Secretary of Labor's Report to the President on the Status of Federal Agencies Occupational Safety and Health Programs

Calendar Year 2015

The Secretary of Labor's Report to the President on the Status of Federal Agencies Occupational Safety and Health Programs

Calendar Year 2015

Table of Contents

Abstract

The Secretary Of Labor's Report to the President on the Status of Federal Agencies Occupational Safety and Health Programs summarizes the data received by the Department of Labor's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) from Executive Branch agencies for the calendar year (CY) 2015 reporting period. In their reports, agencies identified their significant achievements and challenges they faced in providing safe and healthy working environments for federal employees. An analysis of the data assessed the functioning of agencies' safety and health management systems (SHMSS). It indicates improvements in federal agency SHMSS, as well as identifies areas needing attention.

Overall, in CY 2015, federal agencies continued to seek to improve the management and functioning of their SHMSs. Outcome evidence of these efforts includes a steady decline in the Government's total illness and injury cases and its total case rate, roughly steady numbers of violations per OSHA inspection, and fewer significant cases involving federal agencies. In addition, there is consistent interest and participation in the Federal Advisory Committee on Occupational Safety and Health, and a substantial increase in attendance at the Federal Agency Safety and Health Roundtable, and other training venues offered through the OSHA Training Institute.

The Department of Labor will continue to work with Executive Branch agencies as they pursue efficiency and effectiveness in their SHMSs. Several of those areas that need improved attention include annual Occupational Safety and Health Reporting, Certified Safety and Health Committees, Field Federal Safety and Health Councils, Motor Vehicle Safety Programs (MVSPs), and Product Safety.

Preface

This Report fulfills the Secretary of Labor's (the Secretary's) annual responsibility, as set forth in Section 19(b) of the *Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970* (the Act), to inform the President about the status of federal agencies' occupational safety and health (OSH) programs, and the accidents and injuries that occurred at federal worksites. The Report provides an analysis of agencies' reports submitted to the Secretary. It also describes the activities that OSHA conducted at or with federal agencies during CY 2015.

Agency heads <u>must</u> establish and provide guidance on their OSH programs, as well as report on the status of these programs, as mandated by:

- Section 19(a) of the Act [29 United States Code (U.S.C.) 668(a)], which directs, "*the head of each Federal agency to establish and maintain an effective and comprehensive occupational safety and health program which is consistent with the occupational safety and health standards promulgated under Section 6*" of the Act (29 U.S.C. 655).

- Section 19(a)(5) of the Act [29 U.S.C. 668(a)(5)], which requires federal agency heads to, "*make an annual report to the Secretary with respect to occupational accidents and injuries and the agency's program under this section*" for providing safe and healthful places and conditions of employment.

- Presidential Executive Order (E.O.) 12196, *Occupational Safety and Health Programs for Federal Employees*, signed by President Carter on February 26, 1980, which guides the heads of federal Executive Branch agencies in implementing Section 19 of the Act, and directs the Secretary to issue a set of basic program elements to assist the various federal agencies in carrying out their responsibilities.

- Title 29 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §1960, *Basic Program Elements for Federal Employee Occupational Safety and Health Programs and Related Matters*, which establishes the requirements for agency heads to implement OSH programs in their respective agencies.

The Act, E.O. 12196, and 29 CFR §1960 require the heads of federal agencies to submit annual reports on their OSH programs to the Secretary. According to amended 29 CFR §1960.71(a)(1), the annual report is due to OSHA, annually, no later than May 1.[1]

---

[1] Historically, 29 CFR §1960.71(a)(1) required federal agencies to submit the annual report to OSHA by the first of January. As of August 5, 2013, OSHA amended the regulation requiring agencies to submit their reports no later than May 1. The 78 Federal Register 47180 (8/5/2013), amending 29 CFR §1960 is available at: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-08-05/pdf/2013-18457.pdf.

Format

This *Secretary of Labor's Report to the President on the Status of Federal Agencies Occupational Safety and Health Programs* – Calendar Year 2015 (Report), includes an Executive Summary, the two main sections of the Report proper, and four Appendices.

The **Executive Summary** summarizes some of the significant achievements and challenges Executive Branch agencies faced in providing safe and healthy working environments for federal employees and highlights what efforts OSHA made to support federal agencies. The Report includes two main sections: **OSHA Activities**, and **Federal Agency OSH Activities**. These sections describe support activities OSHA provided to federal agencies, and provides OSHA's summative analysis of specific categories of information federal agencies reported to OSHA.

The appendices provide information on the attributes included in the tool federal agencies used to assess their SHMSs, federal agencies' response to the electronic records collection initiative, agency participation in field federal safety and health councils (FFSHCs), and analyses of agencies' requests for technical assistance.

Executive Summary

During the 2015 reporting period, both the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and federal agencies continued their efforts to protect the health and safety of federal employees and support agencies' respective safety and health management systems (SHMSs). This report provides calendar year (CY) 2015 injury and illness data for this sector, and is a compilation of the required annual reports that OSHA received from federal Executive Branch agencies. In addition, this Report summarizes the efforts OSHA and agencies made to improve OSH programs for federal workers. The reader should refer to the various sections of the Report for specific details regarding the subject matter contained in this Executive Summary.

As in prior years, this Report assesses trends and progress the departments and agencies, and the Government as a whole, less the U.S. Postal Service[2] (USPS) and non-Executive Branch agencies, made in improving workplace safety and health. This Report also provides information about the types of support OSHA has provided to federal agencies, including enforcement, oversight, and compliance assistance activities, with an emphasis on the Agency's efforts to assist federal agencies in complying with recent recordkeeping rule changes. In addition, it describes the actions federal agencies took during the reporting period to analyze trends and improve their SHMSs. The Report continues with an analysis of federal agencies' self-evaluations of their respective SHMSs.

Statistics and Trends

Injury and Illness Statistics
OSHA uses injury and illness claims data reported to the Department of Labor's (DOL's) Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP), together with the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM's) employment data, to calculate injury and illness incidence rates for individual agencies.

In FY 2015, the Government's employment rolls *increased* by 11,272 employees (0.5 percent) to 2,166,791 employees. Its total injury and illness cases *decreased* by 3,657 to 48,447, and its total case rate (TCR) *decreased* from 2.42 to 2.24 (7.4 percent). The Government's lost-time cases *decreased* by 1,389 to 24,463; and its lost-time case rate (LTCR) *decreased* from 1.20 to 1.13 (5.8 percent).

Workers' Compensation Costs
For chargeback year (CBY) 2015, the Federal Government's workers' compensation costs (less the USPS) were approximately $1.6 billion. This figure illustrates a slight *increase* in costs over CBY 2014's roughly $1.4 billion. In CBY 2013, costs were approximately $1.6 billion; and in CBY 2012, costs were approximately $1.7 billion. Workers' compensation benefits provided to

---

[2] On September 28, 1998, Congress amended the Act to make it applicable to the USPS. Therefore, the USPS is not included in this Report.

employees and their survivors include payments for medical treatment, rehabilitation services, replacement of lost wages, and death benefits.

Fatalities and Catastrophic Events

The Act, and provisions of 29 CFR §1960 and other regulations, require employers, both private and public, to investigate, track, and report findings involving work-related fatalities and catastrophic events[3] to OSHA in an expeditious manner. According to federal agencies reports, 26 civilian employee fatalities occurred at work during CY 2015. The Departments of Agriculture reported seven fatalities; the Department of Defense reported four fatalities; the Departments of the Interior and Justice, and the International Boundary and Waters Commission all reported two fatalities; and the Departments of Energy, Health and Human Services, and Labor, and the Smithsonian Institution reported a single fatality each. The Department of Homeland Security reported 24 catastrophic events, the Department of Defense reported 8 events, and the Department of Justice reported one event.

OSHA Activities

During the reporting period, OSHA's Directorate of Enforcement Programs - Office of Federal Agency Programs engaged in a wide range of activities to assist federal agencies in improving their SHMSs, and continued to ensure that agencies could easily access OSH-related information. In general, the Office's activities fell into two categories: *enforcement* and *compliance assistance*. Enforcement activities primarily focused on inspections of federal workplaces to identify violations of OSHA standards. Oversight activities ranged from monitoring injury and illness rates, to providing leadership in identifying issues specific to federal agencies. Compliance assistance included consultation activities that assisted federal agencies in understanding both the importance of providing safe and healthy working environments, and possible methods for accomplishing this goal. (Please refer to Section 1 – OSHA Activities, for a complete explanation of these activities.)

Enforcement

During CY 2015, OSHA conducted 475 programmed inspections, and 344 un-programmed inspections of federal worksites, with an average of 3.99 violations per programmed inspection, and 2.23 violations per un-programmed inspection. In addition, OSHA inspected federal agencies under a variety of national and local emphasis programs that targeted specific hazards, such as lead, fall prevention, powered industrial vehicles, energized equipment, and specific injuries (such as amputations), or industries (such as manufacturing and maritime). During CY 2015, under the Federal Agency Targeting Inspection Program (FEDTARG), OSHA continued to specifically target for inspection those federal agencies with the highest numbers of lost-time cases. An analysis of FEDTARG data identified a decrease in programmed

---

[3] On January 1, 2015, OSHA's new definition of catastrophic event became effective. The new rule lowered the threshold for proactively reporting a catastrophic incident from the hospitalization of three or more employees to the *hospitalization of a single employee.*

inspection activity with a flat in-compliance rate, and an increase in the issuance of *Notices of Unsafe or Unhealthful Working Conditions* (Notices) for serious violations of OSHA standards.

In CY 2015, OSHA issued a total of seven federal agency *significant* case reports involving the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Interior, Justice, and Veterans Affairs. (Please refer to SECTION 1 – OSHA ACTIVITIES, Table 2, for specific information on the significant cases.)

Compliance Assistance

OSHA provides assistance to federal agencies using a variety of strategies, including responding to agency technical assistance requests; optimizing the use of the field federal safety and health councils, and other safety and health committee formats; supporting the development of federal agency alternate and supplementary standards; and providing federal agencies with OSH training opportunities.

An agency technical assistance request (ATAR) is a consultative service open only to federal agencies; it is analogous to OSHA's Consultation Program for private sector employers. OSHA's various field Area Offices perform the vast majority of ATARs and interact directly with the federal agency sites requesting assistance. During 2015, the Cleveland, Ohio Area Office assisted two Department of Labor, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs sites with ergonomics evaluations and assistance.

Field Federal Safety and Health Councils are federal interagency groups, chartered by the Secretary, that encourage local OSH professionals to cooperate for education and problem solving. In CY 2015, 35 councils actively carried out efforts to improve the effectiveness of OSH functions within the Government. The OSHA Assistant Secretary recognized 10 of these councils for *Superior Performance*, *Meritorious Achievement*, and *Notable Recognition* awards.

Under 29 CFR §1960.17, if agencies cannot comply with an applicable OSHA standard, the agency may submit a request for an *alternate standard*. Currently, there are five OSHA-approved alternate standards. Under §1960.18, if no OSHA standard exists that is appropriate for application to working conditions of federal agency employees, an agency must develop a *supplementary standard* for that working condition and provide the standard to OSHA. Currently, there are two supplementary standards.

OSHA provides federal agency OSH personnel with training opportunities though the OSHA Training Institute and other venues, such as the newly-inaugurated Federal Agency OSH Managers' Roundtable. Federal OSH personnel may attend any of the myriad of professional and technical courses provided through the Institute. In addition to the on-site training courses, OSHA provides a week of training specifically for federal agency OSH personnel at the Institute, commonly referred to as FEDWEEK. During the 2015 FEDWEEK, OSHA provided nine half-day seminars offered twice during the week on topics chosen after surveying federal OSH personnel. There were 112 students registered at the beginning of the class week. Since 39 did not show up/did not attend, there were 73 attendees. Although the number of attendees was

lower than anticipated, those in attendance reported that they were pleased with the training offered.

The Federal Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health continued its efforts to identify strategies to assist federal agencies to progress in providing safe and healthy workplaces. The Council investigated the utility of field federal safety and health councils, and received presentations on federal agencies' whistleblower responsibilities and the value of OSHA's Voluntary Protection Program.

Agency Activities

Occupational Safety and Health Committees

Federal agencies reported a range of OSH committees and the benefits from these committees. While four agencies continued to maintain *Certified Safety and Health Committees* (CSHCs), regulated by 29 CFR §1960, Subpart F, most agencies described internal OSH committees developed outside of these regulatory requirements.

Any Executive Branch agency can form a CSHC under 29 CFR §1960, Subpart F to monitor and assist an agency's OSH program. Agencies with Secretary-approved CSHCs must have committees at both the national and field/regional levels. The national level committees provide policy guidance, while the local committees monitor and assist in the execution of the agency's OSH policies. When appropriately implemented, an approved-CSHC exempts agencies from *unannounced* OSHA inspections. As of CY 2015, the Secretary had six agencies authorized to maintain CSHCs, including: the Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Labor (DOL), General Services Administration (GSA), Tennessee Valley Authority, U.S. International Trade Commission, and the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

Per 29 CFR §1960, Subpart F, DOL and the Tennessee Valley Authority submitted information certifying to the Secretary of Labor that their respective CSHCs met the requirements of the subpart. The U.S. International Trade Commission and General Services Administration reported that they no longer had CSHCs. The Central Intelligence Agency and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission did not report on their CSHCs for CY 2015.

Self-Evaluations

29 CFR §1960.79 requires that agencies periodically evaluate their OSH programs. These evaluations should assess both the extent to which the agency's program conforms to the requirements of E.O. 12196, and the corresponding regulations, as well as whether the agency has implemented the program effectively in all agency establishments and field activities. Most agencies reported conducting some type of periodic review of their SHMSs and related OSH programs during CY 2015. Many agencies reported evaluating their programs themselves, using a variety of pre-packaged and/or agency-developed tools; while others requested assistance from outside experts, including assistance from GSA, OSHA, and the Joint Commission – an independent, not-for-profit, private sector organization, with the mission to continuously improve health care. With few exceptions, those agencies that reported

performing self-evaluations indicated improvement in the different aspects of their SHMSs, including gains in the operational, managerial, and cultural components that encompass an effective SHMS. Agencies' self-assigned ratings of the attributes of their SHMSs reflect these system-wide improvements.

For the fourth consecutive year, OSHA asked agencies to 'self-rate' the **Operational**, **Managerial**, and **Cultural** components of their SHMSs using a 30-question (attribute) prescribed tool. An analysis of the reported data indicates that the majority of federal agencies are in compliance with the requirements of 29 CFR §1960, and have effectively functioning SHMSs. Overall, agencies' ratings of the three SHMS components indicate an *increase* in the number and percentage providing higher ratings, with the operational component seeing the greatest increase.

However, subcomponents within each of the three components are amenable to improvement, even in those agencies that provided higher ratings of their SHMSs. The operational component's *hazard survey* and *tracking hazard correction* attributes; the managerial component's *knowledge, skills, and information* and *authority to perform* attributes; and the cultural component's *provided competent staff*, *resource allocation*, *process involvement*, *organizational decision-making on resources*, and *evaluation of OSH performance* attributes may require additional emphasis in subsequent years. The analysis also indicated that multiple agencies are not fully cognizant of their OSH responsibilities and all the attributes of an effective SHMS in assuring employee safety and health and the efficient management of Government operations, even in those agencies that report a 'purely' administrative mission. (Please refer to SECTION 1 – OSHA ACTIVITIES, Figures 1 through 4, and the ensuing discussion, for a description of the components of a SHMS and an analysis of the self-evaluations as reported by agencies.)

