Local 614 Safety Council – PECO and Local 614 Leads

• Regional and Organizational Safety Council – Department Meetings

• Local Safety Meetings – Sub-department Meetings

• Seasonal Safety Reviews

• STRONG partnership and participation between Company and IBEW Local 614
PECO Process for SIFP – Programmatic Focus

✓ Leadership Engagement

• Executive Safety Steering Committee
  – PECO COO, PECO Operating VPs and select Key Managers
  – IBEW Local 614 President and Vice President

• PECO/Local 614 Safety Council
  – PECO Electric Operations Vice President, select executives and Key Managers
  – IBEW Local 614 President and Vice President
  – Department Safety Reps

• Regional and Organizational Safety Council
  – PECO Key Managers and Management Team
  – IBEW Local 614 ABMs and Safety Leads

• Local Safety Meetings
  – PECO Supervisors and their teams

• Seasonal Safety Reviews

• Safety Organization and Line Partnership with specialty teams

• STRONG partnership and participation between Company and IBEW Local 614
PECO Process for SIFP – Programmatic Focus

✔ Hazard Recognition Sites
  - Shepperd’s Way
    - Electrical hazard recognition site, located at PECO aerial line school
    - Multiple hazard stations for experience, observation and identification
  - Connelly Place
    - Gas hazard recognition site, located at PECO Fire Academy and Gas Methods and Training facility
    - Multiple hazard stations for experience, observation and identification
  - DALE’s Alley
    - Supply Management and back office hazard recognition site, located at PECO Oregon Shop facility
    - Multiple hazard stations within the warehouse and back office environment for experience, observation and identification
A.C.T Safe Methodology and Tailboard Focus

- A.C.T. Safe methodology highlights that there are a number of “zones” that we operate in on any given day and that hazards exist in places other than where a worker may be physically “turning a wrench.”
  - Awareness Zone
  - Caution Zone
  - Task Zone

- The A.C.T Safe methodology was built into the tailboard/job briefing process to encourage conversations about what hazards are found in what zones related to a particular work task.

- An analysis of each craft area was conducted to determine which tasks have SIF potential and these tasks are outlined on the tailboard form as well to drive a discussion by the crew members that will be working those tasks.
Impactful Guest Speakers

• Eric Guigere – spoke at a series of PECO all hands meetings in 2011 and relayed his story about being buried alive in a trench collapse event only a few days after his wedding. The trench was not shored and he discussed the consequences of taking a short cut from the safe work practices associated with our work.

• Philadelphia Police Department – spoke at a highly attended safety presentation in 2012 and outlined the measures that they use to keep themselves safe and prevent serious injuries. Spurred a communication and visual series at PECO that is still visible today called “Lessons learned from law enforcement”.

• Lee Shelby – spoke at a series of PECO all hands meetings in early 2015 and relayed his story of making electrical contact on a 12kV line and losing both of his hands. He spoke about the “routine nature” of the work he was doing and the shortcuts that were taken on that particular day.
PECO Process for SIFP – Programmatic Focus

✓ Visuals and Messaging

- Stickers
- Posters
- Gate Signs
- Building Signs
- Videos

Hazard Recognition and Control
Top 5 Lessons Learned from Law Enforcement

1) Drive safely – It’s a task
2) Always use the proper Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)
3) Survey the scene to get the big picture
4) Treat nothing as routine – complacency kills
5) Focus on what’s important now

Falls are the leading cause of fatalities in the United States.
Do you know how to protect yourself?

“You are looking at the person most responsible for your safety.”
PECO Process for SIFP – Programmatic Focus

✓ Communication and Review Strategy

- Safety Bulletins
- Monthly FLS Meeting reviews
- PECO Connection articles
- PECO Supervisor Updates
- Monthly SIFP Topic review posted on Safety website – standard meeting agenda
Industry Event Review

- Exelon Utilities MRC discussion of Industry Events
- PECO Safety mining of industry events
- Review of OSHA website materials related to Industry Events
PECO Process for SIFP – Personal Focus

✓ Leadership messaging and challenge at the individual level

• All employees are empowered to stop a job and request assistance and support

• Good catches are rewarded and highlighted for learnings

• Clear messaging that “there is no job so important that we cannot take the time to do it safely.”

• Commitment and support at all levels of leadership
Field and Back Office Personal Safety Assessments

- Administered twice over the last two years for both field and back office

- “The only questions that really matter are the ones you ask yourself.”

- Provides a challenging look in the mirror for every employee and the results are not shared – unless the employee decides to share

- Analogous to the magazine survey that you probably would not admit to taking

- Who is the safest person you know?
PECO Process for SIFP – Personal Focus

- Videos that highlight personal impact
  - Employee video related to A.C.T. Safe
  - AT&T Texting Video
  - Utah State Police – Roadside Safety Video
  - PA Turnpike Commission – Workzone Safety Video
  - Exelon Utilities – Employee Videos