Q12 Please provide any thoughts you have that would help us update this survey for the 2018/19 hazard communication environment

Answered: 46 Skipped: 93

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	You should connect with unions or employee groups to distribute survey to members to get representation from frontline workers, if that's what you are looking for.	12/11/2018 10:40 AM
2	Question 9 only has two answers - Written so I can understand, or Written in a way that is difficult to understand. Two other answers are just reformatted versions of the second answer.	12/11/2018 7:29 AM
3	no comment	12/11/2018 2:53 AM
4	Type of workplace Role of respondent	12/10/2018 12:22 PM
5	I am a chemical hygiene officer. I find that companies that sell chemicals often do not follow the most current rules and guidelines when they write SDSs for their products. Some chemicals we purchased recently have SDSs that have not been updated for more than 10 years. I have seen some SDSs as old as 1998. Many still use NFPA instead of GHS for hazard statements, etc. I think there needs to be more oversight. I have contacted the companies to let them know and their response is usually lukewarm or there is no follow-up whatsoever. I have stopped contacting them because of this. However, I am concerned because the SDS dictates everything from PPE, proper waste disposal, to risk assessments.	12/10/2018 11:35 AM
6	Sending this to a listserve serving mostly safety professionals might not be the most cross sectional of employees. Would be interesting to see what employees across whole campuses are feeling about this.	12/10/2018 10:18 AM
7	The least helpful part of SDS is the waste disposal part for me.	12/10/2018 9:40 AM
8	ask each person for their role in using SDS ask how they believe others are using them (most filling this out will be the safety people) maybe ask for what info they think they should be able to get from an SDS (I find that this is often misunderstood)	12/10/2018 8:42 AM
9	perhaps an open question on what users of SDS are expecting to find in them (regardless of whether that information is in them)	12/10/2018 8:28 AM
10	1) Bifurcate it for industry and academics. 2) Expand "departments" to include researchers. 3) Expand on evaluation of SDS. For example have you ever looked at the one for sand? It is ridiculous. 4) Ask about years of experience and then correlate to other answers. 5) Ask a question related to #10, but on how useful people find SDS.	12/8/2018 4:08 PM
11	the change from msds to sds confused the user, also sds is the name of one of the most used chemicals in biological science.	12/7/2018 4:03 PM
12	The waste disposal sections are usually unhelpful - always "in accordance with regulations"	12/7/2018 2:29 PM
13	Add this question: "I feel that SDSs alone generally provide me with all the hazard communication information that I need."	12/7/2018 2:19 PM
14	SDS are boilerplate that provides little useful information for the actual user. It is mostly regulatory CYA for the manufacturer.	12/7/2018 1:28 PM
15	I understand that states have different disposal regulations, but I think it would be very helpful to have disposal recommendations that meet federal regulations.	12/7/2018 12:48 PM
16	The Chem Dept here does annual training for our lab assistants (undergraduates), faculty, and staff that run academic labs. Each lab section spends time on Lab Safety on the first day to get the students focused on lab safety.	12/7/2018 12:34 PM