Controlling Trends

As a way to assess how well agencies were tracking their injuries, OSHA asked agencies to report on the most common cause of injuries and their efforts to mitigate that cause. As in previous years, most agencies that provided this information noted slips, trips, and falls as the leading cause of injuries. Their control efforts included engineering approaches such as improving housekeeping and installing slip-resistant flooring and warning signage, along with providing prevention awareness training and using safety bulletin boards to heighten employee and public awareness of the hazards. This year several agencies also reported participating in OSHA's National Safety Stand-Down for Fall Prevention in May 2015. The purpose of the Stand-Down was to bring awareness to fall hazards, typical work tasks associated with fall risks, and fall protection strategies.

Annual Information Request

Each year, OSHA asks agencies to provide information on a variety of OSH-related topics and programs. While OSHA consistently requests information on such topics as OSH accomplishments for the reporting period and goals for the upcoming year, other information

requests may be based on findings from previous annual reports or developing trends. For the current reporting period, OSHA requested an assessment of OSH program activities and events, including: Presidential and Federal Government-wide Initiatives; occupational illnesses, injuries, fatalities, and catastrophic events; specific 29 CFR §1960 requirements, an agency SHMS self-evaluation, and CY 2015 OSH goals.

Motor Vehicle Safety

Collectively, 39 federal agencies reported that approximately 9,798 motor vehicle accidents (MVAs) occurred in CY 2015. Most agencies reported having motor vehicle safety programs (MVSPs) that are in compliance with the Executive Orders requiring the use of seatbelts in motor vehicles, and the ban on distracted driving. Agencies reported that their programs had demonstrable effects on limiting the likelihood and effect of MVAs on the mission. Many departments and agencies reported requiring defensive driving courses, with the majority using courses through either GSA or the National Safety Council.

Federal Agency Safety and Health Mission

29 CFR §1960, Subpart B describes the administration of agencies' OSH programs. The majority of reporting agencies identified the presence of a designated agency safety and health official (DASHO), or other senior OSH manager with primary OSH responsibilities. While most agencies reported that this organizational function is managed under the auspices of Human Resources, some of the agencies indicated that the OSH function is managed in a totally independent organizational safety and health division/department. Of those agencies that reported on this item, the majority alluded to the availability of the necessary resources, including personnel and adequate budgets, to accomplish necessary OSH activities. Agency reports indicated that employee-identified OSH issues are handled internally, at the lowest possible level. According to reports, if such issues have agency-wide implications, they may be forwarded to the agency OSH committee, if existing, for resolution.

Field Federal Safety and Health Councils

In 2016, 35 FFSHCs submitted annual reports detailing their activities during CY 2015. The FFSHCs represent OSHA Regions 2 through 10. Due to inactivity, no councils in Region 1 submitted an annual report. According to the annual reports, approximately 538 appointed representatives[4] from 65 federal departments and agencies[5] participated in FFSHCs across the country. Five hundred and forty-four non-appointed members from at least 88 federal departments and agencies also participated in the councils along with 607 associate members[6] from roughly 287 local businesses, local governments, safety and health associations, and labor unions. Eleven FFSHCs (31% of FFSHCs that submitted a CY 2015 annual report) do not have any officially appointed representatives on their council. These councils' memberships consist of associate members and non-appointed members. In CY 2015, 24 departments and agencies

---

[4] The number of appointed representatives participating in FFSHCs decreased 13.37% from CY 2014 to CY 2015.
[5] The number of departments and agencies participating in FFSHCs decreased 14.47% from CY 2014 to CY 2015.
[6] The number of associate members participating in FFSHCs decreased 14.75% from CY 2014 to CY 2015.

appointed new representatives to 12 FFSHCs. Of the new appointments, 19 were management representatives and 13 were non-management representatives.

Agency's Self-inspection of Safety and Health Management System

Overall, federal agencies reported a moderate improvement in the effectiveness of their self-inspections. Some agencies have increased the frequency of self-inspections while others used multiple methods for conducting self-evaluations. Agencies involvement in internal and external inspections included correcting minor issues on the spot, abating hazards in accordance with corrective action plans, and updating policy and procedural guidance to improve the overall effectiveness of their OSH programs. During this reporting period, 60 agencies indicated conducting some sort of self-inspection activities. Twenty-three agencies indicated external inspection activities conducted by an outside source, such as OSHA, GSA, or a third party contractor. (Please refer to SECTION 1 – OSHA ACTIVITIES, for an analysis of agencies' evaluation of their SHMSs.)

Training of Federal Employees (including Overseas)

The legislative provisions of the Act, E.O. 12196, and 29 CFR §1960 that require agencies to provide safe and healthful workplaces have no geographical limits. According to agency reports, close to 132,000 government employees worked outside the United States' border this year. This represents a less than one percent *decrease* from the ~132,291 federal civilian employees reported working overseas in CY 2014. Multiple agencies indicated the presence of a federal civilian overseas workforce, but did not disclose the approximate numbers of these employees. While many agencies reported extending their own OSH programs to cover their overseas employees, several independent agencies reported that they rely totally on either Department of Defense (DoD) or State OSH programs to provide coverage for their overseas-deployed workforce. At a minimum, these agencies reportedly may provide pre-deployment preparations for their employees, which may include prophylactic immunizations, training, and other pre-travel information.

As in previous annual summary reports, several agencies also reported on agency support of their stateside employees, noting a range of employee support activities for OSH-related activities. Some reported that employee training was largely based on job responsibilities. Some also reported making special efforts to ensure that collateral duty OSH personnel received the appropriate training. In addition, several agencies reported that employees were encouraged to seek professional OSH certification and participate in professional OSH organizations. Agencies also provided support by maintaining OSH websites, distributing OSH awards, publishing OSH newsletters, and encouraging participation in FFSHCs. Many agencies reported that they also supported employees' safety and health through encouraging healthy lifestyles by providing on-site fitness centers; subsidizing gym memberships; sponsoring health fairs; and offering a variety of health-related services, such as health-screenings and physical examinations.

Whistleblower Protection Programs

The OSHA Directorate of Whistleblower Protection Programs enforces the whistleblower provisions of more than 20 whistleblower statutes protecting employees who report violations of various workplace safety, airline, commercial motor carrier, consumer product, environmental, financial reform, food safety, health insurance reform, motor vehicle safety, nuclear, pipeline, public transportation agency, railroad, maritime, and securities laws. One statute is specific to federal agencies; 29 CFR §1960, Subpart G requires federal agencies to ensure that employees are not subjected to reprisal or other forms of restraint for filing a report of unsafe or unhealthy working conditions. In an effort to assess agencies' whistleblower protection programs, OSHA requested that agencies provide information on improvement to their whistleblower protection programs, any federal employee allegations of reprisal, and the actions taken in response to the allegations. The vast majority of agencies indicated awareness of provisions of the *Whistleblower Protection Act*, Title 5, U.S.C. § 2302(c), and reported having functional protection programs. No agency reported cases of allegation of reprisal that occurred during the reporting period.

Product Safety

In the CY 2015 information request to federal agencies, OSHA requested that federal agencies describe their compliance with the provisions of 29 CFR 1960.34, specifically addressing how each agency ensures that the products and services it procures comply with the product safety requirements of the standard, including the use of safety data sheets (SDSs) (aka material safety data sheets - MSDSs), and responding to product recalls. Of the 83 responding agencies, 51 reported their compliance with the standard; 26 indicated that such a program did not exist within their respective agencies. For the agencies that indicated such a program did not exist, some of the agencies noted that they did not use chemicals so did not have a program. Other agencies stated that the provision was inapplicable. OSHA will contact those agencies to ensure that they are aware of their OSH responsibilities in this area. Six agencies did not respond to this item.

Accomplishments

Federal agencies continue to make strides in providing a safe and healthy work environment for federal workers. Agencies reported on a broad range of improvements, from revising OSH programs, procedures, and manuals, to developing training programs and inspecting their facilities and establishments. As in previous years, agencies reported adding risk assessments to their safety policies, implementing interactive safety and health information systems to collect hazard and abatement information and improving trend analysis. A few agencies indicated that they are in the infancy stages of developing SHMSs. Several agencies reported training employees in first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation, and the use of automatic external defibrillators. Agencies also reported implementing policy changes, developing new and improving upon existing OSH programs, completing abatement projects, instituting mandatory OSH training, and performing safety audits.

CY 2016 Goals

There were no significant changes regarding agencies proposed OSH goals for CY 2016 from previous reporting periods. Most agency goals were broad-based in scope incorporating various strategies to improve the effectiveness of specific OSH programs, such as conducting self-assessments, developing procedures and programs to enhance their SHMS programs, and providing employees with OSH training. Agencies reported on plans to reduce the incidence of work-related illnesses and injuries and to incorporate more extensive analyses of OSH-related information from reports on incidents and near-misses. A few agencies reported an interest in participating in local FFSHCs; developing abatement verification processes; implementing data management systems to track OSH training, hazards, and/or program performance; and, developing a formal OSH training program.

Agencies Failing to Submit Annual Reports

OSHA did not receive reports from the following 12 agencies for inclusion in the CY 2015 Report:

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Broadcasting Board of Governors
- Central Intelligence Agency
- Corporation for National Community Service
- Federal Housing Finance Agency
- Federal Labor Relations Authority
- National Credit Union Administration
- National Endowments for the Arts
- National Endowments for the Humanities
- National Science Foundation
- Presidio Trust
- Selective Service System

The Secretary's Report to the President

Section 1 - OSHA Activities

This section provides information about OSHA activities concerning enforcement, oversight, and compliance assistance; significant/novel enforcement cases involving federal agencies; and agencies' reporting of self-evaluations using components of an integrated safety and health evaluation tool. This section also contains information on recordkeeping, and a summary of agency reports on fatalities and catastrophic events, along with a brief description of FEDWEEK - a training opportunity provided by OSHA for federal OSH personnel, and the federal agency safety and health roundtable – a newly created federal OSH information exchange forum.

Enforcement

Inspections

29 CFR §1960 provides for OSHA inspections of federal agencies, which are similar to those conducted within the private sector. OSHA inspections can occur for many reasons, but generally fall into one of two categories: *programmed* or *un-programmed*. Programmed worksite inspections occur as the result of OSHA's emphasis on a particular safety or health issue, such as sites reporting injury and illness statistics that exceed industry averages, or sites associated with particular hazards, or adverse health outcomes, such as amputations. Un-programmed inspections occur for other reasons, such as when OSHA receives an employee complaint or notification of serious hazards.

OSHA further categorizes its inspections as either a *safety*, or a *health* inspection. Safety inspections may focus on workplace issues, such as egress, electrical safety, machine guarding, or proper confined space procedures. Health inspections may include worker exposures to specific chemicals or noise, ergonomic issues, or proper protection from an infectious disease agent.

During an inspection, if OSHA determines that safety and/or health hazards exist, OSHA may document those violations of its standards. In the private sector, OSHA issues citations, often with monetary penalties, for violations. However, for federal agencies, OSHA issues *Notices of Unsafe or Unhealthful Working Conditions* (Notices), which carry no monetary penalties. For either sector, the "cited" employer may appeal the citation/Notice.

There are different types of violations, depending on the severity of the hazard or the employer's response to the condition, including:

- *De Minimis*: Violations that have no direct or immediate relationship to safety or health, and do not result in citations.

- *Other-Than-Serious*: The hazard cannot reasonably be predicted to cause death or serious physical harm to exposed employees, but does have a direct and immediate relationship to their safety and health.

- *Serious*: The hazard could cause injury or illness that would most likely result in death or serious physical harm to the employee(s).

- *Willful*: A willful violation exists under the Act where an employer has demonstrated either an intentional disregard for the requirements of the Act or a plain indifference to employee safety and health.

- *Repeat*: An employer may be cited for a repeated violation if that employer has been cited previously for the same or a substantially similar condition or hazard and the Notice has become a final order.

- *Failure-To-Abate*: The employer has not corrected a violation for which OSHA has issued a Notice, and the abatement date has passed or is covered under a settlement agreement. A *failure-to-abate* also exists when the employer has not complied with interim measures involved in a long-term abatement within the given timeframe.

OSHA Inspection Activity

During CY 2015, OSHA conducted 475 programmed inspections, and 344 un-programmed inspections of federal worksites, with an average of 3.99 violations per programmed inspection, and 2.23 violations per un-programmed inspection. According to data obtained through the OSHA Information System, of the programmed inspections, 429 (~90 percent) were categorized as 'not in compliance'; and an average of 4.10 violations were issued per inspection. Overall, OSHA discovered 1760 violations including: 1088 *Serious*, 295 *Repeat*, 3 *Failure-to-Abate*; and 371 *Other-Than-Serious* violations. (OSHA did not identify any willful violations.)

In CY 2015, OSHA's National Office continued the *Federal Agency Targeting Inspection Program* (FEDTARG), which is an inspection program targeting federal worksites. OSHA uses the previous fiscal year's OWCP data to identify federal establishments with the highest number of lost-time cases.

In addition, OSHA inspected federal agencies under a variety of national and local emphasis programs (NEPs/LEPs) that targeted specific hazards, such as lead, falls, powered industrial vehicles, energized equipment; and specific injuries, such as amputations; or industries, such as manufacturing or maritime.

By way of comparison, in 2014 OSHA conducted 496 programmed inspections, and discovered an average of 3.54 violations per inspection, a *slight increase* from FY 2013's 442 violations. Overall, for the 2014 reporting period, OSHA discovered 702 violations including: 3 *Willful*, 476 *Serious*, 135 *Repeat*, and 88 *Other-Than-Serious* violations. In the 2013 reporting period, OSHA discovered 442 violations including: 3 *Willful*, 714 *Serious*, 101 *Repeat*, and 117 *Other-Than-Serious* violations.

15

Table 1. *OSHA Federal Agency Programmed, Un-programmed Inspection Activity, FY 2013 through CY 2015.*

	CY 2015	CY 2014	FY 2013
Programmed Inspections	475	496	645
Percent in Compliance	10	11	11
Average Number of Violations	3.99	3.59	3.75
Serious Violations	1088	476	265
Average Number Serious Violations	0.70	0.96	0.57
Unprogrammed Inspections	344	332	304
Percent in Compliance	49	47	22
Avg. No. of Violations	2.23	3.48	3.38
Serious Violations	345	314	395
Average Number Serious Violations	0.92	0.95	1.30
Total Inspections	819	828	949

Further comparison of the data extracted from the OSHA federal agency inspection activity database illustrates the following trends: 1) a *decrease in programmed inspection activity* with a *steady* in-compliance rate and a *decrease* in average numbers of violations this year; and, 2) an *increase in serious violations* identified under programmed inspection activities for the three year period. These trends suggest that federal agencies have improved the levels of occupational safety and health within their establishments.

The abovementioned trends include several contributing factors. Recall that programmed inspections of federal establishments are based on an analysis of the previous year's lost time case data reported through OWCP, with absolute cut-offs for various levels of injuries. A reduced number of programmed inspections may result when fewer establishments qualify for inspection due to their lower injury and illness rates. The flat or decreasing levels of 'in-compliance inspections' and 'average violations' implicates the accuracy of the targeting of establishments with higher injury and illness rates. Similarly, the higher numbers of serious violations implies increasing accuracy of the targeting system. In addition, the roughly steady levels of average violations could indicate that, while more federal employees were reporting OSH concerns and/or followed-up by regulatory agencies – including OSHA, the relative risks in

federal workplaces remained fairly constant. These further support the suggestion that federal agencies have improved the levels of occupational safety and health within their establishments.

Previously, OSHA began a campaign to encourage the private sector's 'workers voice' in identifying workplace hazards. The campaign focused on informing civilian workers of their OSH-related rights, and providing guidance on seeking redress if the employer failed to abate the hazard even after notification. This effort seemed to increase complaint-based inspections within the private sector, and spilled over into the public sector, including federal agencies. Even though minor fluctuations in the "in-compliance" rate and serious violations may be seen over the three-year period, it does not support the conclusion that a significant trend exists.

