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

Calendar Year 2016

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

Calendar Year 2016

Table of Contents

Abstract

The *Secretary Of Labor's Report to the President on the Status of Federal Agencies' Occupational Safety and Health Programs* describes the efforts federal agencies and the Department of Labor's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) made in calendar year (CY) 2016 to improve workplace safety and health for federal employees. OSHA analyzed federal agencies' evaluations, and reported on the different types of support it provided to federal agencies. In addition, the report summarizes the information Executive Branch agencies submitted to OSHA, documenting worker fatalities and hospitalizations, assessing injury and illness trends, and describing Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) activities at their worksites.

Overall, in calendar year 2016, federal agencies successfully improved the management and functioning of their OSH programs, as demonstrated by a continual decline in the Government's total illness and injury cases and its total case rate, fewer significant enforcement cases involving federal agencies, and a decrease in the number of violations per OSHA inspection compared to CY 2015. As in previous years, agencies actively participated in participating in the Federal Agency Safety and Health Managers' Roundtable, and diverse training offered through the OSHA Training Institute and other venues.

The Department of Labor (DOL) will continue to work with Executive Branch agencies as they pursue OSH program efficiency and effectiveness.

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' 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 2016.

Agency heads must 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."

- Presidential Executive Order (E.O.) 12196, *Occupational Safety and Health Programs for Federal Employees*, 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 29 CFR §1960.71(a)(1), the annual report is due to OSHA, annually, no later than May 1.

Format

This *Secretary of Labor's Report to the President on the Status of Federal Agencies' Occupational Safety and Health Programs* – Calendar Year 2016, includes an Executive Summary, two main sections, and four Appendices.

The **Executive Summary** summarizes some of the Executive Branch agencies' significant achievements and the challenges faced in providing safe and healthy working environments for federal employees during CY 2016. It also highlights OSHA's efforts to support federal agencies.

The report includes two main sections: **OSHA Activities**, and **Federal Agency OSH Activities**. These sections describe the support activities that OSHA provided to federal agencies, and presents OSHA's summative analysis of specific categories of information federal agencies reported to OSHA.

The **Appendices** provide information on the attributes included in the assessment tool federal agencies used to evaluate OSH programs, the injury and illness data federal agencies submitted for CY 2016, agencies' participation in Field Federal Safety and Health Councils (FFSHCs), and agencies' requests for technical assistance from the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

Executive Summary

During the 2016 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 by supporting agencies' respective OSH programs. This report provides calendar year (CY) 2016 injury and illness data for this sector, and summarizes information provided in the federal Executive Branch agencies' annual reports to OSHA. In addition, this report describes the efforts OSHA and agencies made to improve OSH programs for federal workers.

The report explains how the Executive Branch departments and agencies[1] sought to improve workplace safety and health in CY 2016. It also provides information about the actions OSHA took with regards to federal agencies, including enforcement, oversight, and compliance assistance activities. In addition, it describes the actions federal agencies took during the reporting period to analyze trends and improve their programs.

Statistics and Trends

Injury and Illness Statistics

OSHA calculates injury and illness incidence rates for individual agencies by using fiscal year (FY) injury and illness claims data reported to the Department of Labor's (DOL's) Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP)[2], together with the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM's) employment data

In FY 2016, the Government's employment number decreased by 59,569 employees (3 percent) to a total of 2,107,222 employees. The total injury and illness cases decreased by 2,969 to 45,478, and the total case rate (TCR) decreased from 2.24 to 2.16 (3.6 percent). The Government's lost-time cases decreased by 256 to 24,207, and the lost-time case rate (LTCR) increased from 1.13 to 1.15 (1.8 percent).

Workers' Compensation Costs

The Federal Government's workers' compensation costs for chargeback year (CBY) 2016 remained the same as CBY 2015, at approximately $1.6 billion. This amount is a slight increase in costs over CBY 2014, which was approximately $1.4 billion, but was approximately the same as CBY 2013. Workers' compensation benefits provided to employees and their survivors include payments for medical treatment, rehabilitation services, replacement of lost wages, and death benefits.

---

[1] On September 28, 1998, Congress amended the Occupational Safety and Health Act (the Act) to make it applicable to the U.S. Postal Service in the same manner as any other employer subject to the Act. Therefore, the U.S. Postal Service is not included in this report.

[2] OWCP data is only available on a fiscal year basis.

Fatalities and Hospitalizations

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 hospitalizations[3] to OSHA in an expeditious manner. As shown below, for CY 2016, federal Executive Branch departments and independent agencies reported 24 work-related civilian employee fatalities and 184 work-related hospitalizations (including incidents resulting in a loss of an eye or amputation).

Agency	Fatalities	Hospitalizations
Department of Agriculture	4	0
Department of Commerce	0	4
Department of Defense	2	48
Department of Homeland Security	1	93
Department of the Interior	8	18
Department of Justice	1	11
Department of Labor	1	4
Department of State	5	1
Department of Veterans Affairs	0	2
National Archives and Records Administration	0	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2
Total	**24**	**184**

OSHA Activities

OSHA's Directorate of Enforcement Programs – Office of Federal Agency Programs (OFAP) engages in a wide range of activities to address occupational safety and health issues at federal agencies. OFAP assists agencies with improving their OSH programs, and continually works to ensure that agencies can easily access OSH-related information. In general, the Office's activities fall into two categories: enforcement and compliance assistance. Enforcement activities primarily focus on inspections of federal workplaces to identify violations of OSHA standards. Other oversight activities range from monitoring injury and illness rates, to providing leadership in identifying issues specific to federal agencies. Compliance assistance includes consultation activities for federal agencies in understanding both the importance of providing safe and healthy working environments, and the best methods to accomplish this goal. (Please refer to Section 1 – OSHA Activities, for a complete explanation of these activities.)

[3] On January 1, 2015, OSHA implemented a new reporting rule that requires employers to report an incident resulting in the hospitalization of one or more employees, rather than three or more employees. In addition employers must report incidents that result in a loss of an eye or amputation.

Enforcement

During CY 2016, OSHA conducted 349 programmed inspections, and 365 unprogrammed inspections of federal worksites, with an average of 3.19 violations per programmed inspection, and 1.21 violations per unprogrammed inspection. OSHA inspected federal agencies under a variety of national and local emphasis programs that target specific hazards, (such as lead, fall prevention, powered industrial vehicles), specific injuries (such as amputations), and types of industries (such as manufacturing and maritime). During CY 2016, under the Federal Agency Targeting Inspection Program (FEDTARG), OSHA continued to specifically target those federal agency establishments with the highest numbers of lost-time cases. An analysis of FEDTARG data identified a decrease in programmed inspection activity, an increase in the compliance rate, and a decrease in the issuance of Notices of Unsafe or Unhealthful Working Conditions (Notices) for serious violations of OSHA standards.

In CY 2016, OSHA issued a total of six federal agency significant case reports involving the Departments of Agriculture, 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; 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 that is available only to federal agencies but is similar to OSHA's Consultation Program for private sector employers. OSHA's Area Offices conduct the vast majority of ATARs and interact directly with the federal agency sites requesting assistance. During 2016, OSHA Area Offices conducted ATARs at the request of the Departments of Defense, Labor, Commerce, and the Navy.

Field Federal Safety and Health Councils (FFSHCs) are federal interagency groups, chartered by the Secretary, that enable local OSH professionals to share knowledge and resources. In CY 2016, 32 Councils actively carried out efforts to improve the effectiveness of OSH functions within the Government. According to the FFSHCs' annual reports, 31 departments and agencies participated in the councils and over 2,000 federal employees attended meetings and/or training provided by the councils. Each year, OSHA assesses the councils so that the Secretary can recognize the most successful. In CY 2016, the Secretary recognized nine FFSHCs for their efforts to promote the advancement of occupational safety and health in the Federal Government.

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 which address air traffic control towers, special-purpose ladders,

lifting devices, diving standards, weight-handling equipment, and gas-free engineering. Additionally, under §1960.18, if no OSHA standard exists for a specific working condition 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 which address explosives, propellants, pyrotechnics and portable tanks transport.

OSHA continues to provide federal agency OSH personnel with training opportunities through the OSHA Training Institute (OTI) and other venues, such as the Federal Agency OSH Managers' Roundtable. Federal OSH personnel may attend any of the professional and technical courses provided through OTI. In addition to the training courses offered throughout the year, OSHA provides a week of training at OTI, commonly referred to as FEDWEEK, specifically for federal agency OSH personnel. During the 2016 FEDWEEK, OSHA provided eight half-day seminars offered twice during the week on topics chosen after surveying federal OSH personnel. Seventy-three federal employees attended these seminars and reported that they were pleased with the training offered.