SDS Usage Survey 2018

18		
10	The survey should just refer to SDSs not both SDSs and MSDSs since the latter were supposed to be sunsetted unless a specific calls for harking back to the MSDSs. Not sure that it makes sense to ask those being surveyed to possibly select more than one option in answering question 9 can an SDS be incomprehensible and readily understandable at the same time? Clearly, employees and other consumers of SDS-related information need training in where to find and how to interpret the information that is presented and we know that the multiplicity of purposes and audiences for which SDSs are written contribute to the difficulty in understanding and interpreting the information that they provide. I have responded to this survey as an occupational health & safety professional (industrial hygienist) with over 4 decades of experience.	12/7/2018 11:54 AM
19	Although the updated Hazcom std has led to greater consistency, it is still not intuitive to readers. It would help to list the degrees of hazard possible instead of only the one that applies. e.g. toxic if swallowed, cat 3 out of 4. And do a better job highlighting "no data available" does not = safe	12/7/2018 11:44 AM
20	add language that allows assessment of the level to which the GHS is integrated within any given organization (use, training, etc.)	12/7/2018 11:34 AM
21	Our operation handles several hundred chemicals, reviewing all SDS with Operators annually would be impossible. Any new chemicals with GHS classified hazards are reviewed with Operators prior to use. Review includes hazards and controls. General HAZCOM training is performed annually.	12/7/2018 11:00 AM
22	I find the majority of SDS's that I receive from Manufacturers for products used by our mechanics or janitorial surface are very poorly written. The conversions were done form MSDS to SDS and data is in wrong places, missing or contradictory. I have contacted several manufacturers and distributers this year to point out that their GHS Category 2 data does not meet what they have identified as properties in section 9 or their handling information is cut and paste form an entirely different chemical and contradicts what the material is. These are SDS for non-chemists who rely on the handling and clean up sections not the properties to make decisions and it is so very wrong, rather scary.	12/7/2018 10:58 AM
23	From an administrative point of view SDS are comprehensible and useful to me, and my training efforts to the user are directed at making SDSs user friendly, comprehensible, and applicable to their work environment. This survey should be administered to a larger audience at the plant/lab operations level to get their take on their issues with SDS and short falls.	12/7/2018 10:57 AM
24	Q5 - revise to cover the fact that the person completing the survey may be the trainer (I answered as if a trainee). Q9 - Maybe add either just "understandable" or "fairly understandable", but keep "readily understandable".	12/7/2018 10:52 AM
25	Keep it simple.	12/7/2018 10:47 AM
26	Including questions on the quality of SDSs should be included. My main issue with SDSs is with the accuracy and completeness.	12/7/2018 10:47 AM
27	I have not yet seen an SDS	12/7/2018 10:46 AM
28	One option to #5 should be "train others". No one trains me on SDS, but I stay current, do the majority of downloading and storage, and do the training. Also, #5 & 6 say MSDS instead of SDS, and we only mention that the SDS used to be called MSDS.	12/7/2018 10:31 AM
29	Re question number 8. I find SDS readable since I am EHS and I am very familiar with them. But I'm sure they are confusing to most of my end users. So not so user friendly for the average worker.	12/7/2018 10:20 AM
30	SDS info on section 4, 5, &6 is useless bc too general; peroxide formers are a hunt for certain words in the SDS -they should be in HNOC; section 10 should be better like EU;	12/7/2018 10:04 AM
31	SDS fall short on specific recommendations regarding PPE, gloves for instance.	12/7/2018 9:38 AM
32	I wish SDSs were more standardized. We work with and sell a lot of products to Europe and their SDSs are different	12/7/2018 9:34 AM
	The question, was it beneficial (to you, the worker, or administrator) for OSHA to adapt the GHS	12/7/2018 9:14 AM
33	would have been informative.	

SDS Usage Survey 2018

35	Include question on if safety data sheets for all chemicals meet the OSHA HazComm requirements. I personally still have a number of suppliers that have not updated their SDS or labels to meet these current requirements.	12/7/2018 4:49 AM
36	This survey appears to exclude academia.	12/6/2018 9:23 PM
37	The current SDS has improvements over the old system but technical details needed for fire code categorizations are frequently missing. H250 does not equal pyrophoric. SDS generally no longer include autoignition temperatures, for example.	12/6/2018 6:34 PM
38	Some questions say MSDS and some say SDS. I am assuming you meant SDS for all.	12/6/2018 3:49 PM
39	I am a consultant; I've completed this on behalf of a printing plant where I do HazComm training.	12/6/2018 1:38 PM
40	I use SDSs as a starting point and typically refer to Pubchem or Toxnet for more detailed information when writing SOPs.	12/6/2018 12:02 PM
41	Change MSDS to SDS. On #6, change to 0-3 months from 1-3 months.	12/6/2018 11:43 AM
42	none	12/6/2018 11:00 AM
43	I believe that while the 16 part SDS of today is better than the MSDS of years ago, certain sections still leave something to be desired, such as the disposal section. Most SDS tell you contact your local waste authority for disposal. The same goes for the spill and clean up section. I have found, at times, improper spill clean up techniques. I have also been irritated by the Chemical/Physical properties sections since it seems as though some SDS authors are either not able to use the Handbook of Chemistry & Physics, Brethericks Handbook of Reactive Hazards, Chembook, Chemspider, PubChem, Wizer or even Wikipedia. There is a rumor out there that some SDS authors use an SDS writing program rather than actually doing the work themselves.	12/6/2018 10:56 AM
44	When I am trained on a new process or procedure, it is required that I review the necessary SDSs. Y/N When I am trained I actually review the necessary SDSs Y/N I review other hazard tools such as ChemHat.	12/6/2018 10:30 AM
45	the current users are more informed than those in the past	12/6/2018 9:56 AM
46	What other related training have you received in the last period: DOT (TDG in Canada), Chemical spills, Hazardous waste disposal, Other mandatory training in your Organisation. Cheers	12/6/2018 8:42 AM