Significant/Novel Cases

OSHA defines *significant cases* as those inspections having penalties over $100,000, or cases involving novel enforcement issues, such as workplace violence; ergonomics; federal agency cases that would receive a press release; and some general duty clause cases, regardless of penalty amount. While, by law, OSHA cannot assess penalties against federal agencies, it can determine the ***significance*** of a federal agency inspection by comparing the violations to the penalties that would be assessed to a "similar" private sector employer.

In CY 2015, OSHA issued a total of seven federal significant case reports. These cases involved the Departments of Agriculture-Forest Service (one case), Defense-U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (one case), Interior-Fish and Wildlife Service (one case), Justice-Federal Bureau of Prisons (one case), and Veterans Affairs-Veterans Health Administration (three cases). (Please refer to Table 2 for specific information on the significant cases involving federal agencies.)

Table 2. *Summary of OSHA Significant Cases Involving Federal Agencies.*

Department/Agency	Inspection Type	Program	Type of Violations
USDA – Forest Service – John Day and Prairie City Oregon	Planned Programmed	FEDSAFE	Serious: 8 Repeat: 8 Other-Than-Serious: 8

OSHA initiated this inspection as part of a regional emphasis program of federal worksites. Violations addressed: electrical safety; safety and health training for employees; emergency lighting; fire extinguishers; fall hazards; chemical safety, and; personal protective equipment.

Defense – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan	Planned Programmed	LEP	Serious: 21 Repeat: 2

17

Table 2. *Summary of OSHA Significant Cases Involving Federal Agencies.*

Department/Agency	Inspection Type	Program	Type of Violations
OSHA initiated this inspection as part of a local emphasis program of federal worksites. The safety violations addressed: hazards associated with crane deficiencies; guarding of floor openings; stairway handrails; suspended scaffold; storage of gas cylinders; control of hazardous energy; fire extinguisher training; sling inspections; electrical; emergency exits, and; openings in electrical panels. Health violations addressed respiratory protection; permit required confined space, and; an eye wash station.			
Interior – Fish and Wildlife Service – Brimley, Michigan	Planned Programmed	LEP	Serious: 11 Repeat: 1 Other-Than-Serious: 1
OSHA initiated this inspection as part of a local emphasis program of federal worksites. Violations found included: control of hazardous energy; compressed air; confined spaces, and; asbestos and hazardous communication trainings.			
Justice – Federal Bureau of Prisons – Yazoo City, Mississippi	Complaint	N/A	Willful: 2
OSHA initiated this inspection based on a complaint related to a potentially contaminated sharps injury to the hand of a correctional officer. In this incident, a correctional officer was stuck with a tattoo sharp while gathering an inmate's personal belongings. During a previous inspection at this facility, OSHA had issued repeat violations for failing to provide sharps containers and puncture resistant gloves. When this incident occurred, the agency had failed to abate the previous repeat violations. The BOP filed an appeal of its case; it is currently in process at the National Office level. As with all inspections, OSHA worked with these agencies to ensure that they both abated the hazards and made the necessary improvements to their SHMSs.			

18

Table 2. *Summary of OSHA Significant Cases Involving Federal Agencies.*

Department/Agency	Inspection Type	Program	Type of Violations
Veterans Affairs – VA Connecticut Healthcare System – West Haven, Connecticut	Planned Programmed	FEDTARG	Serious: 7 Repeat: 12 Other-Than-Serious: 3

OSHA initiated this inspection on June 2, 2015 as part of the Federal Agency Targeting Inspection (FEDTARG) Program. Violations addressed: walking/working surfaces; machine guarding; electrical safety, hazard communication; means of egress; lockout/tagout; machine guarding; personal protective equipment and; bloodborne pathogens.

Department/Agency	Inspection Type	Program	Type of Violations
Veterans Affairs – Bedford VAMC – Bedford, Massachusetts	Complaint	N/A	Serious: 1 Repeats: 5 Other-Than-Serious: 1

OSHA initiated this inspection based on two complaints concerning lead, asbestos, noise, exit routes, personal protective equipment, and an alleged structurally unsound building. During the course of the inspection, OSHA received three more complaints alleging exposure to asbestos (different locations) and mold, no access to SDSs, and one location not meeting the exit route requirements. OSHA issued notices addressing electrical, chemical and asbestos hazards.

Department/Agency	Inspection Type	Program	Type of Violations
Veterans Affairs – Hunter Holmes McGuire VAMC – Richmond, Virginia	Complaint	N/A	Willful: 10 Serious: 2 Other-Than-Serious: 8

OSHA initiated this inspection based on a complaint alleging inadequate protections for employees exposed to workplace violence hazards while providing patient care. Upon initial review of the OSHA 300 logs there were indications of recordkeeping deficiencies. A complete 3 year recordkeeping review was conducted. The violative conditions found during the inspection were related to recordkeeping, lack of implementation of a workplace violence program, and lack of workplace violence training.

Oversight

Federal Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health

The Federal Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health (FACOSH) is an advisory council to the Secretary of Labor on occupational safety and health matters focusing on federal agencies. The Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health chairs the Council, which consists of 16 members: half represent federal agency management, and half are representatives from labor organizations having OSH responsibilities in their organizations. DOL's Office of the Solicitor-OSH Division provides counsel to the Council. Five special agency liaisons from various federal agencies provide consultative support to FACOSH.

FACOSH met once during the reporting period on July 16, 2015[7]. The Council received updates from its Emerging Issues Subcommittee[8] – Field Federal Safety and Health Councils (FFSHCs); and on the POWER Initiative, and Whistleblower Protection Programs. It also received an informational briefing on OSHA's Voluntary Protection Program from the U.S. Mint. There were no motions considered by FACOSH at this meeting.

Emerging Issues Subcommittee. During the reporting period, the Subcommittee reviewed survey data it collected from FFSHC Executive Board members and OSHA's Federal Agency Program Officers (FAPOs) during FY 2015. Based on survey results, the Subcommittee determined that the Councils are relevant forums for facilitating exchanges of OSH-related information among participating federal agencies, and that the FFSHC program should not be replaced. As a result, the Subcommittee was developing a report for FACOSH to identify how the councils could be revitalized.

Evaluations

Section 1-401(h) of E.O. 12196 requires the Secretary of Labor to, "*evaluate the occupational safety and health programs of agencies and promptly submit reports to the agency heads*." While the E.O. establishes OSHA's responsibility for evaluating federal agencies, 29 CFR §1960.79 expands the evaluation responsibilities to the federal agencies themselves. In addition, 29 CFR §1960.80 develops OSHA's responsibilities for conducting evaluations. Accordingly, both the OSHA evaluations and the agencies' self-evaluations should focus on an assessment of agencies' OSH program elements, vis-a-vis, the safety and health management system.

In an effort to find a consistent and standard evaluation method, OSHA determined that the OSHA Form 33, an extant OSHA consultative tool used for private sector businesses, might be

---

[7] Meeting minutes are available at www.regulations.gov Docket Number: OSHA-2015-0005-0007.

[8] FACOSH tasked the *Training Subcommittee* with evaluating the relevancy of field federal safety and health councils as an adjunct to federal agency safety and health programs. FACOSH further tasked the *Subcommittee* with developing strategies to revitalize the councils. Its deliberations will continue into calendar year 2015 and beyond.

beneficial for both OSHA and federal agencies. The OSHA Form 33, developed in 1984, is a safety and health program assessment tool used to evaluate a private sector employer's safety and health management system. A SHMS integrates OSH attributes into an organizational structure. Therefore, evaluating a SHMS requires a systematic approach to determine whether policies and procedures are appropriately developed and implemented, and regularly monitored and modified to correct any problems and/or adapt to a changing worksite environment. Its relevancy applies to all employers, regardless of size, number of employees, or industrial sector.

Based on the concept of an organizational safety and health program, the OSHA Form 33 provides for the assessment of the three components of a SHMS—*operational*, *managerial*, and *cultural*—using 58 attributes as metrics for the program's overall effectiveness and integration into the organization. (Please refer to Appendix 1 for lists of Attributes by Component.)

The *Operational Component* measures whether a SHMS has a well-defined and communicated system to identify, correct, and control hazards. The *Managerial Component* assesses whether the SHMS incorporates effective planning, administration, training, management leadership, and supervision to support the prevention or elimination of workplace hazards. Finally, the *Cultural Component* evaluates whether the SHMS has developed an effective safety culture in which management and labor come together to effectively reduce or eliminate hazards. While the attributes within each of the components are distinct, they are interdependent, cross-feeding into each other.

For this year's Report, OSHA selected 30 of the tool's 58 attributes to provide a well-rounded assessment of agencies' OSH programs (nine from the Operational, 11 from the Managerial, and 10 from the Cultural component, respectively; please refer to Figures 2, 3, and 4 for the attributes evaluated in CY 2015) across the three components of a SHMS for the agencies to assess. In CY 2014, five new attributes were added to the self-evaluation tool and one attribute, from the FY 2012 evaluation tool, was omitted. (In FY 2013, 25 attributes were assessed). Agencies were asked to rate each of these attributes, based on their CY 2015 reporting period experience, and were provided criteria for rating each attribute. Specifically, agencies were asked to rate each attribute on an ordinal scale from 0 to 3 with a score of "0" indicating that the attribute was not in place at all and "3" indicating the attribute's complete effectiveness and integration into the SHMS without the need for improvement – thereby indicating its 'model' nature. The middle two ratings of "1" and "2" indicate some portion or aspect of the attribute is present, either needing major or minor improvements respectively. In addition to scoring each of the attributes, agencies had to provide a detailed narrative, with examples to support each self-identified attribute rating.

Overall Assessment

For the CY 2015 reporting period, OSHA received responses from 83 out of 96[9] agencies (an 86 percent response rate). In evaluating their respective agencies' SHMSs overall, federal agencies had a mean overall rating of 2.1 for CY 2015. Thirty-two agencies (~39 percent), provided a rating of "3" for the overall assessment of their SHMSs. Forty-two out of the 83 responding agencies (~51 percent) provided a rating of "2" for the 30 attributes used to rate the three components of a SHMS; 74 (~89 percent) indicated that their respective SHMSs are in compliance with the provisions of 29 CFR §1960.

Of the 83 agencies that provided input, only six (~7 percent) either did not provide a self-evaluation of their SHMSs, or provided a "not-applicable" rating for the overall assessment and respective SHMS's attributes. As identified earlier, 32 agencies provided an overall score of "3" to their SHMSs. However, 25 (~78 percent) of these agencies[10] identified that improvements were needed in the three components of their programs, as indicated by self-assessment ratings of less than "3" across 10 to100 percent of the component-attribute spectrum. This phenomenon suggests incongruences between the agency's overall assessment of their SHMSs and the need for improvement *across* the SHMS's component-attribute spectrum. This effect includes those agencies that reported the most effective systems, as indicated by a "3" rating, as well as those that indicated a SHMS, in full or part, was "not applicable" to their situations, or did not report on the status of their SHMSs.   (Please refer to Table 4 for the discrete number of responding federal agencies that provided the specified rating for the 30 assessed attributes.)

Although the attributes of the Cultural Component received the greatest number of "2" or higher ratings, multiple agencies provided "not applicable" or were "not rated" by the agency. These aspects of a 'safety culture' need to be pervasive in an organization if it is to sustain a safe and healthful working environment. OSHA is working with these agencies to ensure they better understand the applicability of the SHMS for the protection of their workers, and the mitigation of hazards in their work environments.

Operational Component Assessment

Federal agencies were provided nine attributes, without change from the FY 2014 reporting period, to rate the operational component of their SHMSs. Overall, the attributes of the operational component were rated highly, indicated by a "2" or higher rating; 63 agencies (~76 percent) rated these attributes a "2" or higher, indicating their *surveillance*, *use of SDSs*,

---

[9] Tables 4a and 4b depict the overall score assigned by federal agencies to the self-evaluation of their respective SHMSs for CY 2015.   Those responding agencies, that either did not provide an overall rating of their respective SHMSs, or did not provide documentation that they conducted a self-evaluation, are identified as "NR"(not reported) in the Table. In addition, the agencies that did not provide an agency report (indicated in the Executive Summary) are not included in the Table.

[10] The Armed Forces Retirement Home, Court Services and Offenders Supervision Agency, National Transportation Safety Board, Office of Personnel Management, and Social Security Administration, provided a "3" rating for the overall score and all 30 attributes.

presence of work rules and practices, and *OSHA – mandated programs* were well implemented. The Department of Agriculture reported providing management with reports detailing deficiencies and included hazard abatement plans, after completing inspections. The reports are effective safety and health program evaluation tools because agencies are able to collect information for trend analysis. Fifty-one agencies (~61 percent) provided a rating of "2" or higher for the *use of SDSs* attribute. The Department of Justice, for example, documents all the chemical products used in its workplaces and provides each of its Districts and Divisions with binders containing Safety Data Sheets. Seventy-five agencies (~90 percent) rated their agency a "2" or higher for the presence of *work rules and practices* attribute. Similarly, 68 agencies (~82 percent) rated themselves a "2" or higher for the *OSHA – mandated programs*. Fifty-two agencies (~63 percent of reporting agencies) rated themselves a two or higher for both the *hazard survey* and the *tracking hazard correction* attributes in CY 2015.

In CY 2015 some agencies had ratings of "non-applicable" or "not reported" for the *hazard survey* (20 agencies, ~24 percent); *self-inspection* (8 agencies, ~10 percent); *surveillance* (18 agencies, ~22 percent); *engineering controls* (27 agencies, ~33 percent); *work rules and practices* (6 agencies, ~7 percent); and *OSHA-mandated programs* (11 agencies, ~13 percent) attributes. OSHA will work with these agencies to determine how best to implement these programs if needed.

Table 4a. *Major Departments and Independent Agencies' Overall Safety and Health Management System Self-rating Score* (n = 23).

Agency	Score	Agency	Score
Department of Agriculture	2	Department of Labor	2
Department of the Air Force	2	Department of the Navy	3
Department of the Army	2	Department of State	2
Department of Commerce	2	Department of Transportation	2
Department of Defense	2	Department of the Treasury	2
Department of Education	2	Department of Veterans Affairs	2
Department of Energy	3	Environmental Protection Agency	3
Department of Health and Human Services	2	General Services Administration	2
U.S Department of Homeland Security	2	National Aeronautics and Space Admin.	3
Department of Housing and Urban Development	3	Social Security Administration (includes SSAB)	3
Department of the Interior	2	Tennessee Valley Authority	3
Department of Justice	3		
SHMS Score Explanation			
3 Completely in place			
2 Mostly in place with only minor improvements needed			
1 Some portion or aspect is present although major improvement is needed			
0 No discernible or meaningful indication that portion or aspect is even in place			
NR Data not reported by agency			

Managerial Component Assessment

Federal agencies were provided 11 attributes[11] to rate the managerial component of their SHMSs. Overall, the attributes of the managerial component were rated highly, indicated by a "2" or higher rating. For example, the five attributes used to assess the Administration/ Supervision subcomponent received the highest number of "2" and "3" ratings during the CY 2015 reporting period. Some agencies that reported "not applicable" or "not reported" ratings for the *specific assignment of OSH tasks* (seven agencies, ~8 percent); *authority to perform* (eight agencies, ~10 percent); and, *appropriate resources* (seven agencies, ~8 percent) attributes in CY 2015.

