

## R2P PARTNERSHIPS IN CONSTRUCTION: ASPHALT PAVING AND MASONRY

	Asphalt Engineering Controls	Masonry r2p
<b>How it started</b>	<p>Initiated: mid-1990s</p> <p>Initial partnership was catalyzed by debate about health hazards of asphalt paving fumes and possible classification as carcinogen</p>	<p>Initiated: November 2010</p> <p>Grew out of established partnership between organizations with a history of partnering on masonry industry promotion and training and an opportunity to work on r2p in health &amp; safety through CPWR</p>
<b>Partners</b>	<p>Industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Asphalt Pavement Association (NAPA)</li> <li>• Association of Equipment Manufacturers (AEM)</li> </ul> <p>Labor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE)</li> <li>• Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA)</li> <li>• Laborers' Health and Safety Fund of North America</li> </ul> <p>Government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)</li> <li>• Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)</li> <li>• Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International Council of Employers of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers (ICE)</li> <li>• International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers (BAC)</li> <li>• International Masonry Institute (IMI), an organization representing the strategic alliance between the BAC &amp; ICE.</li> </ul>
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universal adoption of effective engineering controls for fumes on all highway class pavers.</li> <li>• Voluntary agreement to achieve universal adoption</li> <li>• Model for collaboration and sustainability in health &amp; safety</li> <li>• Spin-off health &amp; safety partnerships focused on silica, work zone safety, dermal exposures, and warm-mix asphalt, which even further reduced exposure to fumes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification and agreement on priority safety &amp; health interventions</li> <li>• Completion of 2 national baseline surveys of workers and contractors awareness of hazards and use of interventions</li> <li>• Working relationships with 2 equipment manufacturers to address safety &amp; health issues.</li> <li>• Creation of mast climber website</li> <li>• Model for collaboration for r2p in health &amp; safety</li> </ul>
<b>Challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial lack of existing relationships between diverse partners</li> <li>• Engineering controls v. PPE</li> <li>• Manufacturer concerns: anti-trust and competitive advantage issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State of economy</li> <li>• Costs to contractor of interventions</li> <li>• Industry factors: decentralized nature, dominated by small employers, resistance to change, need to adapt to changing methods and technologies</li> </ul>

	<b>Asphalt Engineering Controls</b>	<b>Masonry r2p</b>
<b>Success Factors</b>		
<b>1. Shared vision &amp; compartmentalization</b>	A common mission with concrete goals allowed partners to identify and work towards “win-win” solutions. Areas of disagreement were identified and compartmentalized.	Identifying common interests and recognizing interdependence of all partners enables group to move beyond other competing interests and hold the partnership together.
<b>2. Key stakeholders</b>	Key stakeholders related to asphalt paving fumes were incorporated into partnership.	BAC, ICE, IMI are the core, essential players in the partnership. Other stakeholders are brought in according to the issue.
<b>3. Champions, facilitators, and leaders</b>	<p>Critical role of early champions, including a prominent contractor who used his influence to help create the partnership as well as ongoing leadership at NAPA were cited.</p> <p>The role of the facilitator helped the group “tiptoe through the tulips.”</p>	<p>Leadership is critical: within each organization, within the partnership, and the role of the facilitator.</p> <p>IMI represents the institutionalization of each partners’ ongoing commitment to working together and thereby provides key leadership.</p>
<b>4. Partnership infrastructure</b>	Partnership infrastructure had to be built from scratch for initial partnership, but once in place, the group was able to later spin off several additional partnerships.	Built on existing partnership “infrastructure” to proactively launch new collaboration focused on health & safety. Consequently, group was able to “jump right into the work.”
<b>5. Resources &amp; structures</b>	<p>Administrative structures were useful – agendas, minutes, formal meetings &amp; calls. However, partners tended to view these factors as secondary to the “relational component.”</p> <p>Significant levels of resources were required by the partnership, but were not mentioned as a challenge. Partners all contributed resources, and grant awards supported the group as well.</p>	<p>Meeting structures with agendas and facilitator &amp; staff support facilitate the work of the partnership.</p> <p>External funding also has been important to supporting the partnership’s work.</p>
<b>6. Partnership dynamics &amp; relationships</b>	Relationships were considered central to the success of the group. Active and substantial investments were made to facilitate partnership development.	Relationships, trust, and commitment between institutions <i>and</i> between individuals in the partnership were stressed as critical components to working together.
<b>a. Trust</b>		
<b>b. Commitment</b>		
<b>c. Open communication</b>	Openness, transparency, and trust are among the partnership’s stated principles.	Creating an environment that actively encourages open communication is important to partnership synergy.