Agency Activities

Occupational Safety and Health Committees

Federal agencies reported on the various 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 maintained 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 2016, the following agencies maintained Secretary approved CSHCs: the Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Labor, Tennessee Valley Authority, and 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 Central Intelligence Agency and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission did not report on their CSHCs for CY 2016. OSHA will contact these agencies to review their certification.

Self-Evaluations

29 CFR §1960.79 requires agencies periodically evaluate their OSH programs. The purpose of these evaluations is to assess both the extent to which the agency's program conforms to the requirements of E.O. 12196 and corresponding regulations, and to determine whether the

agency has implemented the program effectively in all agency establishments and field activities. A majority of agencies reported conducting some type of periodic review of their OSH programs during CY 2016. Of those agencies, most evaluated their programs themselves, using a variety of pre-packaged and/or agency-developed tools. Only a few agencies reported receiving assistance from outside experts, including assistance from the General Services Administration (GSA), OSHA, and the Joint Commission – a not-for-profit, private-sector organization that accredits and certifies healthcare organizations. With few exceptions, the agencies that reported performing self-evaluations indicated improvement in the operational, managerial, and cultural components of their programs. Agencies' self-assigned ratings of the attributes of their programs reflect these system-wide improvements.

As in CY 2015, OSHA asked agencies to rate the operational, managerial, and cultural components of their OSH programs using a 30-question (attribute) 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 OSH programs. Overall, agencies' ratings of the three components indicate that agencies saw moderate improvement in their programs, with some agencies reporting an increase in the frequency of self-inspections in order to achieve a high level of safety throughout the year. To improve the consistency and effectiveness of their programs, many agencies reported that they emphasized the importance of the supervisor's participation in the inspection process, and the significant role that employees play in the prompt recognition and abatement of workplace hazards.

However, subcomponents within each of the three components are amenable to improvement, even in those agencies that provided higher overall ratings of their programs. The operational component's hazard survey and use of safety data sheets attributes, the managerial component's incidence data attribute, and the cultural component's resource allocation and organizational decision-making on resources attributes may require additional emphasis in subsequent years. The analysis also indicated that multiple agencies were not fully cognizant of their OSH responsibilities or how to implement all the attributes of an effective OSH program in government operations. (Please refer to Section 1 – OSHA Activities, Evaluations, for a description of the components of an OSH program and an analysis of the agencies' self-evaluations.)

Controlling Hazards

To assess how well agencies were tracking workplace injuries, OSHA asked agencies to report on the most common causes of injuries and their efforts to mitigate those causes. As in previous years, most agencies that provided this information noted that "slips, trips, and falls" were the leading cause of injuries for their employees, followed by exertion injuries. Agencies' efforts to address slip, trip, and fall hazards included engineering approaches, such as installing slip-resistant flooring, and providing adequate lighting. Their control efforts for exertion injuries consisted mainly of ergonomic assessments and training. Agencies also addressed these hazards through annual safety training classes and programs, all-inclusive meetings, and

using safety bulletin boards to heighten awareness. Several agencies reported participating in OSHA's *National Safety Stand-Down to Prevent Falls* held in May 2016. The purpose of the Stand-Down was to get employers to pause during the workday for topic discussions, demonstrations, and training on how to recognize related hazards and prevent falls.

Annual Information Request

Each year, OSHA asks agencies to provide information on several OSH-related topics and programs. While OSHA consistently requests information on certain topics, such as agencies' 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 on developing trends. Similar to the previous reporting period, in CY 2016 OSHA requested an assessment of OSH program activities and events, including: presidential and federal government-wide initiatives; occupational illnesses, injuries, fatalities, and hospitalizations; specific 29 CFR §1960 requirements; and an agency OSH program self-evaluation.

Motor Vehicle Safety

Collectively, 36 federal agencies reported that approximately 10,887 motor vehicle accidents occurred in CY 2016. 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 banning distracted driving. Many departments and agencies required defensive driving training, with the majority using courses provided by either the GSA or the National Safety Council.

Federal Agency Safety and Health Mission

The administration of agencies' OSH programs is described in 29 CFR §1960, Subpart B. 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. A majority of the agencies reported this organizational function is managed under the umbrella of Facilities Management. However, several agencies indicated that their OSH function is managed as an independent organizational safety and health division/department. Of the agencies that reported on this item, most indicated the availability of the necessary resources, including adequate personnel and budgets, to accomplish necessary OSH activities. Agency reports also indicated that employee-identified OSH issues were handled internally, at the lowest possible level. If such issues had agency-wide implications, they were forwarded to the agency OSH committee, if existing, for resolution.

Agency's Self-inspection of Safety and Health Program

Overall, federal agencies reported improvement in the effectiveness of their self-inspections with some agencies increased the number of self-inspections completed in CY 2016. Other agencies implemented new methods for conducting self-evaluations, or had their facilities inspected by GSA, OSHA, or a federal contractor. 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, 58 agencies indicated conducting some sort of self-inspection activities. Twenty agencies indicated that an outside source conducted inspection activities. (Please refer to Section 1 – OSHA Activities, for an analysis of agencies' evaluations of their OSH programs.)

Training of Federal Employees (including overseas employees)

There are no geographical limits to the legislative provisions of the Act, E.O. 12196, and 29 CFR §1960, which require agencies to provide safe and healthful workplaces. According to agency reports, approximately 102,267 government employees worked outside the United States border in CY 2016. This represented a 16 percent decrease from the 121,354 federal civilian employees reported working overseas in CY 2015. Many agencies reported extending their own OSH programs to cover their overseas employees, while other agencies reported that they relied completely on either Department of Defense (DoD) or Department of State OSH programs to provide coverage for their overseas-deployed workforce. At a minimum, agencies reported providing pre-deployment preparations for their employees, such as prophylactic immunizations, training, and pre-travel information.

Several agencies reported providing a range of support to their stateside employees, including encouraging employees to participate in OSH-related activities and professional OSH organizations, and to seek professional OSH certification. Agencies reported that employee OSH training was primarily based on job responsibilities. Some agencies reported making special efforts to ensure that collateral duty OSH personnel received the appropriate training. In addition, agencies provided support by maintaining OSH websites, distributing OSH awards, publishing OSH newsletters, and encouraging participation in their FFSHC. Many agencies reported they also supported employee 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

As required by 29 CFR §1960, Subpart G, federal agencies must ensure that employees are not subjected to reprisal or other forms of retaliation for filing a report of unsafe or unhealthy working conditions. In an effort to assess agencies' whistleblower protection programs, OSHA requested agencies provide information on improvements to their programs, any federal employee allegations of reprisal, and actions taken in response to the allegations. The vast majority of agencies indicated awareness of their whistleblower responsibilities, and reported having functional protection programs. In CY 2016, the Smithsonian Institute investigated two allegations of reprisal for filing reports of unsafe or unhealthful working condition. The Smithsonian Office of the Inspector General found that the allegations in both cases were unsubstantiated. The US Air Force also investigated two allegations of reprisal. In one case, the allegation was unsubstantiated. The second case was substantiated and resulted in appropriate disciplinary action. No other agencies received employee allegations of restraint, interference, coercion, discrimination, or reprisal for reporting unsafe working conditions in CY 2016.

Product Safety

In the CY 2016 information request to federal agencies, OSHA asked federal agencies to describe their compliance with the provisions of 29 CFR 1960.34, which addresses conflicts that may exist in standards concerning federal buildings, leased space, products purchased or supplied, and other requirements affecting federal employee safety and health. Specifically, OSHA asked each agency to address how it ensured that the products and services it procured complied with the product safety requirements of the standard, including the use of safety data sheets (SDSs), and how the agency responds to product recalls. Of the 76 responding agencies, 48 reported their compliance with the standard, while 20 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 awareness of their OSH responsibilities in this area. Eight agencies did not respond to this item and will be contacted as well.

Accomplishments

Federal agencies continued to make strides forward in providing a safe and healthy work environment for federal workers. Agencies reported on a broad range of improvements, from revising existing OSH programs, procedures, and manuals, to implementing new training delivery systems, and completing abatement projects. Agencies also reported instituting mandatory OSH training and inspecting their facilities and establishments. As in previous years, agencies reported using trend analysis to develop risk mitigation programs, and incorporating risk assessments to their safety policies. A few agencies indicated that they were in the infancy stages of developing OSH programs, while others reported that they invested additional resources to develop a more robust safety program.