For the reporting period, agencies' ratings of the three attributes of the Planning/Evaluation subcomponent of their respective SHMSs, illustrate the management's continued involvement in SHMSs. Fifty-seven agencies (~69 percent) rated themselves a "2" or higher for the *incidence data* attribute. The majority of agencies rated themselves a "2" or higher for the *action plan* and *annual SHMS review* attributes (66 and 64 agencies, respectively; 80 percent and ~77 percent, respectively). The Department of Veterans Affairs reported that improved collection of incidence data, along with Workers' Compensation data, enabled them to develop OSH training geared to prevent repeat accidents and injuries. Agencies continued to place importance on training, at all levels and at all locations, as they pursued excellence in their SHMSs. Almost 80 percent of reporting agencies provided a "2" or higher rating of the *employee training* (72 agencies, ~88 percent) *new employee orientation* (68 agencies, ~ 83 percent), and *supervisory training* (65 agencies, ~78 percent) attributes.

Table 4b. *Smaller Independent Agencies' Overall Safety and Health Management System Self-rating Score* (n =61).

Agency	Score	Agency	Score
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board)	0	National Archives and Records Administration	3
American Battle Monuments Commission	2	National Capital Planning Commission	3
Armed Forces Retirement Home	3	National Council on Disability	NR
Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled (Ability One)	3	National Gallery of Art	2
Commodity Futures Trading Corporation	3	National Labor Relations Board	2
Consumer Product Safety Commission	2	National Mediation Board	NR
Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency	3	National Transportation Safety Board	3
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	2	Nuclear Regulatory Commission	NR
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	2	Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission	3
Export-Import Bank of the United States	2	Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	3

---

[11] For the CY 2015 reporting period, no new attributes were added for federal agency assessment.

Agency	Score	Agency	Score
Farm Credit Administration	3	Office of Personnel Management	3
Federal Communications Commission	2	Overseas Private Investment Corporation	2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	Peace Corps	NR
Federal Election Commission	3	Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	3
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	2	Postal Regulatory Commission	3
Federal Maritime Commission	3	Railroad Retirement Board	2
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	0	Security and Exchange Commission	3
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission	2	Small Business Administration	2
Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board	2	The Smithsonian Institution	2
Federal Reserve Board	3	U.S. African Development Foundation	3
Federal Trade Commission	2	U.S. Agency for International Development	2
Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation	NR	U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	2
Institute of Museum and Library Services	2	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights	2
Inter-American Foundation	3	U.S. Commission of Fine Arts	3
International Boundary and Water Commission	NR	U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum	2
James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation	3	U.S. International Trade Commission	2
Kennedy Center	2	U.S. Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	NR
Marine Mammal Commission	2	U.S. Office of Government Ethics	0
Merit Systems Protection Board	NR	U.S. Trade and Development Agency	3
Millennium Challenge Corporation	3	Vietnam Education Foundation	3
Morris K. and Stewart L. Udall Foundation	2		
SHMS Score Explanation			

3 Completely in place

2 Mostly in place with only minor improvements needed

1 Some portion or aspect is present although major improvement is needed

0 No discernible or meaningful indication that portion or aspect is even in place

NR Data not reported by agency

Table 5. *Number of Federal Agencies Assigning Ratings to Safety and Health Management System Attributes* (n = 82).

Component	Subcomponent	Attribute	Number of Agencies with the Self-assigned Rating					
			3	2	1	0	NA	NR
Operational	Hazard Anticipation/Detection	Hazard survey	30	22	3	8	14	6
		Self-inspection	48	24	1	2	2	6
		Surveillance	40	22	1	2	12	6
		Change analysis	35	23	3	4	12	6
		Use of SDSs	35	16	0	2	24	6
	Hazard Prevention/Control	Engineering controls	36	18	0	2	21	6
		Work rules and practices	52	23	0	2	0	6
		OSHA-mandated programs	39	29	0	4	4	7
		Tracking hazard correction	38	22	1	4	12	6
Managerial	Planning/ Evaluation	Incidence data	35	22	0	4	16	6
		Action plan	35	31	3	5	3	6
		Annual SHMS review	38	26	4	4	4	6
	Administration/ Supervision	Specific assignment of OSH tasks	53	20	1	2	1	6
		Knowledge, skills, and information	46	26	1	2	2	6
		Authority to perform	61	12	0	2	2	6
		Appropriate resources	52	21	1	2	1	6
		OSH organizational policies	49	25	0	2	1	6
	Safety/Health Training	Employee training	39	33	2	1	0	8
		New employee orientation	40	28	3	1	3	8
		Supervisory training	30	35	6	1	3	8
Cultural	Management Leadership	OSH priority policies	54	15	3	1	2	8
		Provided competent staff	52	13	3	1	6	8
		Delegate authority	56	14	1	1	3	8
		Resource allocation	47	21	1	1	5	8
		Safety and health training	42	26	4	1	2	8

26

Component	Subcomponent	Attribute	Number of Agencies with the Self-assigned Rating					
			3	2	1	0	NA	NR
		Safety/health performance	45	24	3	1	1	9
		Process involvement	46	23	2	1	1	10
	Employee Participation	Organizational decision-making on resources	27	30	7	3	6	10
		Organizational decision-making on training	27	33	4	5	4	10
		Evaluation of OSH performance	32	30	4	3	3	11
SHMS Score Explanation								
3 Completely in place								
2 Mostly in place with only minor improvements needed								
1 Some portion or aspect is present although major improvement is needed								
0 No discernible or meaningful indication that portion or aspect is even in place								
NA Not applicable								
NR Data not reported by agency								

Cultural Component Assessment

For the CY 2015 reporting period, OSHA provided agencies with 10 attributes[12] to rate the cultural component of their SHMSs. Overall, 60 federal agencies (~73 percent), provided a "2" or higher rating for all 10 cultural component attributes. In CY 2015, 69 agencies (~83 percent) provided a "2" or higher rating for the *OSH priority policies* attribute, while 8 agencies (~10 percent) provided a "not-applicable" or "not rated" ratings for the same attribute. The two lowest rated attributes were *organizational decision-making on resources and training,* with 57 and 60 agencies, respectively rating them "2" or higher (~69 and ~72 percent respectively). OSHA will continue to assess the responses and reach out to agencies to provide support and guidance.

Recordkeeping

Since January 1, 2005, federal agencies have been required to maintain injury and illness records in essentially the same format as the private sector, as set forth in 29 CFR §1904. On August 5, 2013, OSHA finalized a rule change that allowed the Department of Labor to annually collect the statutorily-required injury and illness records from all Executive Branch agencies. In

---

[12] In CY 2014 OSHA added five attributes to assess the *Cultural c*omponent of each federal department's or agency's respective SHMSs: *OSH priority policies*; *safety and health training*; *safety and health performance*; and *organizational decision-making on resources*, and *training*.

addition, the rule clarified and updated some existing provisions of 29 CFR §1960 for better application to the Executive Branch. The goal of the rule change was to both assist agencies and OSHA in identifying those worksites with the highest injury and illness rates, and better target needed training for federal agencies. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) collects the data and provides it to OSHA.

CY 2015 marked the second completed data collection cycle. OSHA continued to work with the BLS to track the data collected and monitor the quality of that data. In addition, OSHA worked with OWCP for those agencies using the EComp system to collect the data, providing the appropriate establishment codes and communicating with agencies about the procedures for getting the data from OWCP and providing it to BLS. OSHA also provided agencies with guidance about the data collection process and followed-up with information on errors identified in the submitted data.

During this reporting period, 84 of a possible 96 agencies submitted data on approximately 12,000 establishments. Of the agencies that submitted data, 75 submitted data on almost 9,000 establishments and OSHA deemed that data reliable based on error checks. Of those 75 agencies, 59 submitted data for all of their establishments. The most common error identified in the submitted data was the failure to provide the number of employees or hours work for each establishment. (Please see Appendix 2 for a table detailing the success of federal agencies' injury and illness reporting.).

OSHA will analyze the collected data for key findings, and post the aggregate data. In addition, the OSHA will analyze the collection process itself for lessons-learned to further streamline and simplify the process.

Compliance Assistance

Agency Technical Assistance Request

An agency technical assistance request, known as an ATAR, is a consultative service open only to federal agencies, and is analogous to OSHA's Consultation Program for private sector employers. Federal agencies may contact an OSHA Area Office and request technical assistance, which may include hazard abatement advice, training, a partial or comprehensive inspection, and/or program assistance. While the request is generally considered to be strictly consultative, an agency's subsequent failure or refusal to abate serious hazards may result in an inspection referral.

In CY 2015, OSHA did not conduct, nor did federal agencies request, any ATARs at the National Office level. However, the Cleveland, Ohio Area Office assisted two Department of Labor, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs sites with ergonomics evaluations and assistance.

Field Federal Safety and Health Councils

Field federal safety and health councils (FFSHCs) are federal interagency groups, chartered by the Secretary, that bring together local OSH professionals for education, problem solving, and cooperation in the safety and health field. Located throughout the nation, these councils work to reduce the incidence, severity, and cost of accidents, injuries, and illnesses within their designated geographic areas.

When OSHA queried federal agencies regarding the depth of their involvement in the FFSHCs, 42 federal agencies reported some involvement, 36 reported no involvement in these councils and the remainder did not report on this item. Agencies' involvement varied. The Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, and the Navy; and the Federal Reserve Board and GSA reported that agency senior OSH management participated within local FFSHCs, some even holding council offices. Only seven agencies reported that they provide in-kind supports to their local councils, including advertising and providing meeting space, and administrative support.

In CY 2015, 35 FFSHCs actively carried out efforts to improve the effectiveness of OSH functions within the Government. (Please see Appendix 3, for a complete listing of active FFSHCs for CY 2015 and other Council information.) According to the submitted annual reports, approximately 538 appointed representatives from 65 federal departments and agencies participated in FFSHCs across the country, both participation figures representing roughly 15% decreases from CY 2014.

Under 29 CFR §1960.89, each active council must submit an annual report to the Secretary describing its activities and programs for the previous calendar year; and its plans, objectives, and goals for the current year. OSHA uses these reports to assess individual FFSHC's program plans, and to determine the success of its goals and objectives. The councils that best exemplify the intent and purpose of the FFSHC program may receive an achievement award from the Secretary.

In determining award recipients, councils are separated into three categories based on the size of the federal population they serve, which allows them to compete with other councils that possess approximately the same resources and serve similar populations. Each council's annual report to the Secretary is evaluated, rated and ranked with other FFSHCs in its category. The top three scorers in each category receive awards for *Superior Performance*, *Meritorious Achievement*, and *Notable Recognition*.

Due to tie scores in Category I, ten FFSHCs received a Secretarial award for their CY 2015 council activities. By category, these were:

Category I: FFSHCs serving an area with a federal employee population exceeding 24,000

- *Superior Performance* – Northern New Jersey
- *Meritorious Achievement* – Greater New York
- *Notable Recognition* – Dallas/Ft. Worth
- *Notable Recognition* – Denver

Category II: FFSHCs serving an area with a federal employee population numbering between 12,000 and 24,000

- *Superior Performance* – Minneapolis
- *Meritorious Achievement* – Western New York
- *Notable Recognition* – Greater St. Louis

Category III: FFSHCs serving an area with a federal employee population of fewer than 12,000

- *Superior Performance* – Mississippi Gulf Coast
- *Meritorious Achievement* – Hudson Valley
- *Notable Recognition* – Louisville Area

Federal agencies reported providing a variety of support to FFSHCs, including participating in meetings, and providing administrative support, speakers, and meeting space. Of note are EPA's employees' actions in supporting 12 local FFSHCs. According to their report, 386 representatives from 16 EPA locations participated in supporting FFSHCs in Chicago, IL; Cincinnati, OH; Dallas/Fort Worth, TX; Denver, CO; Detroit, MI; Duluth, MN; Edison, NJ; Guaynabo, PR; Kansas City, KS; New York, NY; San Francisco, CA; and Washington, DC. Collectively, these participants attended 51 council meetings over the course of the year. In addition to providing meeting space, the Agency indicated that its employees have officiated over council meetings as chair and secretary; and have provided expertise to these councils in the areas of chemical safety, enforcement investigations, environmental response and protection, industrial hygiene, infrastructure program management, laboratory safety, mid-continent ecology, safety engineering and operations, occupational safety and health management, and vehicle and fuel emissions.

Alternate and Supplementary Standards

Under 29 CFR §1960.17, if an agency cannot comply with an applicable OSHA standard, the agency may submit a request to OSHA for an *alternate standard*.[13] Currently, there are six OSHA-approved alternate standards.

The agencies and their alternate standards include:

- Federal Aviation Administration - *Alternate Standard for Fire Safety in Air Traffic Control Towers*;
- National Archives and Records Administration - *Standard on Special-Purpose Ladders*;
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration - *Standard for Lifting Devices and Equipment*;
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - *Alternate Diving Standards*;
- U.S. Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command - *Management of Weight-Handling Equipment*; and,
- U.S. Navy - *Gas Free Engineering Manual*.

Under 29 CFR §1960.18, if no OSHA standard exists that is appropriate for application to working conditions of federal agency employees, an agency must develop a *supplementary standard*. Currently, there are two supplementary standards: the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA's) *Safety Standard for Explosives, Propellants, Pyro-technics*; and U.S. Department of Agriculture/Forest Service's *Supplementary Standard for Containers and Portable Tanks Transport*.

OSHA Training

OSHA provides federal agency OSH personnel with training opportunities. Two of the most highly regarded and widely attended opportunities are FEDWEEK - a one-week training experience, and the *Federal Agency Occupational Safety and Health Managers' Roundtable* (Roundtable) – an informational exchange forum for federal OSH management personnel.

Occupational Safety and Health Training

Annually, OSHA provides a week of training, known as FEDWEEK, specifically for federal agency OSH personnel, tuition-free, at the OSHA Training Institute, located in Arlington Heights, Illinois. The number of participants and federal agencies represented has remained relatively consistent over the years (Please see Table 6 below.). Similar to previous years' offerings, at the CY 2015 event, OSHA provided nine half-day seminars, offered twice during the week on topics chosen after surveying federal OSH personnel. The 93 federal OSH employee participants, representing 18 federal agencies, had the opportunity to attend up to six different sessions on various topics, including: *Asbestos Management and Housekeeping; Construction Safety (Focus 4)*; *Electrical; Fire Protection*; *Forklift and Material Handling; Hearing*

---

[13] An alternate standard is the federal agency equivalent of a private sector variance. Any alternate standard must provide equal or greater protection than the applicable OSHA standard for the affected federal employees.

Conservation; *Hazard Communications – Aligning with GHS*; *Industrial Hygiene Sampling Methods*; and *Safety and Health Management Systems*.

Table 6: *FEDWEEK Participation by Attendees and Calendar Year (2015-2013).*

	Calendar Year		
	2015	2014	2013
Participants	93	109	104
Seminar Registrants	458	477	496
Agencies Represented	18	34	31

Previous years' seminar topics have included: *Confined Spaces; Hearing Conservation; Heat Stress; Industrial Hygiene Exposure Assessment*; *Office Ergonomics; Recordkeeping; and Machine Guarding.* In addition, the Institute offers a myriad of professional and technical courses that are open to the private and public sectors alike. Federal OSH personnel regularly attend these courses.

Federal Agency OSH Managers' Roundtable

In its second year, and after four meetings since its inception, the Roundtable has proven its value as an effective information exchange for issues relevant to federal agency best practices, in both the number of participants and the topics addressed. Participation by federal senior OSH managers, medical personnel, technical experts, and labor representatives has *increased* by 340 percent. At its June 2013 foundational meeting, the Roundtable included 22 individuals representing 13 Executive Branch departments and independent agencies (no labor organizations were represented). By its fourth meeting, held on September 29, 2014, attendance had increased to 75 individuals, representing 37 Executive Branch departments and independent agencies, and eight labor organizations representing federal employees (nearly quadrupling the number of agencies/labor organizations represented). In addition to the issues discussed at the CY 2014 meetings (see below), Roundtable participants discussed a variety of relevant topics, including the application of the multi-employer worksite policy to construction at federal worksites; federal agency recordkeeping requirements; the Global Harmonizing Standard; the *Secretary of Labor's Report to the President on Federal Department and Agency Occupational Safety and Health Program Activity*; strategies to reduce injuries and illnesses among the federal workforce; and OSHA's federal agency inspection process.

