

Marine Safety Forum – Safety Flash 12-13

Issued: 20th March 2012

Subject: Snagging Damage

As part of an offshore installation crane refurbishment project the new crane boom sections were loaded and transported offshore on board a PSV.

There was a lift plan for the boom sections but this covered the operation of swinging the boom sections over the installation deck and landing them in their designated positions. The plan did not consider the operation of lifting the boom sections from the vessel deck.

The load-out of the vessel focussed on the vulnerability of the lights on the boom sections and how best to load the boom sections to avoid damage to these during transit. There was no consideration given to the snagging hazards presented by the walkway on the boom sections.

As a consequence the boom sections were loaded close to the crash barriers with the walkways towards the crash barriers on the vessel.



Crane Boom Section Loaded on PSV

During the discharge of one of the crane boom sections from the portside of the vessel deck the walkway on the boom section snagged on the vessel crash barrier, damaging the walkway.



Walkway Snags

Damaged Walkway

Following the incident the position of the boom section on the starboard vessel deck was assessed and the discharge of this was aborted due to the unacceptable risk of also damaging this section.

Immediate Cause:

- The Crane boom sections were improperly loaded onto the vessel, which lead to the damage being sustained during the lift from the vessel.

System Causes:

- The incident was caused by the failure to identify the hazards associated with the walkway stanchions snagging on the crash barriers. There was no risk assessment process followed to identify the stanchions as a snagging hazard.
- Although all persons involved in the job planning, lifting, loading and offloading operations were well trained at the time of the incident there were a number of poor decisions made without proper consideration of the task and risks.
- There were no clear instructions as to who was responsible for the lift, the loading and the planning. There was conflicting responsibilities between the shipper, the logistics provider, vessel master and the operator.
- The shipper and logistics provider were both aware that the load was seen as a sensitive lift and extra care was required during the lift due to pre-existing hazards. However, this did not instigate any formal actions to address these issues or correct known hazards.
- The boom was designed with the lights already attached and protruding out from the boom structure. This led to the boom being loaded to try and prevent damage to the lights which inadvertently created another hazard with the walkway being a snagging hazard. There was no apparent requirement for the lights to be pre-installed. In addition, it could be argued that the walkway did not have to be pre-installed on the boom and which would have removed the requirement for these lifts being special lifts.