CY 2017 Goals

Compared to previous reporting periods, there were no significant changes regarding agencies' plans to improve the effectiveness of their OSH programs for CY 2017 and beyond. Most agency goals included various strategies to improve the effectiveness of specific OSH programs, such as conducting self-assessments, developing procedures and programs to enhance their OSH 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, mishaps, 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 17 agencies for inclusion in the CY 2016 Report and will be examining ways to improve the CY 2017 response rate:

- Ability One
- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

- African Development Foundation
- Agency for International Development
- Central Intelligence Agency
- Commission for Fine Arts
- Commission on Civil Rights
- Corporation for National Community Service
- Department of Education
- Harry S. Truman Foundation
- James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation
- National Council on Disability
- National Endowments for the Arts
- Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board
- Presidio Trust
- Selective Service System
- Social Security Advisory Board

The Secretary's Report to the President

Section 1 - OSHA Activities

This section provides information about OSHA activities in the general topic areas of 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 hospitalizations, along with a brief description of FEDWEEK – a training opportunity OSHA provides solely for federal OSH personnel, and the Federal Agency Safety and Health Roundtable – a newly created federal OSH information exchange forum for headquarters-level OSH personnel.

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. Programmed inspections also occur at sites associated with particular hazards or with adverse health outcomes, such as amputations. Un-programmed inspections occur for reasons, such as receipt of an employee complaint or a 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 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.

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 2016, OSHA conducted 349 programmed inspections, and 365 unprogrammed inspections of federal worksites. Inspections averaged 3.19 violations per programmed inspection, and 1.21 violations per unprogrammed inspection. According to data obtained through the OSHA Information System, 311 of the 349 worksite receiving programmed inspections (89 percent) were not in compliance. Overall, OSHA discovered 1,535 violations including: 895 Serious, 320 Repeat, 10 Willful, and 310 Other-Than-Serious.

In CY 2016, OSHA's National Office continued the *Federal Agency Targeting Inspection Program* (FEDTARG), to target high-hazard 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, or energized equipment), and specific injuries (such as amputations), and industries (such as manufacturing or maritime).

By comparison, during the 2015 reporting period, OSHA conducted 475 programmed inspections and 344 unprogrammed inspections. In CY 2015, OSHA discovered, on average, 3.99 violations per programmed inspection and 2.23 violations per unprogrammed inspection. Of the 1,757 violations found in CY 2015, 1,088 were Serious, 295 were Repeat, 3 were Failure-to-Abate, and 371 were Other-Than-Serious violations. While OSHA conducted fewer inspections in CY 2016 compared to CY 2015, the average number of violations detected dropped only slightly and the average number of more serious violations (serious, willful, repeat violations) continued its upward trend.

Table 1. *OSHA Federal Agency Programmed, Unprogrammed Inspection Activity, CY 2014 through CY 2016*.

	CY 2016	CY 2015	CY 2014
Programmed Inspections	349	475	496
Percent in Compliance	11	10	11

Table 1. *OSHA Federal Agency Programmed, Unprogrammed Inspection Activity, CY 2014 through CY 2016*.

	CY 2016	CY 2015	CY 2014
Average Number of Violations	3.19	3.99	3.59
Serious, Willful, Repeat Violations	873	1088	476
Average Number Serious, Willful, Repeat Violations	2.56	2.29	0.96
Unprogrammed Inspections	365	344	332
Percent in Compliance	51	49	47
Average Number of Violations	1.21	2.23	3.48
Serious, Willful, Repeat Violations	352	345	314
Average Number Serious, Willful, Repeat Violations	0.97	1.0	0.95
Total Inspections	714	819	828

Significant/Novel Cases

OSHA defines significant cases as those inspections having penalties over $180,000. Novel cases involve specific enforcement issues, such as workplace violence or ergonomics, and federal agency cases for which OSHA issues a press release. While, by law, OSHA cannot assess penalties against federal agencies, it can determine the significance of a federal agency case by comparing the violations to the penalties that would be assessed to a "similar" private sector employer.

In CY 2016, OSHA issued six federal agency significant case reports. These cases involved the Departments of Agriculture (one case), Justice (three cases), and Veterans Affairs (two 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 – US Forest Service Region 5 – Vallejo, California	Complaint	N/A	Willful: 1

OSHA initiated this inspection after a non-formal complaint alleged that US Forest Service Law Enforcement and Investigations division employees were regularly exposed to unknown toxic chemicals when eradicating marijuana sites on Forest Service land, and were not provided with adequate training, personal protective equipment, or medical surveillance.

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

Department/Agency	Inspection Type	Program	Type of Violations
DOJ – Federal Bureau of Prisons – Federal Correctional Institute Hazelton – Bruceton Mills, West Virginia	Follow-up	N/A	Willful: 1 Repeat: 2 Other-Than-Serious: 1
OSHA initiated this inspection as a follow-up inspection after the facility failed to provide abatement certification. It was a partial inspection that addressed the previously cited items (including chemical exposures, personal protective equipment, and walking/working surfaces), and one additional plain view hazard involving lead.			
DOJ – Federal Bureau of Prisons – Federal Correctional Institute Allenwood – White Deer, Pennsylvania	Complaint	N/A	Willful: 1
OSHA initiated this inspection as a complaint inspection after a formal complaint alleged employee exposure to contaminated needles, and lack of personal protective equipment for employees to use during housing searches. The partial scope inspection addressed the complaint items.			
DOJ – Federal Bureau of Prisons – Federal Correctional Institute McDowell - Welch, West Virginia	Follow-up	N/A	Willful: 1
OSHA initiated this inspection as a follow-up inspection to ensure abatement of previously cited items under inspection No. 962553. The inspection was partial in scope and addressed correctional officers' failure to use puncture resistant gloves during pat down operations.			
VA – Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System – McClellan Memorial Veterans Hospital – Little Rock, Arkansas	Planned Programmed	FEDTARG	Serious: 8 Willful: 1 Repeat: 2 Other-than-Serious : 4
OSHA initiated this programmed planned inspection as part of the FEDTARG Program. Violations addressed: machine guarding, electrical, bloodborne pathogens, hazardous energy, recordkeeping, and means of egress.			

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

Department/Agency	Inspection Type	Program	Type of Violations
VA – VA Palo Alto Healthcare System – Palo Alto, California	Planned Programmed	FEDTARG	Serious: 7 Repeat: 13 Other-Than-Serious: 15 Hazard Alert Letter: 1
OSHA initiated inspections of the Palo Alto, Menlo Park, and Livermore Divisions of the Palo Alto Healthcare System as part of the FEDTARG Program. Violations addressed: walking/working surfaces, machine guarding, electrical safety, hazard communication, means of egress, lockout/tagout, machine guarding, personal protective equipment, bloodborne pathogens, portable power tools, welding/cutting/brazing, noise, ergonomics, lead, slings, and workplace violence.			

Oversight

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 increases OSHA's responsibilities for conducting evaluations. Both the OSHA evaluations and the agencies' self-evaluations focus on an assessment of agencies' OSH program elements.

In 1985, OSHA developed Form 33 to evaluate private sector employers' occupational safety and health programs and has refined it through years of use by OSHA's Consultation Programs. A validation study confirmed that Form 33 could accurately measure the effectiveness of those programs and found that the form was a reliable measurement tool. In 2013, OSHA adapted Form 33 to better evaluate the safety and health programs of federal agencies.

Agencies' operations and worksites are quite diverse, ranging from office spaces to field and construction sites. As such, federal employees have potential exposure to a wide range of occupational safety and health hazards. Since an OSH program integrates OSH attributes into an organizational structure, it requires a systematic approach to determine whether policies and procedures are appropriately developed and implemented. An evaluation determines if an OSH program's policies and procedures are regularly monitored and modified to correct any problems and/or adapt to a changing worksite environment. A structured OSH program is applicable 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 program—operational, managerial, and cultural. It uses 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 program has a well-defined and communicated system to identify, correct, and control hazards. The managerial component assesses whether the program 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 OSH program 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 the CY 2016 report, OSHA selected 30 of the tool's 58 attributes to provide a well-rounded assessment of agencies' OSH programs across three components. OSHA selected nine attributes from the operational component, 11 attributes from the managerial component, and 10 from the Cultural component. Agencies were asked to rate each of these attributes, based on their CY 2016 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 OSH program 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 attribute, agencies had to provide a detailed narrative, with examples to support each self-identified attribute rating.