During the September 25, 2015 meeting the Roundtable participants discussed several issues of interest:

- PEER: Over the last several years, federal Executive Branch agencies have attempted to improve OSH performance via successive Presidential OSH-related Initiatives, the latest of which is Protecting Employees, Enabling Re-employment (PEER), a replacement for the POWER (Protecting our Workers, Enabling Re-Employment) Initiative that ended in

FY 2014. PEER has not yet received Presidential approval and has not yet been implemented.

- E-COMP: In August 2016, OSHA ceased using the Safety and Health Information Management System (SHIMS) to submit and track injury and illness data and began using the Employees' Compensation Operations and Management Portal (E-COMP).
- The CY 2014 *Secretary of Labor's Report to the President on Federal Department and Agency Occupational Safety and Health Program Activity* and changes to the upcoming CY 2015 *Report*.
- DoD Policy on Lead Exposure – DoD presented its proposed policy to implement more stringent methods to protect its workers with occupational exposures to lead. The Department proposes to lower the threshold blood lead level for removal of workers and use the OEL for airborne exposure measurements.
- DoD Policy on Vapor Intrusion – DoD presented its recommended policy for managing the risk of vapor intrusion in its workplaces. The policy did not include EPA's recommendation for removing workers from buildings where vapor intrusion may occur.

Section 2 – Federal Agency OSH Activities

This section provides information on agency-reported fatalities and catastrophes; and selected agency activities, including participation in OSH committees and councils, and agencies' efforts to increase motor vehicle safety. It also provides a summary of agencies' methods of controlling occupational injury and illness trends; the impact of the inspection process on an agency's safety and health management system; OSH training programs; protections afforded employees who report safety and health hazards, and product safety. Per statute, the GSA and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) are required to provide certain services to federal agencies in pursuing the safety and health of federal employees. This section ends with a brief regarding these activities.

Fatalities and Catastrophes

The Act, and provisions of 29 CFR §1960 and other regulations, require employers, both private and public, to investigate, track, and report findings involving work-related fatalities and catastrophic events to OSHA in an expeditious manner. For the CY 2015 reporting period, agencies reported 21 federal civilian employee fatalities. This is approximately a 39 percent *increase* from the 13 work-related federal civilian employee fatalities reported for CY 2014, but still fewer than the 41 (37 work-related) reported during the previous reporting period.

The agencies and the respective numbers of fatal/catastrophic events were:

- Department of Agriculture (USDA): seven fatalities;
- Department of Defense (DoD)/Department of the Army: three fatalities, two catastrophic events;
- DoD/Defense Logistics Agency: one fatality, four catastrophic events;
- DoD/Defense Finance and Accounting Service: one catastrophic event;
- DoD/Department of the Navy: three fatalities, two catastrophic events;
- Department of Energy: one fatality;
- Department of Health and Human Services: one fatality;
- Department of the Interior: two fatalities;
- Department of Justice: two fatalities, one catastrophic event;
- Department of Labor: one fatality;
- International Boundary Waters Commission: two fatalities;
- Smithsonian Institution: one fatality; and
- Department of Homeland Security: twenty-four catastrophic events.

Summary of Agency Fatality/ Catastrophic Reports

The USDA reported seven fatalities:
- A contractor-operated helicopter crashed while conducting aerial ignition operations on a prescribed burn near Saucier, Mississippi. The contract helicopter pilot and one Southern Region Engineering Technician employee were fatally injured while a second Forest Service employee from the Northern Region was critically injured. The aircraft

was destroyed in the post-crash fire. The National Transportation Safety Board preliminary report stated that the probable cause of the accident was a loss of engine power for reasons that could not be determined due to post-accident fire damage.

- A 38 year-old male Black Hills National Forest Engine Captain was entrapped and killed while scouting on foot during initial attack of the Frog Fire on the Modoc National Forest. The Engine Captain was on a temporary detail assignment to the Modoc National Forest when the Frog Fire began. He scouted the fire as initial attack forces worked to establish an anchor at the heel of the fire and lost contact with other responders shortly after fire activity increased across the fire. The Modoc County Sheriff's Office responded to search and the initial search effort continued until about midnight when it was halted due to smoke, poor visibility, and the hazardous fire conditions. Efforts began again the following morning; his body was discovered mid-morning.

- Two volunteers were building a corral for livestock on the Sierra National Forest. As they were using rigging to move a fallen log back to the top of the sill log, one of the volunteers was struck by the log under tension. He was evacuated by air ambulance to Fresno, CA, but died of his injuries the following morning.

- While conducting the initial attack on the Sierra Fire in a remote area south of Echo Peak on the border of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit and the Eldorado National Forest, in Northern California near the Nevada border, a weakened hemlock tree struck two firefighters, killing one and injuring the second. Two Firefighter/Emergency Medical Technicians provided immediate care on scene, immediately beginning cardiopulmonary resuscitation and calling for helicopter evacuation. The deceased was a 21-year-old male member of Organized Crew 36 (Hand crew).

- While conducting the initial attack on the Twisp Fire on state forest land in Washington State, three members of a Forest Service engine crew from the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest died when fire overwhelmed their engine. The engine had left the road while trying to escape the fire and stopped upright approximately 40 feet down a steep wooded embankment. Four additional firefighters were injured: one Forest Service employee who was riding in the engine received life-threatening burn injuries and was airlifted to Harborview Burn Center, and three Washington State Department of Natural Resources firefighters (one contractor and two DNR employees) were transported for medical treatment.

The DoD reported four work-related fatalities, and eight catastrophic events. These included one fatality reported by the Department of the Army, one fatality and four catastrophes reported by the Defense Logistics Agency, a catastrophe reported by the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, and two fatalities and three catastrophes reported by the Department of the Navy.

Department of the Army

35

- An Army employee was changing a recessed ceiling light when he fell through the ceiling panel and sustained fatal injuries.

Defense Logistics Agency
- A military customer turned in an unserviceable military vehicle containing an Automatic Fire Extinguishing System (AFES). The AFES contains two small compressed gas canisters. Under normal procedures, the customer turning in the vehicle removes the AFES before turning-in the vehicle. While removing the AFES from the vehicle, the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) employee helped the military customer perform this task, and then placed the canisters temporarily on the ground. The DLA employee picked up one of the compressed cylinders by the nozzle but then dropped the cylinder. When the cylinder hit the ground, it discharged rapidly, becoming a projectile. The cylinder/projectile's impact with the DLA employee caused fatal injuries from blunt force trauma.
- A DLA employee was setting up a machine to punch bolt holes in sheet steel stock. While punching the bolt holes, a sliver of metal punctured the employee's right eye and lodged in his sinus. The employee was treated at the hospital but lost sight in his right eye.
- During forklift operations, two pallets (each containing a wooden box) were stacked on each other. A DLA employee used a forklift to move both pallets at the same time and struck an upright column of the racking system. A pallet and material on the pallet were forced back into the employee's lower left leg, resulting in multiple fractures of the employee's leg and requiring hospitalization.
- A DLA employee was taking pictures of stored material when he fell off a ladder stand, experienced multiple fractures, and was hospitalized.
- A DLA employee transported an Armored Security Vehicle (ASV) to a designated area. After parking the ASV the employee attempted to exit the vehicle via the side doorway. Upon reaching up to grab the frame of the doorway, the top hatch inadvertently swung shut pinching the employee's right ring finger between the hatch and the latch, severing the tip of the employee's finger. The finger was subsequently amputated at the hospital.

Defense Finance and Accounting Service
- A Defense Finance and Accounting Service employee was filing documents in a four-drawer electronic file cabinet with two drawers open simultaneously. As she began opening a third drawer, the cabinet tipped over and landed on her, causing multiple pelvic fractures.

Department of the Navy
- An employee performing a facility inspection during a high power engine test stood adjacent to an operational jet engine to be photographed by a colleague. The suction of the engine's exhaust current sucked the employee into the exhaust stream and through the facility augmenter/exhaust duct, killing the employee.

- A railcar braker/switcher (brakeman) fell from a moving rail flatcar and was run over by one of the train car wheels. The brakeman died from hypovolemic shock.
- A student operator was attempting to repair a Patriot missile launcher system (conducting non-standard maintenance). A safety pin became severely jammed and the student couldn't remove the pin using established procedures. The student's finger was caught in a pinch point resulting in amputation of the finger.
- Two Explosive Ordnance Disposal technicians were disassembling a foreign sub-munition when they experienced a partial detonation. One employee sustained an injury to his right hand resulting in bone loss and permanent mobility restriction.
- During the night shift, a machine tool operator was using a mechanical punch press to manufacture rubber spacers. The spacers kept 'clogging' in the die and the designated tool used to remove the spacers was not working. The employee removed the machine guard and began manually pushing the spacers out of the die. The employee accidentally activated the foot pedal on the press, while his fingers were pressing out a spacer. The press amputated the employee's left index finger and fractured his middle finger.

The Department of Energy reported one fatality:
- A security officer found a male employee on the floor of a bathroom stall. The employee was unconscious, not breathing, and cyanotic. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) was initiated along with the use of an automated external defibrillator (AED). Medical services, investigative personnel, and the medical examiner were called to the scene. There was no obvious evidence of an occupational injury or exposure.

The Department of Health and Human Services reported one fatality:
- An employee was deployed to an Anniston, Alabama training site as an instructor in an event held at a parking lot. On the day of the fatality the employee complained about not feeling well after lunch. About 30 minutes after lunch another instructor examined the employee and called for the medics. The employee was transported via ambulance to a local hospital where he continued to deteriorate and died of a massive heart attack shortly after arriving. The employee was not engaged in hard labor but was on his feet for an extended period of time in hot weather. A subsequent investigation indicated that the employee had an undisclosed pre-existing medical condition.

The Department of the Interior reported two work-related fatalities.
- A Bureau of Land Management employee collapsed of a heart attack after completing a required 2-mile fitness run.
- A U.S. Geological Survey scientist working for the Grand Canyon Monitoring Research Center in Flagstaff, AZ died while hiking down a remote trail with a partner in the Grand Canyon National Park. An autopsy determined that the employee was a victim of exertional heat stress.

The Department of Justice reported two fatalities and one catastrophe:

37

- A foreign national assigned to the Drug Enforcement Agency died as a result of a robbery/shooting.
- A Deputy U.S. Marshal, part of a team of Marshals, was shot while executing a warrant on a fugitive wanted for double homicide in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The team engaged gunfire and he was shot in the neck and died in the hospital.
- Three Federal Bureau of Investigation employees were overcome by carbon monoxide in a warehouse and had to be hospitalized. The local fire department was brought in to conduct air monitoring and to monitor the space. The Bureau provided a safety briefing at an all-employees conference.

The Department of Labor reported one fatality:
- An employee on official travel was found deceased in hotel room of a possible cardiac arrest.

The International Boundary Waters Commission reported two fatalities:
- The IBWC did not provide any information on the events.

The Smithsonian Institution reported one fatality:
- An employee working in a computer department suffered a fatal heart attack.

The Department of Homeland Security reported 24 catastrophic events:
- Nine employees, in separate incidents slipped, tripped or fell. Locations included boarding boats, climbing a hill, exiting an elevator, training a service dog, and walking through a parking lot.
- Five employees experienced heart attacks.
- Four employees were injured in ATV accidents.
- Two employees experienced spider bites.
- One employee developed rhabdomyolysis during training.
- One employee was struck by a falling object.
- One employee was injured when their weapon accidently discharged.
- One employee's finger was partially amputated.

Certified Safety and Health Committees

A certified safety and health committee is an agency OSH committee that the head of the sponsoring agency has certified to the Secretary of Labor as meeting the requirements of 29 CFR §1960, Subpart F. The purposes of a CSHC are to monitor and assist with an agency's OSH program; maintain an open channel of communication between employees and management; and facilitate employee input to improve OSH-related policies, conditions, and practices. In addition to an improved OSH program and a safe and healthful workplace, agencies with a CSHC are statutorily exempt from 'unannounced' OSHA inspections.

Both E.O. 12196 and 29 CFR §1960, Subpart F discuss the formation, composition, and duties of CSHCs. When an agency decides to form a CSHC, it must report this intent to the Secretary and include:

- The existence, location, and coverage (establishments and populations) area of the committee; and
- The names and phone numbers of each committee chair (national and local).

In addition, the agency must certify to the Secretary of Labor that the committee meets all the requirements of 29 CFR §1960, Subpart F. The agency must also provide an annual update on its CSHC as part of its required *Annual Report to the Secretary of Labor on the Agency's Occupational Safety and Health Program Activity*.

In an effort to support agency formation of CSHCs, OSHA may not conduct unannounced inspections at federal agencies with CSHCs unless the CSHC has requested an inspection. While any agency may form a CSHC, only six such certified committees existed in CY 2015. The Secretary recognized the following Departments and independent agencies as having CSHCs:

- Central Intelligence Agency,
- Department of Labor,
- General Services Administration,
- Tennessee Valley Authority,
- U.S. International Trade Commission, and the
- U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

Status of Agency CSHCs

As previously noted, the aforementioned agencies are required to provide the Secretary with an annual status report on their respective CSHCs. The DOL and the Tennessee Valley Authority submitted information certifying to the Secretary of Labor that their respective CSHCs met the requirements of the subpart. The U.S. International Trade Commission and General Services Administration reported that they no longer had CSHCs. The Central Intelligence Agency and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission did not report on their CSHCs for CY 2015.

The Department of Energy is reportedly still continuing its efforts to establish a CSHC, and the National Archives and Records Administration stated that, while it does not have a CSHC, its national OSH committee is "patterned after one in accordance with 29 CFR 1960." However NARA did not communicate any intent to establish a CSHC.

Other OSH Committees and Councils

OSHA asked federal agencies to provide information on their involvement with both internal and external OSH committees, along with whether their employees participated in local OSH councils/committees and organizations. Many agencies reported that they encourage employees to participate in local council activities and appropriate OSH professional

organizations, such as the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, the American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA), the American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE), and the National Fire Protection Association, as well as, nationally- and locally-oriented safety organizations, such as the National Safety Council (NSC). The agencies, listed below, encouraged employees to participate in OSH committees, in addition to FFSHCs.

- The Army indicated that most of its major Commands, subordinate Commands, and organizations participate in Command OSH advisory councils at least twice a year, and that it encourages its personnel to participate in other agencies' OSH councils. To enhance and streamline oversight of its safety and health programs and to address OSHA compliance related issues, the Army recently chartered the Safety and Occupational Health Senior Executive Council (SOH SEC) and the SOH Synchronization Oversight Council (SOH SOC).
- The Department of Commerce reported encouraging its employees to participate in professional organizations such as ASSE, AIHA, and NSC. Employees also participate in the Department's semiannual Occupational Safety and Health Council and monthly Safety Work Group meetings.
- The Department of State reported that its DASHO was appointed to the Federal Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health (FACOSH) in CY 2015. The DASHO also participates in the Office of Federal Agency Programs' OSH Managers Safety and Health Roundtable.

Little change from previous years was noted in federal agencies' participation in other venues in support of their OSH programs. For CY 2015, 73 agencies (~89 percent) reported a variety of non-certified OSH-related committees that function at the departmental, agency, and field operation levels, including FFSHCs. Committee membership varied from agency-to-agency, with some comprised of various levels of managers, others focused on expertise in a specific area, and still others had members with only OSH-related duties and responsibilities.

Motor Vehicle Safety

Collectively, 39 federal agencies provided information on the number of motor vehicle accidents (MVAs) their employees experienced during CY 2015. According to those reports, roughly 10,012 MVAs occurred during calendar year. Most agencies reported having a motor vehicle safety program (MVSP), with the majority noting compliance with E.O.s 13043 and 13513, which require the use of seatbelts in motor vehicles and ban texting while driving, respectively. In addition, agencies reported that they continued to provide programs to limit the likelihood and effect of MVAs.

