

## OHS IMPROVEMENT NOTICE

To: Esso Australia Pty Ltd (“EAPL”)

In conducting an OHS inspection in relation to the Bream B facility, I, [REDACTED], a NOPSEMA inspector appointed under section 602 of the Act, am satisfied on reasonable grounds that the person named above as the responsible person is contravening:

- (a) clause 9(2)(a) of Schedule 3 to the Act at Bream B facility.

The reasons for my opinion are:

NOPSEMA conducted an inspection on the 29 July 2019 on Bream B facility and further enquiries thereafter.

As part of the inspection, NOPSEMA inspectors observed the stairway and stair tread grating from the cellar deck to the sub-cellar deck of the facility with an advanced state of corrosion with some sections of stair tread grating load bars completely corroded away.

A fall from an elevated worksite from the failure of grating or ladder under load due to corrosion is identified by EAPL as a major accident event (MAE) in the Bream B facility safety case. The safety case critical preventative control to prevent the failure of grating or ladder due to corrosion is the targeted above water structural inspection program as defined by the Structural Equipment Integrity Program Manual (SEIPM).

SEIPM Appendix 1 – Fitness for Service (FFS) describes *‘The repairs for stairways are generally handrail or grating replacements. The FFS criteria and LACDs for these repairs will be taken from their respective sections within this memo.’* The respective section (Table 0-1) states the LACD (Last Acceptable Completion Date) recommendation for stairways with a ‘black’ risk is to repair within 12 months of inspection.

EAPL document *‘IEG Integrity Procedures Handbook – Structural Inspections’* (Document IEG-FIMS-04-01) Appendix A includes the *‘Structural Inspection Grading System’*. The stated aim of the grading system is to provide consistent guidelines for the assessment of structures or structural elements. The assessment is based on visual inspection and is used to highlight those areas that require remedial action or more detailed inspection work to determine the risk level of the structure/element in question. *‘Condition S4 Advanced Deterioration’* is described:

*‘Structural loss exceeds 25% of section/capacity, or a defect identified such that the structure has been significantly compromised. The structure may have failed or be in danger of failure under design loads/conditions.’*

Figure 24 of Document IEG-FIMS-04-01 provides an example for ‘Condition S4 steel’ and states *‘Severe corrosion (>25%) of staircase stringer. Collapse under personnel load is a real possibility and the staircase should not be used until repaired’*.

During the inspection, the inspectors observed the staircase stringers were more than 25% corroded and which had evidently not been repaired for a period greater than 12 months.

The SEIPM ‘Fitness for Service’ explicitly states where the load bar thickness for grating is less than 2mm the risk is designated 3A (Black) and the recommendation is to mitigate and replace within 12 months of

inspection. The stair tread grating was observed by the inspectors to be less than 2mm thick and evidently had not been replaced within 12 months; based on EAPL's 'Fitness for Service' criteria.

It was noted that temporary mitigation measures had been applied, including barricading of the stairway access using scaffolding, providing a vertical ladder and using glass-reinforced plastic to replace the corroded stair treads. However, such measures do not adequately reduce risks to health and safety of personnel who use the stairway or temporary ladder on the facility.

I am therefore satisfied that EAPL has not taken all reasonably practicable steps to provide and maintain a physical environment at the facility that is safe and without risk to health.

As a result of this contravention, I am satisfied that there is, or may be, the following risk to the health or safety of any person:

Due to the advanced state of corrosion to the stairway, stair tread grating and supporting sub-structure from between the cellar deck to the sub-cellar deck on the facility, there is a risk to personnel from falling from elevated worksite which could result in serious injury or death.

You are required to take action within **60** days of the date of this notice to prevent or reduce the risk.

The following action must be taken by the responsible person within the period specified above:

- ensure the stairway, associated stair treads and supporting substructure including connection points to the primary structure are fit for purpose and is safe and without risk to health; or
- Implement such other controls as required to reduce risk to a level that is as low as reasonably practicable.

Signed: 

  
**NOPSEMA Inspector**  
**Dated: 30 August 2019**

NOTES: (Please see back of notice)

When the required improvement has been completed, return this part of the notice to the following person at the address below:

Name: [REDACTED]

Position: Manager Assessment and Inspection

Address: Send in electronic format via email to:  
[submissions@nopsema.gov.au](mailto:submissions@nopsema.gov.au)

Telephone number: +61 8 6188 8700

Specify the action that has been taken to comply with this notice in the space below.

Improvement Notice No. **765** has been complied with by:

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**NOTES:**

1. Under clause 78 of Schedule 3 to the Act, a person who fails to ensure that this notice is complied with, to the extent that it relates to a matter over which the person has control, may be liable to a penalty of 300 penalty units or a civil penalty of 400 units.
2. This notice must be displayed in a prominent place at or near each workplace at which work affected by the notice is being performed and, must not be tampered with or removed before the notice has ceased to have effect.
3. If the notice is not issued by being given to the operator's representative at the facility, the responsible person (unless the responsible person is the titleholder) must cause a copy of the notice to be given to the operator's representative.
4. If the responsible person is the operator or an employer (other than the operator) of members of the workforce, the operator's representative at the facility must give a copy of the notice to each health and safety representative for a designated work group having group members performing work that is affected by the notice.
5. If the responsible person is the titleholder, as soon as practicable after issuing the notice, the NOPSEMA inspector will take reasonable steps to give a copy of the notice to the operator and, if the NOPSEMA inspector is at the facility when the notice issued, the operator's representative at the facility.
6. If the responsible person is the titleholder, but the inspector is not at the facility when the notice is issued, the operator must give a copy of the notice to the operator's representative at the facility.
7. As soon as practicable after issuing the notice, the NOPSEMA inspector will take reasonable steps to give a copy of the notice to, where applicable:
  - (a) the employer of an employee who is a member of the workforce if the notice is issued to the employee, and in connection with work performed by the employee, and
  - (b) the owner of any workplace plant, substance or thing that the notice relates to, unless the owner is the responsible person or an employer referred to in (a), and
  - (c) if the responsible person is the owner of any workplace, plant, substance or thing because of which the contravention has occurred, or is likely to occur: the operator of the facility, and if the employer of employees who work in that workplace or who use that plant, substance or thing is a person other than the operator—that employer; and
  - (d) the titleholder, if the responsible person is the operator, and the contravention relates, or is likely to relate to, the titleholders' well related obligations.
8. Under item 8 of subclause 80A(1) of Schedule 3 to the Act, any of the following persons may in writing request the reviewing authority to review the NOPSEMA inspector's decision:
  - the operator of the facility
  - the titleholder, if the notice is issued to a titleholder;
  - any other person to whom the notice has been issued;
  - an employer, if affected by the decision;
  - a relevant health and safety representative;
  - a relevant workforce representative, if requested by a member of the workforce affected by the decision;
  - a person who owns any workplace plant, substance or thing to which the NOPSEMA inspector's decision relates.
9. An improvement notice ceases to have effect when the responsible person takes the action specified in the notice.