Overall Assessment

For the CY 2016 reporting period, OSHA received responses from 78 out of 95[4] agencies (an 82 percent response rate). In evaluating their respective agencies' programs overall, federal agencies had a mean overall rating of 2.0 for CY 2016. Of the 78 responding agencies, 32 (41 percent) provided a rating of "3" for the overall assessment and 31 agencies (40 percent) provided a rating of "2." For most of the 32 agencies that provided an overall score of "3" for their overall OSH programs, 26 (81 percent) agencies[5] provided self-assessment ratings of less

---

[4] Tables 3a and 3b depict the overall score assigned by federal agencies to the self-evaluation of their respective OSH programs for CY 2016. Those responding agencies, that either did not provide an overall rating of their respective programs, 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.

[5] Armed Forces Retirement Home, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Social Security Administration, and Tennessee Valley Authority provided a "3" rating for the overall score and all 30 attributes.

than "3" across 10 to 100 percent of the component-attribute spectrum. These ratings indicated that their programs needed improvements and highlighted the disparity between agencies' overall assessments and needed improvements across the program's component-attribute spectrum. This inconsistency included agencies that reported the most effective systems, as indicated by a "3" rating, as well as those that indicated an OSH program, in full or part, was "not applicable" to their situations, or did not report on the status of their programs. (Please refer to Tables 3a and 3b for the number of responding federal agencies that provided ratings for the 30 assessed attributes.) In the future, OSHA will provide clearer guidance when making an overall assessment.

Overall, most agencies recognized that an effective safety and health program was an asset to their organization. Several stated that they were successful in their efforts to reduce the risk of illness and injuries to employees through hazard anticipation and detection and by changing the culture of the workplace to reinforce the value of working safe and smart.

Of the 78 agencies that provided input, 12 (15 percent) either did not provide a self-evaluation, or provided a "not-applicable" rating for the overall assessment and respective program's attributes. Many of these agencies reported with a small number of employees and their missions are comprised of administrative functions, their work environments have very limited risks for injuries and illnesses. These agencies indicated that their OSH programs were sufficient, and noted that a majority of the attributes in the Form 33 do not apply to their programs. OSHA will confirm their assessment or work to help them understand how to use this assessment tool.

Table 3a. *Major Departments and Independent Agencies' Overall Safety and Health Program Self-rating Score* (n = 22).

Agency	Score	Agency	Score
Department of Agriculture	2	Department of State	2
Department of the Air Force	2	Department of Transportation	3
Department of the Army	NR	Department of Veterans Affairs	2
Department of Commerce	3	Department of the Interior	2
Department of Defense	NA	Department of the Navy	3
Department of Energy	3	Department of the Treasury	2
Department of Health and Human Services	2	Environmental Protection Agency	3
Department of Homeland Security	2	General Services Administration	2
Department of Housing and Urban Development	3	National Aeronautics and Space Admin.	3
Department of Labor	2	Social Security Administration (includes SSAB)	3
Department of Justice	3	Tennessee Valley Authority	3
Score Explanation			

Agency	Score	Agency	Score
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			

Table 3b. *Smaller Independent Agencies' Overall Safety and Health Program Self-rating Score* (n =56).

Agency	Score	Agency	Score
American Battle Monuments Commission	NR	Morris K. and Stewart L. Udall Foundation	2
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board)	0	National Archives and Records Administration	2
Armed Forces Retirement Home	3	National Capital Planning Commission	3
Broadcasting Board of Governors	NA	National Credit Union Administration	1
Commodity Futures Trading Corporation	3	National Endowment for the Humanities	NA
Consumer Product Safety Commission	2	National Gallery of Art	2
Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency	3	National Labor Relations Board	2
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	2	National Mediation Board	3
Export-Import Bank of the United States	2	National Science Foundation	NA
Farm Credit Administration	NR	National Transportation Safety Board	3
Federal Communications Commission	3	Nuclear Regulatory Commission	NA
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission	3
Federal Election Commission	3	Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	3
Federal Housing Finance Agency	3	Office of Personnel Management	2
Federal Labor Relations Authority	NA	Overseas Private Investment Corporation	2
Federal Maritime Commission	2	Peace Corps	NA
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	3	Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	2

Agency	Score	Agency	Score
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission	2	Postal Regulatory Commission	3
Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board	3	Railroad Retirement Board	2
Federal Reserve Board	NA	Security and Exchange Commission	3
Federal Trade Commission	2	Small Business Administration	2
Institute of Museum and Library Services	2	The Smithsonian Institution	2
Inter-American Foundation	3	U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	2
International Boundary and Water Commission	NA	U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum	2
Kennedy Center	2	U.S. International Trade Commission	2
Marine Mammal Commission	3	U.S. Office of Government Ethics	0
Merit Systems Protection Board	3	U.S. Trade and Development Agency	3
Millennium Challenge Corporation	3	Vietnam Education Foundation	3
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			

Operational Component Assessment

Federal agencies were provided nine attributes to rate the operational component of their OSH programs. Overall, the attributes of the operational component were rated highly, indicated by a "2" or higher rating. The self-inspection, work rules and practices, and OSHA-mandated programs attributes were well implemented by agencies, as indicated by the majority of agencies rating these attributes as "2" or higher. Sixty-four agencies (82 percent) provided a rating of "2" or higher for the self-inspection attribute. Many agencies reported an increase in the number of inspections conducted during CY 2016. The Armed Forces Retirement Home, for example, stated that a qualified safety and health specialist now conducted formal inspections on a monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, and annual basis to ensure early detection of existing hazards. Similarly, 66 agencies (85 percent) rated their agency a "2" or higher for the presence of work rules and practices attribute. The DoD stated that effective, two-way communications between management and employees was a program cornerstone and the prime contributor to the effectiveness of safety and health rules and work practices. DoD Components used an array of communication methods to ensure workplace safety and health rules were understood and followed. These methods included published component-specific regulations, standard operating procedures, manuals, new employee orientation training, direct supervisor-employee

discussions, newsletters, posters and bulletin boards, organizational websites, social media, command-directed safety "stand-downs," and town hall meetings.

Some agencies reported improvements in safety information management systems and accident reporting tools, which provided better methods for assessing the status of their program. Other agencies reportedly lacked a comprehensive centralized safety information management system, which most likely hindered the accuracy of hazard and trend analysis, and their overall assessment of their program. In CY 2016, some agencies had ratings of "non-applicable" or "not reported" for the surveillance (21 agencies, 27 percent); use of SDSs (29 agencies,37 percent); engineering controls (26 agencies, 33 percent); and tracking hazard correction (21 agencies, 27 percent) attributes. OSHA will work with these agencies to determine how best to implement these programs, if needed.

Managerial Component Assessment

As in prior years, OSHA provided federal agencies with 11 attributes to rate the managerial component of their OSH programs. Overall, the attributes of the managerial component were rated highly, indicated by a "2" or higher rating. The five attributes used to assess the Administration/Supervision subcomponent received the highest number of "2" and "3" ratings (65 agencies, 83 percent) during the CY 2016 reporting period. Numerous agencies, like the Smithsonian Institution and the Department of Commerce, reported that management provided extensive support to OSH personnel through delegation of necessary authority, and in most cases, adequate resource allocation to maintain program performance despite fiscal challenges.

While a large number of agencies reported ratings of "2" or "3" for the attributes of the managerial component, several agencies provided "not applicable" or "not reported" ratings for these attributes. Specifically, "not applicable" or "not reported ratings" were provided for the incidence data (25 agencies, 32 percent), the new employee orientation (14 agencies, 18 percent), and the supervisory training (14 agencies, 18 percent) attributes. Additionally, 13 agencies (17 percent) provided "not applicable" or "not reported" ratings for the knowledge, skills, and information, and the employee training attributes. The Department of the Treasury, for example, reported that some safety training is not available Agency-wide; however, it noted that it provides all available safety training to the bureaus with more advanced health and safety programs. Overall, agencies reported that the breadth of their safety training programs is proportionate to their perceived safety and health risks and needs.

Cultural Component Assessment

For the CY 2016 reporting period, OSHA provided agencies with 10 attributes to rate the cultural component of their programs. Most federal agencies provided a "2" or higher rating for all 10 cultural component attributes. In CY 2016, 63 agencies (81 percent) provided a "2" or higher rating for the OSH priority policies attribute, while 13 agencies (17 percent) provided a "not-applicable or "not rated" for the same attribute. Nearly all agencies stated that they are committed to providing a safe and healthful workplace for all employees by reducing workplace

injuries and illnesses. To accomplish that goal, most agencies indicated that they have created a comprehensive, self-sustaining culture of safety performance that is supported by management and requires supervisor and employee involvement.

The two lowest rated cultural component attributes were organizational decision-making on resources and organizational decision-making on training, with 55 and 57 agencies, respectively, rating them "2" or higher (71 and 73 percent respectively). OSHA will continue to assess the responses and reach out to agencies to provide support and guidance.