Similar to previous years' reports, many agencies required defensive driving courses, the majority using courses through GSA, or the National Safety Council or similar organizations. Several agencies also reported encouraging seatbelt use, by placing decals in vehicles, reminders on employee websites, or notices in break rooms. While several agencies reported tracking seatbelt use after an accident – many using information from police reports – few had

any full-time tracking. A number of agencies mentioned performing random compliance checks, and more agencies this year reported using camera surveillance inside vehicles to monitor compliance.

One department, Health and Human Services, reported using Drive-Cam™ to record events inside its vehicles with the intent of achieving two goals: modify driver behavior associated with high frequency and risk of accidents; and use telematics, essentially a 'black box' for motor vehicles, to obtain error free data on HHS fleet performance. The Department found that the Drive-Cam™ pilot had the effect of "driver coaching" by addressing accidents and "near-miss" incidents through training rather than finding fault or enacting disciplinary action. This approach encouraged driver community responsiveness through safe driving patterns and behavior. The Department cited saving lives while reducing costs through the use of telematics. With trials that encompassed over 200 units and venues in the Continental United States, HHS learned lessons related to how best to deploy Drive-Cam™ units along with assessing issues that arose during usage.

The Department of the Navy's MVSP is also worth mentioning for its implementation and scope. The comprehensive requirements focused on risk management strategies including: vehicle design standards, operator duty time limitations, and fatigue management evaluations. The program also emphasized training and instruction that addressed issues such as: specific vehicle type, installation, host state/nation traffic policies, and refresher courses and their frequency. Notably the Navy supplemented its policies and formal training information with service-wide promotional material and media campaigns that included permanent road signs, electronic marquees, and posters or pamphlets on topics such as seatbelt use, distracted driving, driving under the influence, fatigued driving, and aggressive driving. By promulgating motor vehicle safety standards, the Department reinforced classroom instruction while enforcing compliance via police patrol and citation, along with driver improvement training following serious moving traffic violations.

Thirty-three agencies indicated the lack of a MVSP for a variety of reasons: size and number of employees assigned, agency mission - such as not driving in an "official capacity," not owning an agency-dedicated fleet, or that agency employees used mass transit for travel needs to and from the workplace. A number of agencies asserted that such a program was "not applicable" to their situations, or failed to provide any report on the existence or absence of a program. Some agencies deemed to have little to no training stated a mere compliance to E.O.s 13043 and 13513, with no indication of any further information on safety protocols or measures.

Those agencies reporting that they did not have a motor vehicle safety program include: Ability One Commission, American Battles Monuments Commission, Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, Commission on Civil Rights, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Export-Import Bank of the United States, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Maritime Commission, Federal Mediation and

Conciliation Service, Federal Reserve Board, Holocaust Memorial Museum, Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation, Inter American Foundation, International Boundary and Water Commission, James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Marine Mammal Commission, National Capital Planning Commission, National Council on Disability, National Labor Relations Board, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, Office of Government Ethics, Peace Corps, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Postal Regulatory Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Selective Service System, Small Business Administration, Social Security Administration, Trade and Development Agency, Vietnam Education Foundation

Table 7. Summary of Motor Vehicle Accidents as Reported by Department and Independent Agency (Fiscal Year 2013 through Calendar Year 2015).

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2015 (CY 2014/FY2013)
Department of Agriculture	⬇	2,117 (2,321/2,427)
Department of the Air Force	⬆	29 (25/13)
Department of the Army	?	NR (11/11)
Department of Commerce	⬇	102 (141/134)
Department of Defense	?	485 (NR/515)
Department of Energy	?	NR (NR/90)
Department of Health and Human Services	⬆	88 (80/100)
Department of Homeland Security	⬇	1,127 (1,441/NR)
Department of Housing and Urban Development	⬆	0 (10/0)
Department of Justice	⬇	1,971 (2,493/2,689)
Department of Labor	⬆	487 (384/403)
Department of the Interior	⬆	618 (581/0)
Department of the Navy	⬇	9 (10/NR)
Department of State	⬆	1,692 (1,200/380)
Department of Transportation	?	50 (NR/28)

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2015 (CY 2014/FY2013)
Department of the Treasury	⬆	196 (387/316)
Department of Veterans Affairs	⬆	308 (215/43)
Environmental Protection Agency	⬆	39 (37/31)
General Services Administration	⬇	72 (35/38)
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	⬆	135 (0/201)
Social Security Administration	⬆	16 (15/3)
Tennessee Valley Authority	⬆	160 (157/102)
Office of Personnel Management	⬇	177 (190/218)
Armed Forces Retirement Home	⬆	3 (0/1)
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	?	NR (NR/2)
Consumer Product Safety Commission	⬆	2 (6/0)
Corporation for National and Community Service	?	NR (1/3)
Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency	⬇	4 (13/14)
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	?	12 (NR/15)
Farm Credit Administration	⬇	0 (2/0)
Federal Communications Commission	⬆	5 (2/4)
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	⬇	40 (0/32)
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	⬇	0 (0/NR)
Federal Maritime Commission	⬇	0 (0/3)
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	⬇	0 (2/0)
International Boundary and Water Commission	⬌	7 (7/0)
National Archives and Records Administration	⬆	1 (0/7)
National Capital Planning Commission	⬌	0 (0/0)

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2015 (CY 2014/FY2013)
National Labor Relations Board	⬆	0 (5/0)
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	⬆	1 (6/0)
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	⬌	0 (0/0)
Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians	?	NR (NR/0)
Small Business Administration	⬆	1 (3/0)
Smithsonian Institution	⬆	26 (17/13)
The Peace Corps	⬆	2 (3/1)
The Presidio Trust	?	NR (NR/4)
U.S. Arctic Research Commission	?	NR (NR/0)
Legend for Table 6		
⬌ **No change from FY 2014 report**	**NR**	Not reported
⬇ **Decrease from FY 2014 report**	**?**	Undetermined from reported data
⬆ **Increase from FY 2014 report**		

Analyzing and Controlling Trends

This year, OSHA again asked agencies how they determined any OSH-related trends, such as specific causes or types of injuries, or hazardous jobs or tasks. Specific attention was given to agency activities focusing on the prevention of slips, trips, and falls. Of the 65 agencies that provided information on this topic, 33 (~ 51 percent) specifically reported that the most frequent cause of employee injury was attributable to slips, trips, and falls. Other causes included materials handling (lifting, caught by/against) and ergonomics. Many of the smaller independent agencies reported that none of their employees had suffered any work-related injuries or illnesses. And some agencies noted that their statistics were so low that they could not identify a "most frequent" cause. Nineteen agencies did not report on this item.

Agencies included a variety of prevention strategies to counter injurious incidents. Most reported relying on the accurate employee reporting of and self-inspections by supervisory personnel to identify hazard areas. Other approaches included: installing slip-resistant flooring and warning signage; prevention awareness training, including ergonomics and ladder safety training; general housekeeping improvement, including the removal of slip, trip, and fall hazards and the accessible placement of supplies and equipment; and the innovative use of the web and safety bulletin boards to heighten employee and public awareness of the hazards. This year several agencies also reported participating in OSHA's National Safety Stand-Down for

Fall Prevention in May 2015. The purpose of the Stand-Down was to bring awareness to fall hazards, typical work tasks associated with fall risks, and fall protection strategies.

Agencies provided information on their efforts to identify and analyze workplace hazards. Overall, responses illustrated little change in previously reported agency actions. Agencies described a range of analysis methods, from manual cataloging of incidents to real-time computer monitoring of OSH-related data as entered into a variety of information system(s). In general, agencies with more employees, or higher incidence rates, tended to incorporate information systems and more frequent monitoring of entered data. It is not surprising to note that overall, federal agencies with higher rates of injuries and illnesses reported greater emphasis on data analysis, integrating OSH-related considerations into all aspects of agency operations, and tracking near misses. Yet even agencies that reported few or no work-related injuries and illnesses continued to track OSH-related reports and information to help ensure safer and more healthful workplaces.

Similar to previous years' reporting, the majority of agencies reported performing some type of data analysis to determine the prevalence of injury type, the most common causes of injuries, and the jobs or tasks that resulted in injuries. A few agencies reported that incident investigation remained a top priority in root cause analysis, and helped aid in hazard abatement. Agencies also reported tracking and analyzing 'near-misses,' or those incidents that could have resulted in an accident or injury, but did not at that particular time. Other strategies for reducing workplace injuries and illnesses include integrating safety considerations into building design and/or job duties and procedures; encouraging employees to report potential hazards as they are discovered; and focusing on specific problems, such as frequent types of injuries, or specific hazards. Agencies stressed the importance of self-inspection, internal and external, in identifying hazards, and analyzing and controlling trends.

Safety and Health Management System Response to the Inspection Process

Federal agencies reported involvement in a variety of inspection activities, including internal agency and external (OSHA-conducted) inspections; and various responses to the inspection process, including immediate hazard correction, working with GSA and other entities for hazard abatement, consulting with OSHA on abatement methods, and updating policy and procedural guidance. Several agencies, including the Departments of Health and Human Services, and Labor, along with some of the Defense subagencies, indicated that they encourage employee and contractor participation in this inspection process.

Collectively, 60 agencies affirmed that they perform at least annual internal inspections/audits on their safety and health management systems. A few reported an increased frequency of inspections/audits. The Department of the Interior reported conducting, with assistance provided by Federal Occupational Health, several hundred announced/unannounced inspections/audits. The Smithsonian Institution reported that it conducts at least two self-inspections on each of its establishments on an annual basis. Most agencies reported that agency OSH personnel conduct the majority of internal inspections, although one agency, the

Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, reported that its DASHO conducts a comprehensive annual SHMS self-inspection.

In addition to self-inspections/audits, agencies reported that external regulatory agencies performed routine OSH-related inspections on their establishments. Although most agencies that reported outside inspections did not specify the exact number of such inspections/audits – from any particular agency – for the reporting period, they did indicate receiving more than 340 *Notices of Unsafe or Unhealthy Working Conditions,* or the citing agency's equivalent, from the various external regulatory agencies. The external agencies that issued the Notices (or equivalents) included the Joint Commission, OSHA, Mine Safety and Health Administration, the United States Postal Service-Inspector General, and various state departments of Worker Safety. Commonly cited hazards included deficiencies in egress; electrical and fire safety; hazard communication; OSH training, at all levels of responsibility; personal protective equipment programs, including respiratory protection; use of energized equipment; and recordkeeping. Most agencies reported correcting the hazards immediately or within the specified abatement periods.

Federal Employees Overseas

The legislative provisions of the Act, E.O. 12196, and 29 CFR §1960 that require agencies to provide safe and healthful workplaces have no geographical limits. In an effort to determine how to best assist agencies with providing safe and healthful workplaces for their overseas employees, OSHA requested that agencies provide information on whether any of their federal employees were stationed overseas, and how they ensured that those employees were provided with safe and healthful workplaces.

According to agency reports, over 132,000 government employees worked outside the United States' border this year.

Table 8. *Number of Federal Civilian Employees in Overseas Locations by Agency* (CY 2015, FYs 2014 and 2013) (n = 30 agencies).

Agency	Status	Number of Employees		
		2015	**2014**	**2013**
Department of Agriculture	⬄	~400	~400	450
Department of Commerce	?	NR	NR	785
Department of Defense	⬇	72,638	~83,000	~88,000
Department of Energy	?	NR	NR	0
Department of Health and Human Services	?	NR	NR	NR
Department of Homeland Security	⬄	~2,100	2,100	NR

Agency	Status	Number of Employees		
		2015	2014	2013
Department of the Interior	?	NR	NR	550
Department of Justice	⬇	426	500	1,351
Department of Labor	⬌	30	30	24
Department of State	⬆	57,888	56,104	55,200
Department of Transportation	?	NR	NR	645
Department of the Treasury	⬆	46	0	55
Department of Veterans Affairs	⬌	0	0	NR
Environmental Protection Agency	⬇	199	247	179
General Services Administration	?	NR	12	7
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	?	12	NR	4
Consumer Product Safety Commission	⬆	2	0	1
Millennium Challenge Corporation	⬌	22	22	29
National Endowment for the Humanities	?	NR	8	NR
National Science Foundation	?	NR	NR	4
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	⬇	4	8	4
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	⬆	4	1	1
Peace Corps	⬆	191	181	181
Postal Regulatory Commission	⬇	0	40	NR
Smithsonian Institution	?	NR	NR	~1
Social Security Administration		NR	6	6
U.S. Agency for International Development	?	NR	NR	6,780
U.S. Trade and Development Agency	?	30	NR	30
~TOTAL	⬌	**~132,292**	**~132,291**	**~142,512**

47

Agency	Status	Number of Employees		
		2015	2014	2013
Legend for Table 6				

Legend for Table 6

⬌	**No change from CY 2014 report**	**NR**	Not reported
⬇	**Decrease from CY 2014 report**	**?**	Undetermined from reported data
⬆	**Increase from CY 2014 report**		

The Departments of Defense (including the armed services, reported approximately 73,000 employees), and State (57,888 employees) reported the largest number of overseas employees. The DoD, its various components, and the military Departments indicated that they extend their OSH programs and coverage to include their overseas federal civilian employees. The State Department indicated that it has a robust overseas OSH program, and includes provisions for safe and healthful living conditions for its overseas employees, as well as other federal employees stationed at embassies. As in previous years' reporting, multiple agencies indicated the presence of a federal civilian overseas workforce, but did not disclose an approximate number of these employees serving in overseas locations. In addition, several independent agencies reported an overseas federal workforce, most of whom are covered under either DoD's or State's OSH programs.

OSH Training and Resources

E.O. 12196 provides for OSH-related training at the various levels of agency employees. And 29 CFR §1960 Subpart H specifies the necessary OSH-related training for all levels of agency employees. OSHA requested that agencies provide information on the OSH-related training they provided to their employees.

Agencies reported a range of employee support activities for OSH-related activities. Some reported that employee training is primarily based on job responsibilities. Some also reported making special efforts to ensure that collateral duty OSH personnel received the appropriate training. In addition, several agencies reported that employees were encouraged to seek professional OSH certification and participate in professional OSH organizations. Agencies also reported providing support by maintaining OSH websites, distributing OSH awards, publishing OSH newsletters, and encouraging participation in FFSHCs and other appropriate venues. Many agencies reported that they also supported employees' safety and health through encouraging healthy lifestyles by providing fitness centers; subsidizing gym memberships; sponsoring health fairs; and offering a variety of health-related services, such as health-screenings and physical examinations. Although not specific to OSH-related issues, several agencies reported on the added value of Employee Assistance Programs.

According to reports, agencies' OSH training efforts ran the complete gamut of venues, from new-hire orientation to supervisory training; and from workplace safety best practices to accident analysis; and issues, from mandatory safety programs to personal emergency preparedness, and from surveillance programs to whistleblower protection. Agencies reported using conventional didactic methods, such as on-line training, classroom activities, and self-

paced learning activities. Student competency assessment followed similar approaches, with agencies often using practical examinations/demonstrations, quizzes, and instructor evaluations.

Even though agencies provided few details regarding dedicated monies for OSH training efforts, it was evident that training budgets vary dramatically between agencies, and that size is not a determinant. While the Agency for International Development is only able to allocate a reported $108,000 for its entire OSH program, it is able to provide its employees with an extensive amount of training under the auspices of the Department of State. Among larger agencies, the Department of Labor noted that its OSH training budget was $752,000.