Table 4. *Number of Federal Agencies Assigning Ratings to Safety and Health Program Attributes* (n = 78).

Component	Subcomponent	Attribute	Number of Agencies with the Self-assigned Rating					
			3	2	1	0	NA	NR
Operational	Hazard Anticipation/Detection	Hazard survey	33	13	5	7	12	8
		Self-inspection	47	17	1	2	3	8
		Surveillance	36	16	2	3	13	8
		Change analysis	35	17	3	3	12	8
		Use of SDSs	37	9	1	2	21	8
	Hazard Prevention/Control	Engineering controls	38	13	0	1	17	9
		Work rules and practices	54	12	1	1	1	9
		OSHA-mandated programs	46	15	4	1	3	9
		Tracking hazard correction	38	16	1	2	12	9
Managerial	Planning/ Evaluation	Incidence data	34	15	2	2	16	9
		Action plan	40	21	2	4	2	9
		Annual SHMS review	42	18	3	3	3	9
	Administration/ Supervision	Specific assignment of OSH tasks	54	11	1	1	1	10
		Knowledge, skills, and information	44	19	2	0	3	10
		Authority to perform	59	6	1	0	2	10
		Appropriate resources	47	18	1	1	2	9
		OSH organizational policies	51	16	0	0	2	9
	Safety/Health Training	Employee training	39	24	1	1	1	12
		New employee orientation	43	18	2	1	2	12
		Supervisory training	28	32	4	0	2	12

Component	Subcomponent	Attribute	Number of Agencies with the Self-assigned Rating					
			3	2	1	0	NA	NR
Cultural	Management Leadership	OSH priority policies	54	9	2	0	2	11
		Provided competent staff	47	14	1	0	5	11
		Delegate authority	53	11	0	0	3	11
		Resource allocation	42	17	1	1	4	13
		Safety and health training	40	25	1	0	1	11
		Safety/health performance	44	19	1	0	1	13
	Employee Participation	Process involvement	42	21	1	0	1	13
		Organizational decision-making on resources	29	26	3	1	6	13
		Organizational decision-making on training	28	29	4	0	4	13
		Evaluation of OSH performance	33	25	2	0	5	13
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								

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 to allow the Department of Labor to annually collect the statutorily-required injury and illness records from all Executive Branch agencies. In 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 was to assist agencies and OSHA identify worksites with the highest injury and illness rates, as well as to provide greater precision on the training needs of federal agencies. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), which worked with OSHA in developing the rule, collects the data and provides it to OSHA.

CY 2016 marked the third completed data collection cycle. OSHA continued to work with BLS to track the data collected and monitor the quality of that data. In addition, OSHA worked with

OWCP to assist those agencies using the E-Comp system[6], to ensure that all the required data was captured, and explain the procedures for transferring the data from E-Comp 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 the reporting period, OSHA received complete establishment data from 49 of 96 agencies and partial data from an additional 26 agencies. The most common errors identified in the submitted data were the failures to provide the number of employees or hours worked 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. In addition, OSHA will analyze the collection process itself for lessons learned to further streamline and simplify the process.

Injury and Illness Rates
In the data provided, agencies reported a total of 24 deaths. In addition, agencies reported a total of 28,578 injuries. This total includes 195 skin disorder conditions; 248 respiratory conditions; 14 poisonings; 622 hearing loss conditions; and 1,153 cases of other illnesses.

Compliance Assistance

Agency Technical Assistance Request
An agency technical assistance request, (ATAR) is a consultative service open only to federal agencies, and is similar 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 visit, 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 2016, four OSHA Area Offices conducted one ATAR each during the reporting period.
- The Anchorage, Alaska Area Office assisted the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Tsunami Center in Palmer, Alaska regarding Life Safety Code issues. NOAA corrected all ATAR findings.
- The Bellevue, Washington Area Office conducted an ATAR for the U.S. Navy at the Naval Base Kitsap. The Navy, had recently moved its Port Operations Division out of the Shipyard, and wanted to verify that it was correctly following OSHA standards regarding confined space, temporary wiring, and PPE for working on or adjacent to the water. After visiting the areas in question and reviewing Port Operations programs, OSHA determined that Port Operations were in compliance with OSHA standards.

---

[6] E-Comp is an OWCP electronic reporting system that also allows federal agencies to maintain their OSHA required injury and illness data.

- The Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Area Office provided assistance to the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) when DLA expressed concern that there might be asbestos contamination in one of its buildings. After conducting sampling, OSHA determined that there were no detectable levels of asbestos in the building.
- The Mobile, Alabama Area Office assisted the Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division with indoor air quality sampling and compliance assistance.

Field Federal Safety and Health Councils

Field Federal Safety and Health Councils 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.

Agencies reported that their involvement varied from extensive engagement to occasional attendance at FFSHC meetings. The DoD, for example, reported that approximately 30% of its components participated in local FFHSCs during CY 2016. Many of the DoD components hosted local and regional meetings and provided logistical support. Similarly, the EPA reported that 19 of its employees participated in 10 FFSHCs. Collectively, the EPA employees attended more than 30 FFSHC meetings in CY 2016. Only eight agencies reported that they provided in-kind support to their local Councils during CY 2016. That support ranged from generating meeting notices and providing meeting space to assisting the FFSHC with program development.

In CY 2016, 32 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 2016, and other Council information.) According to the annual reports FFSHCs submitted to OSHA, 31 departments and agencies participated in the councils and over 2,000 federal employees attended meetings and or training provided by the council. Some agencies, like the U.S. Navy, indicated that participation had decreased as a result of limited funds and personnel shortages. Other agencies, like the Department of the Interior, reported that the lack of nationwide coverage by the Councils, particularly in rural areas, limited participation.

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 each individual FFSHC's program plans, and 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 against other FFSHCs in its category. The top three scorers in each category receive awards for Superior Performance, Meritorious Achievement, and Notable Recognition.

In CY 2016, nine FFSHCs received a Secretarial award for their council activities. By category, these were:

Category I: FFSHCs serving an area with a federal employee population exceeding 24,000
- Superior Performance – Greater New York
- Meritorious Achievement – Dallas/Ft. Worth
- Notable Recognition – Oklahoma

Category II: FFSHCs serving an area with a federal employee population 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

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.[7] 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*.

---

[7] 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.

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, Pyrotechnics*; 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.

FEDWEEK

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 declined over the years (Please see Table 5 below.). Similar to previous years' offerings, at the CY 2016 event, OSHA provided eight half-day seminars, offered twice during the week on topics chosen after surveying federal OSH personnel. The 73 federal OSH employee participants, had the opportunity to attend up to six different sessions on various topics, including: *Machine Guarding, Fall Protection, Industrial Hygiene Sampling Methods, Recordkeeping, Construction Safety, Confined Spaces, Forklift and Material Handling, and, Fire Protection.* OSHA generally seeks input from federal agencies when developing the FEDWEEK curriculum.

Table 5: *FEDWEEK Participation by Attendees and Calendar Year (2016-2014).*

	Calendar Year		
	2016	**2015**	**2014**
Participants	73	93	109
Seminar Registrants	NA*	458	477
Agencies Represented	NA*	18	34

*A new system for registering students did not include this information.

Previous years' seminar topics have included: Asbestos Management and Housekeeping; Construction Safety (Focus 4); Electrical; Fire Protection; Forklift and Material Handling; Hearing Conservation; Hazard Communications – Aligning with GHS; Industrial Hygiene Sampling Methods; and Safety and Health Management Systems. In addition, the Institute offers 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

The Federal Agency OSH Managers' Roundtable is a valuable tool for agencies to exchange information on safety and health issues, and to share agency best practices. Since its inception,

the number of federal senior OSH managers, medical personnel, technical experts, and labor representatives participating in the Roundtable has increased significantly. Additionally, the topics addressed during Roundtables demonstrate added value for participating agencies. In 2016, the Office of Federal Agency Programs held two Roundtables. On February 18, the meeting agenda included information on the National Safety Stand Down, OSHA's Safety and Health Management Program Guidelines, and Recordkeeping. On September 8, the three presentations included: the Naval Safety Center Guidance on Electronic Cigarette Prohibition, an update on OSHA Recordkeeping, and OSHA Worker Safety and Health Activities and the Ongoing Zika Virus Outbreak. Both Roundtables included OSHA updates and open discussions.

Section 2 – Federal Agency OSH Activities

This section provides information on agency-reported fatalities and hospitalizations, as well as selected agency activities, including participation in OSH committees and councils, and 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 to support the Government's pursuit of improved safety and health conditions for federal employees. A summary of their activities is provided at the end of this section.