EPA continues to excel with its exemplary OSH training program. The Agency routinely identifies OSH training needs, provides training, assesses competencies, and tracks the completion of training requirements. It is continually working to strengthen the training program. In 2014 the Agency reported that it was transitioning to a centralized online tracking system, and has taken steps to ensure that specific groups receive adequate OSH training. On April 16, 2015, EPA posted a system of records notice (SORN) to the *Federal Register* to announce its intent to use the Field Readiness Module to track employee training requirements and medical preparedness data. After the SORN's 30-day comment period closed, the EPA encouraged all its regions and program offices to transition their health and safety training and medical preparedness data into the Field Readiness Module. By the end of CY 2015, six of the agency's 10 regions and the Office of Land and Emergency Management's Environmental Response Team had already completed this task. According to the EPA, having this information available in real time, as the Field Readiness Module will allow, will greatly improve efficiency during national response events.

In addition to the above information regarding federal agency OSH training, federal agencies were requested to describe their overall experience with the *Occupational Safety and Health Training Guidelines for Federal Agencies* issued in 2014. OSHA developed and published these Guidelines in response to a FACOSH recommendation. While the majority of agencies did not address their experience with the *Guidelines*, a few indicated that their training programs met or exceeded the document's parameters, some noted that they were incorporating or would incorporate the information, and others noted that they were looking at the guidelines and considering implementing some of the suggestions at a later date.

Whistleblower Protection Programs

29 CFR §1960, Subpart G requires federal agencies to ensure that employees are not subjected to reprisal or other forms of restraint for filing a report of unsafe or unhealthy working conditions. In an effort to assess agencies' whistleblower protection programs, OSHA requested that agencies provide information on any federal employee allegations of reprisal,

and the actions taken in response to the allegations. Agencies were also asked to describe program improvements that may have resulted from these cases of employee-alleged reprisal.

Nearly all agencies indicated awareness of provisions of the *Whistleblower Protection Act*, Title 5, U.S.C. § 2302(c), and reported having functional protection programs. None of the agencies reported any allegations of reprisal for the current year.

Product Safety Programs

In the CY 2015 information request to federal agencies, OSHA requested that federal agencies describe their compliance with the provisions of 29 CFR 1960.34, specifically addressing how each agency ensures that the products and services it procures comply with the product safety requirements of the standard, including the use of safety data sheets (SDSs) (aka material safety data sheets - MSDSs), and responding to product recalls. Of the 82 responding agencies, 50 reported their compliance with the standard; 26 indicated that such a program did not exist within their respective agencies; six agencies did not respond to this item.

Most agencies provided few details on their programs, noting program specifics authority vested to GSA under 29 CFR 1960, Subpart E. However, the Department of Agriculture noted that it addressed product safety through the federal acquisition process and that purchases must meet federal product safety guidelines. It also reported that the affected functional areas, such as Fleet Management for fleet vehicles, would address any recalls. The Department of Health and Human Services reported that product recalls are monitored by its component OSH program managers, and follow-up information is provided to local offices as appropriate using alerts and electronic webpage postings. Among smaller agencies, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) reported that it only purchases and uses products that are UL (Underwriters Laboratory) listed and used in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations and guidelines. It also noted that it strictly adheres to its Hazard Communication Program requirements including the issuance and review of all SDSs, and maintains an electronic SDS database for all associated products used at FDIC. The Corporation stated that its managers follow product recalls in their program areas.

The Environmental Protection Agency product safety program is noteworthy. According to the agency's report, even though it has not developed a comprehensive product safety program to address 29 CFR 1960.34(b), 89 percent of its operating locations have procedures in place to ensure that OSH managers are notified when new chemicals, such as cleaning agents, pesticides, and laboratory chemicals, are introduced into their processes. The OSH managers then determine the associated introduced risks. The SDSs for these chemicals are reviewed by safety professionals and relevant employees, and available for reference on an as-needed basis. Moreover, EPA indicated that in a recent questionnaire, 89 percent of its operation location OSH managers reported compliance with labeling of hazardous materials; wearing the correct personal protective equipment and the adherence to special handling procedures, and complying with product recalls.

Specific Agency Reporting Requirements

29 CFR 1960, Subpart E requires GSA and NIOSH to assist federal agencies with specific activities affecting federal employee safety and health. For the second year, OSHA requested that these two agencies provide details on these activities in their annual reports. Specifically, OSHA asked GSA to address its programs for ensuring that federal facilities are designed, operated, and maintained in accordance with OSH requirements and best practices; how the agency ensures that the products and services offered to federal agencies comply with product safety requirements; how safety recalls are implemented; and how federal purchasers are made aware of the safe use of such products, including any system for providing safety data sheets. OSHA asked NIOSH to address its Request for Technical Assistance[14] program, and how it affects federal agencies.

General Services Administration

As requested, GSA reported on its processes pertaining to *Facilities and Operations*, indicating that it continually updates the safety and health requirements set forth in the governing standards and requirements regarding both federally-owned facilities and those commercially leased to federal tenants. It also reported that its *Operations and Maintenance*, and custodial specifications are current. Similarly, GSA did not note implementation of any significant changes within its *Products and Services* function. It reported zero product recalls for the 2015 reporting period.

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

NIOSH reported that in CY 2015 it completed 21 out of 28 technical assistance requests, also known as a *Request for Health Hazard Evaluation*, from federal agencies, including four field investigations, and 17 desktop investigations. Federal agency requests varied by exposure group and health problem, but continued to remain focused on the issues of concern. For the reporting period, the 'Exposure Group' category of 'Indoor Environmental Quality' and the combined categories of 'Radiological,' 'Biological' and 'Chemical' accounted for over 88 percent of agency requests for technical assistance under this grouping. The 'Health Problem' category of 'Respiratory' accounted for nearly 40 percent of the investigations, with 'Cancer' and 'Skin Disorder' comprising a further 40 percent of the grouping.

NIOSH reported similar results for the 37 requests that it received during the 2014 reporting period (completing 34 of the 37). For that reporting period, the 'Exposure Group' category of 'Indoor Environmental Quality' and the combined categories of 'Radiological,' 'Biological' and 'Chemical' accounted for over 80 percent of agency requests for technical assistance under this

---

[14] A Request for Technical Assistance by a federal agency usually involves a Health Hazard Evaluation (HHE), which is a study of a workplace to learn whether workers are exposed to hazardous materials or harmful conditions. For federal agencies, NIOSH provides for technical assistance requests. On the basis of the information provided, NIOSH answers an HHE/ technical assistance request in one of the following ways: respond in writing with helpful information or a referral to a more appropriate agency, call to discuss the problems and how they might be solved, visit the workplace. During a visit, NIOSH will meet with the employer and employee representatives to discuss the issues and tour the workplace. During one or more visits, NIOSH may review records about exposure and health, interview or survey employees, measure exposures, and perform medical testing. At the end of this evaluation, NIOSH will provide a written report to the employer and employee representatives. Depending on the type of evaluation, the final report may require a development time of a few months to a few years.

grouping. The 'Health Problem' category of 'Respiratory' accounted for nearly 50 percent of the number of investigations conducted under this grouping. (Please see Appendix 4 for information on agencies' requests to NIOSH for technical assistance.)

Appendices

Appendix 1: Safety and Health Management System Attributes Evaluated in CY 2015

Operational Component

- Hazard Anticipation and Detection (5 of 11 attributes assessed)
  - o **A comprehensive, baseline hazard survey has been conducted within the past 5 years.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency, through site inspection and analysis, has developed a reasonably complete inventory of the safety and health hazards existing at a certain time, to serve as the basis for subsequent action planning and priority setting.*
  - o **Effective safety and health self-inspections are performed regularly.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if personnel in the agency are performing effective safety and health inspections on a regular basis.*
  - o **Effective surveillance of established hazard controls is conducted.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency regularly assesses if previously established safety and health controls are still effective; or if they are either improperly applied, or otherwise inadequate.*
  - o **Change analysis is performed whenever a change in facilities, equipment, materials, or processes occurs.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency has effective policies and procedures that result in advance detection of potential hazards associated with planned or anticipated changes in the workplace.*
  - o **Safety Data Sheets (SDSs) are used to reveal potential hazards associated with chemical products in the workplace.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency is effectively utilizing the information contained in the SDSs to detect existing or potential hazards.*

- Hazard Prevention and Control (4 of 9 attributes assessed)
  - o **Feasible engineering controls are in place.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency identifies and employs engineering methods to eliminate or control workplace hazards.*
  - o **Effective safety and health rules and work practices are in place.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency has established general workplace rules, and specific work practices that prescribe safe and healthful behaviors and task performance methods.*
  - o **Applicable OSHA-mandated programs are effectively in place.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency has effectively implemented program management requirements in applicable OSHA standards.*
  - o **An effective procedure for tracking hazard correction is in place.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency monitors timely correction of identified hazards.*

Managerial Component

- Planning and Evaluation (3 of 5 attributes assessed)
  - o **Hazard incidence data are effectively analyzed.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency uses hazard incidence data to set safety and health priorities.*
  - o **An action plan designed to accomplish the organizations safety and health objectives is in place.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency has established a plan to achieve its safety and health objectives.*
  - o **A review of the overall safety and health management system is conducted at least annually.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency periodically audits the management aspects of its SHMS, identifying progress, and needed changes/improvements.*

54

- Administration and Supervision (5 of 8 attributes assessed)
  - **Safety and health program tasks are each specifically assigned to a person or position for performance or coordination.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the essential OSH responsibilities are identified and assigned to appropriate personnel.*
  - **Individuals with assigned safety and health responsibilities have the necessary knowledge, skills, and timely information to perform their duties.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency's personnel have the understanding, skill and current information needed to effectively perform their OSH responsibilities.*
  - **Individuals with assigned safety and health responsibilities have the authority to perform their duties.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency's personnel have adequate authority to perform their safety and health responsibilities effectively.*
  - **Individuals with assigned safety and health responsibilities have the resources to perform their duties.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency's personnel have the necessary resources to perform their safety and health responsibilities effectively.*
  - **Organizational policies promote the performance of safety and health responsibilities.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency's personnel are provided positive incentive for performance of their safety and health responsibilities.*

- Safety and Health Training (3 of 6 attributes assessed)
  - **Employees receive appropriate safety and health training (including those overseas).** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency's personnel are provided appropriate training to perform their assigned safety and health responsibilities.*
  - **New employees' orientation includes applicable safety and health information.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency provides appropriate education and training in safety and health protection for new employees who are assuming new duties.*
  - **Supervisors receive training that covers the supervisory aspects of their safety and health responsibilities.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency provides supervisory training that address their responsibilities and an understanding of hazards.*

Cultural Component

- Management Leadership (6 of 10 attributes assessed)
  - **Top management policy establishes clear priority for safety and health.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency has an established policy, emanating from top management, that sets worker safety and health as an organizational priority.*
  - **Top management provides competent safety and health staff support to line managers and supervisors.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency provides appropriate staff guidance and assistance to managers and supervisors relative to their safety and health responsibilities.*
  - **Managers delegate the authority necessary for personnel to carry out their assigned safety and health responsibilities effectively.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency's managers promote a culture of safety and health and support effective operation of the SHMS by delegating adequate authority for personnel to perform their OSH responsibilities.*
  - **Managers allocate the resources needed to properly support the organization's SHMS.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency's managers demonstrate OSH leadership,*

promote a culture of safety and health in the organization, and support effective operation of the SHMS by allocating needed resources.

- o **Managers assure that appropriate safety and health training is provided.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency's managers demonstrate safety and health leadership, promote a culture of safety and health in the organization, and support effective operation of the safety and health management system by ensuring that appropriate safety and health education and training is provided to workers, supervisors, and managers.*
- o **Top management is involved in the planning and evaluation of safety and health performance.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if the agency's top managers personally track performance in safety and health protection to demonstrate visible management leadership.*

- Employee Participation (4 of 9 attributes assessed)
  - o **There is an effective process to involve employees in safety and health issues.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if there is an established organizational process that is known, trusted, and used by employees to provide input regarding safety and health issues.*
  - o **Employees are involved in organizational decision-making in regard to the allocation of safety and health resources.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if agency employees influence the allocation of resources affecting their safety and health.*
  - o **Employees are involved in organizational decision-making in regard to safety and health training.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if agency employees influence training decisions affecting their safety and health.*
  - o **Employees participate in the evaluation of safety and health performance.** *The purpose of this attribute is to determine if agency employees are actively engaged in reviews and audits of safety and health performance.*

Appendix 2: Status of Agency Injury and Illness Reporting

Department/Agency	Number of Establishments		
	Total	Submitted Data	Submitted Usable Data
AbilityOne	1	1	1
Access Board	1	1	1
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	1	1	1
African Development Foundation	1	1	1
Agency for International Development	5	5	5
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	1
Armed Forces Retirement Home	2	2	2
Broadcasting Board of Governors	32	0	0
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	2	2	2
Commission of Fine Arts	1	1	1
Commission on Civil Rights	6	6	6
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	4	4	4
Consumer Product Safety Commission	3	3	3
Corporation for National and Community Service	1	0	0
Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency	13	13	12
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	1	1	1
Department of Agriculture	2,287	346	334
Department of the Air Force	542	535	0
Department of the Army	692	649	274
Department of Commerce	707	5	5
Department of Defense	522	517	506
Department of Education	27	0	0
Department of Energy	54	54	53
Department of Health and Human Services	2,042	2,041	759

Department/Agency	Number of Establishments		
	Total	Submitted Data	Submitted Usable Data
Department of Homeland Security	1,274	566	557
Department of Housing and Urban Development	95	9	9
Department of the Interior	2,044	1	1
Department of Justice	1,580	1,270	1,266
Department of Labor	824	824	802
Department of the Navy	506	1	1
Department of State	397	135	132
Department of Transportation	1,099	1,094	915
Department of the Treasury	1,066	168	0
Department of Veterans Affairs	2,186	1,269	1,144
Environmental Protection Agency	166	166	59
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	54	6	6
Export-Import Bank	13	13	13
Farm Credit Administration	6	1	1
Federal Communications Commission	27	27	27
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	94	93	93
Federal Election Commission	1	1	1
Federal Housing Finance Agency	1	1	1
Federal Labor Relations Authority	7	7	7
Federal Maritime Commission	7	7	7
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	1	1	1
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission	3	3	3
Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board	1	1	1
Federal Trade Commission	10	10	10

Department/Agency	Number of Establishments		
	Total	Submitted Data	Submitted Usable Data
General Services Administration	579	1	1
Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation	1	1	1
Holocaust Memorial Museum	8	8	8
Institute of Museum and Library Services	1	1	1
Inter-American Foundation	1	1	1
International Boundary and Water Commission	12	12	12
International Trade Commission	1	1	1
James Madison Foundation	1	1	1
Kennedy Center	1	1	1
Marine Corps	56	1	1
Marine Mammal Commission	1	1	1
Merit Systems Protection Board	9	9	9
Millennium Challenge Corporation	17	0	0
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16	13	13
National Archives and Records Administration	46	42	41
National Capital Planning Commission	1	1	1
National Council on Disability	1	1	1
National Credit Union Administration	6	0	0
National Endowment for the Arts	1	1	1
National Endowment for the Humanities	1	1	1
National Gallery of Art	1	1	1
National Labor Relations Board	55	55	53
National Mediation Board	2	2	2
National Science Foundation	1	1	1
National Transportation Safety Board	7	7	7

Department/Agency	Number of Establishments		
	Total	Submitted Data	Submitted Usable Data
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	7	7	7
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	1	1	1
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission	3	3	3
Office of Government Ethics	1	1	1
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	3	1	1
Office of Personnel Management	69	0	0
Office of Special Counsel	1	0	0
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	1	1	1
Peace Corps	78	0	0
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	3	3	3
Postal Regulatory Commission	1	1	1
Presidio Trust	1	0	0
Railroad Retirement Board	54	54	54
Securities and Exchange Commission	12	12	12
Selective Service System	4	1	1
Small Business Administration	188	0	0
Smithsonian Institution	31	31	31
Social Security Administration	1,896	1,896	1,618
Social Security Advisory Board	1	0	0
Tennessee Valley Authority	91	0	0
Trade and Development Agency	1	1	1
Udall Foundation	2	2	2
Vietnam Education Foundation	1	1	1
Total	**21,686**	**12,042**	**8,927**

Appendix 3: Field Federal Safety & Health Councils

Active FFSHCs in CY 2015 – Received Annual Reports by OSHA Region

Region 2:
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Hudson Valley FFSHC
- Northern New Jersey FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- Southern New Jersey FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Region 3:
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Metropolitan Washington, DC FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC

Region 4:
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Louisville Area FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- North Carolina FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC

Region 5:
- Chicago FFSHC
- Detroit FFSHC
- Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- Greater Cincinnati FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC

Region 6:
- Dallas/Fort Worth FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- Roadrunner Chapter FFSHC
- South Texas FFSHC

Region 7:
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater Omaha FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Kansas FFSHC

Region 8:
- Denver FFSHC

Region 9:
- Hawaii FFSHC
- Phoenix FFSHC
- San Diego FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay Area FFSHC

Region 10:
- Mt. Rainier Chapter FFSHC

FFSHCS with Appointed Representatives in CY 2015 by Federal Department/Agency

Department of Agriculture
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- Southern New Jersey FFSHC
  - **Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service**
    - Greater Des Moines FFSHC
  - **Food Grain Inspection Service**
    - Minneapolis FFSHC
  - **Forest Service**
    - Duluth/Superior FFSHC
    - Puerto Rico FFSHC

Department of Commerce
  - **National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Detroit FFSHC
    - Greater Kansas City FFSHC
    - Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
    - Mt. Rainier FFSHC

Department of Defense
  - **Defense Contract Management Agency**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
  - **Defense Contractors Agency**
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
  - **Defense Logistics Agency**
    - Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
  - **National Geospatial Agency**
    - Greater St. Louis FFSHC

US Air Force
- Detroit FFSHC
- Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- Greater Omaha FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- Southern New Jersey FFSHC
  - **US Air Force Fighter Wing**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
  - **US Air Force Reserve**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Minneapolis FFSHC
    - Western New York FFSHC
  - **US Air Force Retirement Home**
    - Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
  - **US Air National Guard**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Duluth/Superior FFSHC
    - Minneapolis FFSHC
    - Southern New Jersey FFSHC
    - Western New York FFSHC

US Army
- Detroit FFSHC
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
- Southern New Jersey FFSHC
  - **US Army Corps of Engineers**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Detroit FFSHC
    - Greater St. Louis FFSHC
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
    - Minneapolis FFSHC

62

- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
  - o **US Army Reserves**
    - Minneapolis FFSHC

US Navy
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
  - o **US Marine Corps**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
  - o **US Naval Sea Systems Command**
    - Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC

Department of Health and Human Services
  - o **Centers for Disease Control and Prevention**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
  - o **Federal Occupational Health**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - San Francisco Bay FFSHC
  - o **Food and Drug Administration**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Greater Kansas City
    - Minneapolis FFSHC
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
    - Puerto Rico FFSHC

Department of Homeland Security
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- Phoenix FFSHC
  - o **Federal Emergency Management Agency**
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Puerto Rico FFSHC
  - o **National Urban Security Technology Laboratory**
    - Greater New York FFSHC

  - o **Science and Technology**
    - Greater New York FFSHC
  - o **Transportation Security Administration**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Detroit FFSHC
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Greater Omaha FFSHC
    - Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
    - South Florida FFSHC
  - o **US Citizenship and Immigration Services**
    - Greater Omaha FFSHC
  - o **US Coast Guard**
    - Detroit FFSHC
    - Duluth/Superior FFSHC
    - Greater St. Louis FFSHC
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
    - South Florida FFSHC
  - o **US Customs and Border Protection**
    - Detroit FFSHC
    - Duluth/Superior FFSHC
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Puerto Rico FFSHC
  - o **US Immigration and Customs Enforcement**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - South Florida FFSHC

Department of Justice
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
  - o **Federal Bureau of Investigation**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
    - Greater Omaha FFSHC
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC

63

- o **Federal Bureau of Prisons**
  - Atlanta FFSHC
  - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
  - Minneapolis FFSHC
  - Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- o **US Marshals Service**
  - Greater Omaha FFSHC

Department of Labor
- Central Florida FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
- Southern New Jersey FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC
  - o **Employment and Training Administration**
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
  - o **Occupational Safety and Health Administration**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
    - Cincinnati FFSHC
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Duluth/Superior FFSHC
    - Greater Des Moines FFSHC
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Greater Omaha FFSHC
    - Minneapolis FFSHC
    - Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
    - Mt. Rainier FFSHC
    - Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
  - o **Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Greater New York FFSHC
  - o **Wage and Hour Division**
    - Greater Omaha FFSHC
  - o **Women's Bureau**
    - Greater New York FFSH

Department of State
- South Florida FFSHC

Department of Transportation
- Northern New Jersey FFSHC
  - o **Federal Aviation Administration**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Greater St. Louis FFSHC
    - Greater Omaha FFSHC
    - Mt. Rainier FFSHC
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
    - Southern New Jersey FFSHC

Department of Veterans Affairs
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Detroit FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Greater Omaha FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- North New Jersey FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
  - o **Veterans Affairs Medical Center**
    - Minneapolis FFSHC
  - o **Veterans Health Administration**
    - Greater St. Louis FFSHC
    - Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
    - Puerto Rico FFSHC
    - Western New York FFSHC

Department of the Interior
- o **Bureau of Land Management**
  - San Francisco Bay FFSHC

- o **National Park Service**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
  - Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
  - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
- o **US Fish and Wildlife Service**
  - Atlanta FFSHC
  - Minneapolis FFSHC
  - Southern New Jersey FFSHC
- o **US Geological Survey**
  - San Francisco Bay FFSHC

Department of the Treasury
- Southern New Jersey FFSHC
  - o **Bureau of Printing and Engraving**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
  - o **Internal Revenue Service**
    - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
    - Greater Des Moines FFSHC
    - Greater Kansas City FFSHC
    - Greater Omaha FFSHC
    - Mt. Rainier FFSHC
    - South Florida FFSHC

Environmental Protection Agency
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- Northern New Jersey FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC

Federal Executive Board
- Detroit FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

General Services Administration
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC

- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- Northern New Jersey FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC

National Archives and Records Administration
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC

Small Business Administration
- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Social Security Administration
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC

U.S. Postal Service
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Detroit FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Phoenix FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Northern New Jersey FFSHC
- Southern New Jersey FFSHC

American Federation of Government Employee
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC

FFSHCS with Non-Appointed Representatives in CY 2015 by Federal Department/Agency

Department of Agriculture
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Kansas FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC
  - ➢ **US Forest Service**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
    - Roadrunner FFSHC

Department of Commerce
- o **National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**
  - Louisville Area FFSHC
  - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
  - Oklahoma FFSHC
  - Western New York FFSHC
- o **US Bureau of the Census**
  - Louisville Area FFSHC

Department of Defense
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- South Texas FFSHC
  - o **Defense Contract Management Agency**
    - Western New York FFSHC
  - o **Missile Defense Agency**
    - San Francisco Bay FFSHC
  - o **National Reconnaissance Office**
    - Central Florida FFSHC

US Air Force
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Kansas FFSHC

- Oklahoma FFSHC
- Roadrunner FFSHC
- o **US Air National Guard**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
  - Louisville Area FFSHC
  - Oklahoma FFSHC
  - Puerto Rico FFSHC

U.S. Army
- o **US Army Corps of Engineers**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
  - Louisville Area FFSHC
  - South Florida FFSHC
- o **US Army Training and Doctrine Command**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC

US Navy
- Central Florida FFHSC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Northern New Jersey FFSHC
- o **US Marine Corps**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **US Navy Inspector General**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **US Navy Reserve**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **US Navy Commander, Fleet Forces**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **US Navy Commander, Naval Region Mid Atlantic**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **US Navy Commander Undersea Surveillance**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **US Navy Mid Atlantic Regional Maintenance Center**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC

- o **Naval Air Station**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Aviation Depot**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Communications**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Environmental and Preventative Medicine**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Environmental Health Center**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Environmental Training Center**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Facilities Engineering Command**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Medical Center**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Ophthalmic Support and Training**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Personnel Development**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Sea Systems**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Shipbuilding**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Shipyard Safety Office**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **Naval Special Warfare /Training Development Center**
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC

Department of Education

- Western New York FFSHC

Department of Energy
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC

- o **National Nuclear Security Administration**
  - Roadrunner FFSHC
- o **Office of Science**
  - Greater New York FFSHC

Department of Health and Human Services
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC
  - o **Centers for Disease Control**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
  - o **Federal Occupational Health**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Phoenix FFSHC
  - o **Food and Drug Administration**
    - Puerto Rico FFSHC
    - Western New York FFSHC

Department of Homeland Security
- Greater New York FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- South Texas FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC
  - o **Federal Emergency Management Agency**
    - Greater New York FFSHC
  - o **Force Protection Services**
    - South Florida FFSHC
  - o **National Urban Security Lab**
    - Greater New York FFSHC
  - o **Secret Service**
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
  - o **Transportation Security Administration**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Kansas FFSHC
    - Western New York FFSHC

67

- o **US Coast Guard**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
- o **US Customs and Border Protection**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
  - Western New York FFSHC
- o **US Immigration and Customs Enforcement**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
  - Western New York FFSHC

Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC

Department of Justice
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- South Texas FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC
  - o **Federal Bureau of Investigation**
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Puerto Rico FFSHC
  - o **Federal Bureau of Prisons**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Oklahoma FFSHC

Department of Labor
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- South Texas FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC
  - o **Bureau of Labor Statistics**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
  - o **Employee Benefits Security Administration**
    - Greater New York FFSHC

- o **Occupational Safety and Health Administration**
  - Atlanta FFSHC
  - Greater New York FFSHC
  - Hampton Roads FFSHC
  - Louisville Area FFSHC
- o **Office of Inspector General**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
- o **Office of Labor/Management Standards**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
- o **Office of Workers Compensation**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
- o **Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management**
  - Atlanta FFSHC
- o **Wage and Hour Division**
  - Greater New York FFSHC
  - Oklahoma FFSHC

Department of Transportation
- Oklahoma FFSHC
  - o **Federal Aviation Administration**
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Duluth/Superior FFSHC
    - Oklahoma FFSHC

Department of Veterans Affairs
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Louisville Area FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
  - o **National Cemetery Administration**
    - Minneapolis FFSHC
    - Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
  - o **Veterans Benefits Administration**
    - Minneapolis FFSHC

68

Department of the Interior
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Roadrunner FFSHC
  - **Bureau of Indian Affairs**
    - Minneapolis FFSHC
    - Roadrunner FFSHC
  - **Fish and Wildlife Service**
    - Central Florida FFSHC
  - **National Park Service**
    - Atlanta FFSHC
    - Central Florida FFSHC
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - Louisville Area FFSHC

Department of the Treasury
  - **Internal Revenue Service**
    - Greater New York FFSHC
    - San Francisco Bay FFSHC

Environmental Protection Agency
- Greater New York FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Federal Executives Board
- South Florida FFSHC

General Services Administration
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC

National Labor Relations Board
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Small Business Administration
- Western New York FFSHC

Social Security Administration
- Greater New York FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
- Western New York FFSHC

U.S. Federal Courts
- Greater New York FFSHC

U.S. Postal Service
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Departments/Agencies that Appointed New Representatives to FFSHCs in CY 2015

Department of Agriculture
- Atlanta FFSHC

Department of Commerce
- **National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**
  - Denver FFSHC
  - Mt. Rainier FFSHC

Department of Defense
- **US Air Force Reserve**
  - Western New York FFSHC

US Army
- Northern New Jersey FFSHC
  - **US Army Corps of Engineers**
    - Greater St. Louis FFSHC
    - South Florida FFSHC
  - **US Army Support Activity**
    - Southern New Jersey FFSHC

U.S. Navy
- **US Naval Air Systems Command**
  - Southern New Jersey FFSHC

Department of Energy
- Greater New York FFSHC

Department of Health and Human Services
- **Centers for Medical and Medicaid Services**
  - Denver FFSHC

Department of Homeland Security
- **Federal Emergency Management Agency**
  - Greater New York FFSHC

- **Federal Protective Service**
  - South Florida FFSHC
- **US Coast Guard**
  - Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- **US Immigration and Customs Enforcement**
  - Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
  - Greater New York FFSHC
- **Transportation Security Administration**
  - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
  - South Florida FFSHC

Department of Labor
- Atlanta FFSHC
  - **Office of Federal Contract Compliance**
    - Northern New Jersey FFSHC
  - **US Bureau of Labor Statistics**
    - Atlanta FFSHC

Department of the Interior
- Denver FFSHC

Department of the Treasury
- **Internal Revenue Service**
  - Mt. Rainier FFSHC

Environmental Protection Agency
- Northern New Jersey FFSHC

General Services Administration
- Western New York FFSHC

Small Business administration
- Western New York FFSHC

Department of Veterans Affairs
- o **National Cemetery Administration**
  - Minneapolis FFSHC
- o **Veterans Benefits Administration**
  - Minneapolis FFSHC
  - Denver FFSHC

Appendix 4: Agency Requests to NIOSH for Technical Assistance

Technical Assistance Requests, and Completed Investigations by Type, CY 2013 through CY 2015

Department/ Agency	Technical Assistance Requests			Completed Investigation by Type					
				Desktop			Field		
	2015	2014	2013	2015	2014	2013	2015	2014	2013
Agriculture	3						1		
Commerce		2			1				1
Defense	3	2	5	1	2	3	1		2
Energy			2						
Health & Human Services	2	4	2		3	5			
Homeland Security	4	7	2	1	4	1	2	2	2
Interior	1	3	3	3	1			3	1
Justice			3		1	1			
U.S. Postal Service	4	5	2	3	3	3			
Social Security Administration	2	3	3	1	4	1			1
Transportation	1	3			3				
State	1			1					
Treasury	1	1	2		1	1			
Veterans Affairs	5	4	5	5	2	5			
Other		3	2		1	2		3	1
Total	27	37	31	15	26	22		8	8

2015 Assistance Requests by Department/Agency and Exposure Group

Department/Agency	Exposure Group*							
	Chemical	Biologic	Indoor Environmental Quality	Noise	Heat	Stress	Radiation	Ergonomics
Agriculture	2		1					
Defense	3	1						
Health Human Services	1							1
Homeland Security	1	1					1	1
Interior			1					
State			1					
U.S. Postal Service	1		2					
Social Security	1		1					
Transportation								
Treasury	1							
Veterans Affairs		1	3				1	1
All	10	3	9				2	3

* A Request for Technical Assistance, also known as a Health Hazard Evaluation request, may involve an investigation under more than one exposure group category. This is illustrated by the single request by the U.S. Department of the Treasury to investigate two exposure groupings: 'Biologic' and 'Indoor Environmental Quality.'

2015 Assistance Requests by Department/Agency and Health Problem

Department/Agency	Respiratory	Viral/Bacterial	Cancer	Musculoskeletal	Mental/Behavioral	Sensory	Skin Disorder	Nervous System
Agriculture	1							1
Defense	2		1				1	1
Health Human Services	1			1			1	
Homeland Security		1	3	1				
Interior	1							1
State	2						1	
U.S. Postal Service	1		1				1	
Social Security								
Transportation	1		1					
Treasury	4						3	1
Veterans Affairs	1	1	1	1				1
All	**14**	**2**	**7**	**3**			**7**	**5**