Fatalities and Hospitalizations

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 hospitalizations to OSHA in an expeditious manner. For the CY 2016 reporting period, agencies reported 24 federal civilian employee fatalities. This is approximately a 12.5 percent increase from the 21 work-related federal civilian employee fatalities reported for CY 2015, and a 45 percent increase from the 13 reported for CY 2014.

Below is a breakdown of the number of fatalities/hospitalizations by department and agency for CY 2016.

Agency	Fatalities	Hospitalizations
Department of Agriculture		
U.S. Forest Service	1	0
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	3	0
Department of Commerce		
Bureau of Industry and Security (Census)	0	1
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	0	1
Department of Defense		
Defense Logistics Agency	1	6
Department of the Army	1	28
Department of the Navy	0	8
DoD Education Activity	0	4
Defense Contract Management Agency	0	1
Defense Finance and Accounting Service	0	1
Department of Homeland Security		
Customs and Border Patrol	1	56
Immigration and Customs Enforcement	0	22
Transportation Security Administration	0	3

U.S. Coast Guard	0	10
U.S. Secret Service	0	2
Department of the Interior		
Bureau of Indian Affairs	3	17
Bureau of Land Management	3	1
Fish and Wildlife Service	1	0
National Park Service	1	0
Department of Justice		
Federal Bureau of Investigation	0	9
U.S. Marshals Service	1	2
Department of Labor		
Job Corps	1	4
Department of State	5	1
Department of Veterans Affairs	0	4
National Archives and Records Administration	0	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2
Total	**24**	**184**

Summary of Agency Fatality/ Hospitalization Reports

The Department of Agriculture reported four fatalities:
- A Forest Service Hotshot crew member, fighting the Strawberry Fire in Great Basin National Park, NV, was hit by a falling tree.
- The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service experienced three separate fatalities involving aircraft crashes.

The Department of Commerce reported two hospitalizations:
- A Census worker slipped on ice when stepping onto a respondent's stairs, resulting in a knee injury and hospitalization.
- While replacing a filter, a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration employee overexerted himself lifting an 80-lb suction louver to shoulder height, injuring his shoulder and requiring hospitalization.

The DoD reported two work-related fatalities and 48 hospitalizations for civilian employees. The Army reported one fatality and 28 hospitalizations; the DLA reported one fatality and six hospitalizations; the Defense Finance and Accounting Service reported a hospitalization; the Navy reported eight hospitalizations; the Defense Contract Management Agency reported a hospitalization; and the DoD Education Activity reported four hospitalizations.

Department of the Army
- An Army employee was killed when a hydraulic scissor lift he was performing maintenance on fell on him.
- Seven employees, in separate incidents, slipped, tripped, or fell. Locations included walking down a hall, climbing stairs, exercising outside, and walking through a parking lot.
- Four employees, in separate incidents, were struck by an object. The incidents included an employee being struck by a fire extinguisher after someone else dropped it, an employee being struck by a saw blade, an employee being struck by a piece of metal while operating a backhoe, and an employee being struck by a food rack.
- Four employees, in separate incidents, were injured by over exertion. The incidents included an employee lifting a 71 pound crankshaft that was too heavy, an employee participating in an exercise class, an employee playing volleyball, and an employee lifting weights.
- Three employees, in separate incidents, had fingers partially amputated. The incidents included an employee severing his fingertip while opening the front fender skirt of an M88A2 tank, an employee severing his finger while conducting scheduled vehicle extrication training, and an employee severing his fingers while working on a generator fan.
- Two employees were injured in separate motor vehicle accidents. The incidents included an employee's vehicle being struck by another vehicle while turning, and an employee's vehicle colliding with the rear of a commercial truck at a stop light.
- One employee experienced an insect bite. An employee's sleeves were rolled up during outdoor operations due to extreme heat, which exposed his bare arms to an insect.
- One employee was diagnosed with a liver abscess after becoming weak, dizzy, and very sick.
- One employee was burned by a caustic cleaner that soaked into the employee's boot while cleaning air conditioning coils.
- One employee experienced heat stress after working in and out of swimming pool pump houses all day during very hot conditions.
- One employee who was adding refrigerant to an air conditioning system was injured by inhaling Freon when it leaked.
- One employee who was inspecting ID cards at a security gate had a toe amputated when a tire left the roadway and ran up on the curb striking the employee's right foot.
- One employee was electrocuted as a result of touching a bare wire in the ceiling while working on a ladder.
- One employee who was welding, had a hand crushed when a hydraulic ram pinched the employee's left hand.

Defense Logistics Agency
- A firefighter/paramedic suffered a fatal heart attack while at work.

- An employee slipped on snow and ice and fractured an ankle, requiring hospitalization.
- An employee was struck by rolling bar stock while standing on a ladder. The force of the bar stock hitting the ladder caused the ladder to fall backward and topple, throwing the employee to the floor. The employee was hospitalized with a several broken bones and a punctured spleen.
- An employee was closing a ramp access door on an unserviceable Bradley Fighting Vehicle when the troop ramp became disengaged and fell open, pinning the employee's legs to the ground under the ramp. The employee was hospitalized with several injuries.
- An employee fractured vertebrae when manually pulling a heavy tire into place while installing it on an axle.
- While manually rolling a cannon barrel assembly off the forks of material handling equipment, an employee suffered two broken toes and a significant laceration when the metal coupler plate connecting the two pieces of the assembly caught the front edge of the crate causing it to strike the employee. The employee was hospitalized as a result of the injuries.
- After straightening out tie-down straps in order to secure palletized containers to a flatbed trailer, an employee fell while attempting to get off the trailer. The employee suffered three fractures and a shoulder injury, resulting in hospitalization.

Defense Finance and Accounting Service
- After a rain, an employee slipped on the wet concrete stairs he was climbing to enter his place of work. The employee fell forward into a wooden door jamb, causing a cut to the right side of the head and a spearing injury which compressed the spinal cord and paralyzed the employee. The employee was hospitalized to due to the injuries suffered.

Department of the Navy
- After completing the installation of a panel on an aircraft, an employee fell while descending a three-step ladder attached to the maintenance stand. The employee landed on the back of his head, requiring hospitalization.
- Two employees, offloading shipping containers from a truck, were injured when the container hit the floor and exploded, causing the top lid to strike the employees in the head and face area. Both employees were hospitalized.
- An employee, working as a forklift spotter, was injured and required hospitalization after stepping backward off the loading dock and falling to the ground.
- An employee was assisting in cutting a 3/4" sheet of plywood on the table saw. The splitter detached from the table saw, was propelled through the blade guard, and impacted the worker's right bicep. The employee had a severe laceration and was hospitalized.
- While cleaning a 600 amp connector with a cotton t-shirt moistened with alcohol, an employee received a shock from a 12kV electrical system. The employee was hospitalized with injuries.

- While replacing a pump at a sewage lift station, an installer attempted to step over the unsecured pump. The employee's foot became tangled in loose pump wires and pulled the unsecured pump onto the employee's leg. The employee's injuries required hospitalization.
- During the installation of an air conditioning duct work panel into a dropped ceiling, an employee lost his grip on the panel, which fell and lacerated his forearm. The employee was hospitalized due to the injury.
- As an employee was walking to her office, she experienced tingling in her arm and pain in her chest. The employee sat on the ground and then fainted. The employee was hospitalized due to fatigue.

Defense Contract Management Agency
- An employee tripped and fell while descending a stairwell, suffering injuries that required hospitalization.

DoD Education Activity
- An employee, walking backwards and directing students to follow her inside after holding outdoor recess, tripped over a student behind her and fell backwards onto the sidewalk. Her resulting hip fracture required surgery and hospitalization.
- An employee, standing on a chair in the classroom, stepped down, fell backwards, and landed on her right wrist. She was taken to the hospital for surgery.
- Walking outside on a paved path to her classroom, an employee tripped and injured her leg, requiring hospitalization.
- An employee, rehearsing a dance skit for an upcoming pep rally, sustained injuries to both wrists when she attempted a back handspring. Her injuries required hospitalization.

The Department of Homeland Security reported one work-related fatality and 93 hospitalizations. Customs and Border Patrol reported one fatality and 56 hospitalizations; Immigration and Customs Enforcement reported 22 hospitalizations; the Transportation Security Administration reported three hospitalizations; the U.S. Coast Guard reported 10 hospitalizations; and the U.S. Secret Service reported two hospitalizations.

Customs and Border Patrol
- An employee operating a motor vehicle died in a collision with a semi-truck.
- Fifteen employees were injured due to overexertion.
- Eight employees slipped, tripped, or fell in separate incidents.
- Four employees were injured in a vehicular accident.
- Four employees were injured in an ATV accident.
- Three employees were hospitalized due to stress.
- Two employees suffered blood clots.
- Two employees were struck by a vehicle.
- Two employees contracted an infectious disease.
- Two employees suffered spider bites.

- Two employees suffered snake bites.
- Two employees were punctured by a tree or plant.
- Two employees were bitten by canines.
- Two employees were injured in horseback riding incidents.
- One employee suffered a heart attack.
- One employee was injured in a motorcycle accident.
- One employee was injured when a weapon accidently discharged.
- One employee was injured during a law enforcement action.
- One employee was injured falling from a chair.
- One employee's finger was partially amputated when a canine bit it during training.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement
- Four employees were injured in vehicular accidents.
- Three employees were hospitalized due to stress.
- Two employees slipped, tripped, or fell in separate incidents.
- Two employees suffered heart attacks.
- One employee suffered an overexertion injury during physical training.
- One employee was struck by a car.
- One employee contracted an infectious disease.
- One employee suffered a gunshot.
- One employee suffered a spider bite.
- One employee was injured during a law enforcement action.
- One employee suffered a stroke.
- One employee had a seizure.
- One employee suffered injuries from an unknown cause.

Transportation Security Administration
- An employee suffered a heart attack during physical training and required hospitalization.
- Two employees were hospitalized due to health issues.

U.S. Coast Guard
- Three employees were injured when they fell in the shipyard.
- Two employees fell through unsecured shipboard openings.
- Two employees were struck by falling material in the shipyard.
- Two employees suffered overexertion injuries when lifting objects.
- One employee's finger was severely cut while operating a band saw.

U.S. Secret Service
- An employee on a protective detail fell from a ladder and required hospitalization.
- An employee had a heart condition that required hospitalization.

The Department of the Interior reported eight fatalities and 18 hospitalizations:
- Two employees died and one employee was injured when their vehicle blew a tire and rolled off the road.

- An employee, driving a motorcycle to the site of a Search and Rescue operation, was fatally injured after losing control.
- An employee operating a dump truck got stuck in the mud up to the chassis while the truck bed was in the raised position. The employee attempted to lower the bed, and the bed fell on the operator causing a fatality.
- An employee died when the mower he was operating entered the adjoining roadway and was struck by a passing vehicle.
- An employee sustained a fatal injury during a rollover motor vehicle accident.
- Employees en route to a fire incident were involved in a motor vehicle accident. Two employees sustained fatal injuries and nine employees were hospitalized.
- Six firefighters, working on a section of uncontained fire line, were entrapped when a large fire whirl formed near them. All six firefighters required hospitalization.
- An employee was working on replacing a four-inch sewer line at the housing unit when the employee's open wound came in contact with sewer water, resulting in blood poisoning and subsequent hospitalization.
- An employee, removing weeds in a yard, was bitten by a spider and required hospitalization.

The Department of Justice reported one fatality and 11 hospitalizations:
- A U.S. Marshals Service agent was killed in a line-of-duty shooting incident, during the execution of an arrest warrant for a fugitive.
- Four employees sustained leg injuries while completing training exercises.
- Three employees received line-of duty gunshot injuries.
- One employee sustained an overexertion injury while moving a refrigerator.
- One employee struck an object when the wind caught his parachute during a jump.
- One employee fell through a ceiling.
- One employee fell while walking.

The Department of Labor reported one fatality and four hospitalizations:
- A Job Corps employee died in a vehicular accident and a Job Corp student was hospitalized.
- A Job Corps student accessed an attic storage area to retrieve materials and fell through a sheetrock ceiling.
- A Job Corps student was guiding a 600 pound deck to the ground, and the deck dropped onto the employee's hand.
- A Job Corps student was using a gas-powered wood splitter when a piece of wood split and hit the employee's hand causing a laceration and amputation.

The Department of State reported five fatalities and one hospitalization:

- Two employees suffered fatal injuries when their vehicle was impacted by an improvised explosive device.
- An employee was shot in the line of duty.
- An employee operating a utility vehicle sustained fatal injuries when a wheel of the vehicle hit an incline area, causing it to roll over onto the operator.
- An employee suffered a fatal heart attack while walking to a meeting.
- An employee, exiting a Department building on his bicycle, struck his head on a roll-up weather door at the building exit, and was knocked off his bike. The employee required hospitalization and surgery due to his injuries.

The Department of Veterans Affairs reported four hospitalizations:
- An employee tripped and fell down a set of stairs, resulting in an injury.
- An employee performing electrical maintenance received an electrical shock.
- Two employees were injured in separate falling incidents.

The National Archives and Records Administration reported one hospitalization:
- An employee, moving a loaded cart down the ramp of a loading dock, lost footing and was pinned by the cart against a concrete wall.

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) reported two fatalities and two hospitalizations:
- An employee was fatally electrocuted while working on electrical equipment at a dam powerhouse.
- An employee died in the crash of a TVA helicopter.
- An employee was injured while aligning systems to flush a traveling water screen. When the line was pressurized to perform the flush, the force of the water caused the pipe to pivot, striking the employee on the elbow, resulting in a fractured right arm.
- An employee was injured while performing a cooling fan filter replacement. While inserting the new filter, his fingertips contacted the spinning fan blades, lacerating four of his five fingers.

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 is to monitor and assist an agency's safety and health program; maintain an open channel of communication between employees and management; and facilitate employee input to improve OSH-related policies, conditions, and practices.

When an agency decides to form a CSHC, it must report this intent to the Secretary. Specifically, the agency must provide information regarding the existence, location, and coverage area (establishments and populations) of the committee, and the names and phone numbers of each committee chair. In addition, the agency must certify 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 four such certified committees existed in CY 2016. The Secretary recognized the following Departments and independent agencies as having CSHCs:
- Central Intelligence Agency
- Department of Labor
- Tennessee Valley Authority
- U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission

As previously noted, agencies with CSHCs must provide the Secretary with an annual status report on their respective committees. 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 Central Intelligence Agency and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission did not report on their CSHCs for CY 2016. OSHA will be requesting they submit their review and determining whether their CSHCs should be revoked. The Department of Energy, which previously had a CSHC, is reportedly exploring the feasibility of re-establishing its Committee.

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 they encouraged employees to participate in local OSH-related council or committee activities and appropriate OSH professional organizations, such as the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH), the American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA), the American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE), and the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), as well as nationally- and locally-oriented safety organizations, such as the National Safety Council (NSC).

The Department of Commerce reported encouraging its employees to participate in professional organizations such as ASSE, AIHA, and NSC. Employees also participated in the Department's semiannual Occupational Safety and Health Council and monthly Safety Work Group meetings. The Smithsonian Institution reported its employees attended conferences and training sponsored by professional organizations such as the American Zoological Association, ACGIH, the Voluntary Protection Programs Participants' Association, the Society of Fire Protection Engineers, the Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections, the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works, the American Academy of Family Physicians, and the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. The

Department of State reported that its DASHO participated in the Office of Federal Agency Programs' Roundtable meetings.

There was little change from previous years in federal agency participation in other venues in support of their OSH programs. For CY 2016, 40 agencies (42 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 among agencies, with some comprised of various manager levels, others with members focused on expertise in a specific area, and still others had members with only OSH-related duties and responsibilities.

Motor Vehicle Safety

Collectively, 79 federal agencies provided information on the number (roughly 10,578) of motor vehicle accidents their employees experienced during CY 2016. 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 motor vehicle accidents.

Similar to previous years, many agencies reported requiring defensive driving courses, with a majority using courses through GSA, the NSC, 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.

The Department of State reported using Event Data Recorders, both domestically and overseas, to monitor drivers and believed this approach reduced fatalities and injuries associated with operating motor vehicles. State added three overseas posts to its Drive-Cam™ program in CY 2016, bringing the total to 19 posts. State reported that these posts reduced risky driving behaviors by 82%, with an estimated 44 lives saved since the program's inception overseas. During 2016, the Department tracked a 26% reduction in seatbelt policy violations and a 17% reduction of cell phone policy violations compared with 2015 totals. Domestically, the Fleet Management Office installed a total of 16 Event Data Recorders to monitor driver performance –nine in passenger vans, and seven in shuttle buses.

The Department of the Air Force reported that its installations used national motor vehicle safety programs such as the American Automobile Association's *Defensive Driving* and the NSC's *Alive at 25*. These programs served to further reinforce motor vehicle safety and mishap prevention. The Department's policy and guidance directly addressed compliance with E.O. 13043 and 13513 regarding seatbelt use and distracted driving. The Department also reported that civilian employees who operated motorcycles in the performance of their duties must

attend motorcycle safety training and those civilian employees who operated motorcycles for personal use outside of their assigned duties were eligible to attend the same motorcycle safety training on a no-cost, space available basis. The Air Force's civilian workers who operated a government motor vehicle other than a motorcycle, such as general purpose or specialized vehicles, receive operator training as part of their employment. The Department noted that it continued to use *Street Smart* presentations conducted by Stay Alive From Education (S.A.F.E.) Inc., often funded through a grant from Anheuser Busch. The *Street Smart* program used audience participation to demonstrate, from first responders' perspectives and real-life experiences, what happened to individuals who made poor driving choices: driving without seatbelts, driving under the influence of alcohol/drugs, texting while driving.

Twelve 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 item. 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. OSHA will be following up with agencies to offer assistance in addressing motor vehicle safety.

Those agencies reporting that they did not have a MVSP include: Ability One Commission, Access Board, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, African Development Foundation, Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Corporation for National and Community Service, Federal Labor Relations Authority, Institute of Museum and Library Services, Inter-American Foundation, the Postal Regulatory Commission, and the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Table 6. *Summary of Motor Vehicle Accidents as Reported by Departments and Independent Agencies (Fiscal Year 2014 through Calendar Year 2016)*.

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2016 (2015/2014)
Department of Agriculture	⬇	2013 (2,117/2,321)
Department of the Air Force	⬇	18 (29/25)
Department of the Army	?	15 (NR/11)
Department of Commerce	⬇	106 (102/141)
Department of Defense	⬆	638 (485/NR)
Department of Energy	?	95 (NR/NR)

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2016 (2015/2014)
Department of Health and Human Services	⬆	147 (88/80)
Department of Homeland Security	⬇	1,126 (1,127/1,441)
Department of Housing and Urban Development	?	NR (0/10)
Department of Justice	⬆	2,303 (1,971/2,493)
Department of Labor	⬆	498 (487/384)
Department of the Interior	⬇	497 (618/581)
Department of the Navy	⬆	15 (9/10)
Department of State	⬆	1,885(1,692/1,200)
Department of Transportation	⬆	181 (50/NR)
Department of the Treasury	⬆	329 (196/387)
Department of Veterans Affairs	⬆	402 (308/215)
Environmental Protection Agency	⬆	43 (39/37)
General Services Administration	⬇	69 (72/35)
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	⬇	85 (135/0)
Social Security Administration	⬆	32 (16/15)
Tennessee Valley Authority	?	NR (160/157)
Office of Personnel Management	⬆	209 (177/190)
American Battle Monuments Commission	⬌	0 (0/NR)
Armed Forces Retirement Home	⬇	0 (3/0)
Broadcasting Board of Governors	?	1 (NR/NR)
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	⬌	0 (0/0)
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	?	NR (NR/NR)
Consumer Product Safety Commission	⬆	7 (2/6)

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2016 (2015/2014)
Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency	?	NR (4/13)
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	⬇	7 (12/NR)
Export-Import Bank of the United States	⬌	0 (0/0)
Farm Credit Administration	⬌	0 (0/2)
Federal Communications Commission	⬌	5 (5/2)
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	⬇	35 (40/0)
Federal Elections Commission	⬌	0 (0/0)
Federal Housing Finance Agency	?	0
Federal Labor Relations Authority	?	0
Federal Maritime Commission	⬌	0 (0/0)
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	⬌	0 (0/0)
Federal Mine Safety & Health Review Commission	⬌	0 (0/0)
Federal Reserve Board	⬆	3 (0/0)
Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board	⬌	0 (0/0)
Federal Trade Commission	?	0 (0/NR)
Holocaust Memorial Museum	⬌	0 (0/0)
International Boundary and Water Commission	⬇	4 (7/7)
John F. Kennedy Center	?	0 (0/NR)
Millennium Challenge Corporation	⬌	0 (0/0)
Morris K. Udall & Stewart L. Udall Foundation	⬌	0 (0/0)
National Archives and Records Administration	⬌	1 (1/0)
National Capital Planning Commission	⬌	0 (0/0)

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2016 (2015/2014)
National Gallery of Art	?	1 (NR/NR)
National Labor Relations Board	⬆	1 (0/5)
National Transportation Safety Board	?	NR (NR/NR)
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	⬆	10 (1/6)
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	⬄	0 (0/0)
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	⬆	1 (0/0)
Railroad Retirement Board	⬄	0 (0/0)
Securities and Exchange Commission	⬄	0 (0/0)
Small Business Administration	⬄	1 (1/3)
Smithsonian Institution	⬆	30 (26/17)
The Peace Corps	?	NR (2/3)
Trade and Development Agency	⬆	1 (0/0)
Vietnam Education Foundation	⬄	0 (0/0)

Legend			
⬄	No change from 2015 report	NR	Not reported
⬇	Decrease from 2015 report	?	Undetermined from reported data
⬆	Increase from 2015 report		

Analyzing and Controlling Hazards

This year, OSHA again asked agencies how they determined any OSH-related trends, such as specific causes/ types of injuries, or hazardous jobs/ tasks. Of the 76 agencies that provided information on this topic, 41 (54 percent) reported that the most frequent cause of employee injuries was slips, trips, and falls. Other common 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. Some agencies noted that their statistics were so low that they could not identify a "most frequent" cause.

Agencies included a variety of prevention strategies to counter injurious incidents. Most reported relying on the accurate employee and supervisor reports to identify hazard areas. Other approaches included: installing slip-resistant flooring and warning signage; prevention awareness training, including ergonomics and ladder safety; general housekeeping

improvement, including removing slip, trip, and fall hazards and placing cleaning supplies and equipment in accessible areas; and the 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 2017, designed 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, and 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, 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. Other strategies for reducing workplace injuries and illnesses included integrating safety considerations into building design and/or job duties and procedures; encouraging employees to report potential hazards upon discovery; and focusing on specific problems, such as frequent types of injuries or specific hazards. Agencies stressed the importance of self-inspection in identifying hazards, and analyzing and controlling hazards.

Safety and Health Program Response to the Inspection Process
Federal agencies were asked to report on their involvement in a variety of inspection activities, including internal and external agency inspections. Agencies' responses varied widely regarding their involvement in the inspection process, from correcting hazards during the course of an inspection to working with GSA and other entities for hazard abatement, and consulting with OSHA on abatement methods. Many also reported updating policy and procedural guidance. Most agencies indicated that they encouraged employees and supervisors to participate in the inspection process.

Collectively, 58 agencies affirmed that they performed at least annual internal OSH program inspections/audits. The Department of Defense reportedly required each of its organizations to complete a program self-assessment annually and to pass an external assessment every four years. As a result, during CY 2016, the Army reported that approximately 43,000 OSH

inspections occurred, of which approximately 10% were conducted by outside agencies. The Department of Labor conducted inspections at 827 of its 966 establishments (86% of its establishments).

Several agencies reported an increase in the frequency of inspections. The Smithsonian Institute, for example, reported that it required each of its establishments (museums/facilities) to conduct at least three self-inspections every year. Some of its establishments increased the frequency of self-inspections in order to achieve a uniform level of facility safety throughout the year.

In addition to self-inspections/audits, agencies reported that external regulatory agencies performed routine OSH-related inspections on their establishments. While most agencies that reported outside inspections did not specify the exact number of such inspections/audits, they did indicate receiving more than 400 Notices of Unsafe or Unhealthy Working Conditions or the equivalent from the various external regulatory agencies. The external agencies that issued the Notices (or equivalents) included the Joint Commission, OSHA, and Mine Safety and Health Administration. Commonly cited hazards included impediments to egress; fire safety; hazard communication; OSH training, at all levels of responsibility; personal protective equipment programs, including respiratory protection; poor housekeeping; 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, which require agencies to provide safe and healthful workplaces, have no geographical limits. During the CY 2016 reporting year, 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 102,000 government employees worked outside the United States' borders during CY 2016. The Departments of Defense (including the armed services), which reported approximately 39,309 overseas employees, and State (59,522 employees) reported the largest numbers of overseas employees. The DoD, its various components, and the military Departments indicated that they extended their OSH programs and coverage to include their overseas federal civilian employees. The State Department indicated that its robust overseas OSH program included provisions for safe and healthful living conditions for its own overseas employees, and for other agencies' federal employees stationed at embassies. 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, a few agencies reported an overseas federal workforce, most of whom were covered under either DoD's or State's OSH programs.

Table 7. *Number of Federal Civilian Employees in Overseas Locations by Agency (2016, 2015 and 2014)* (n = 27 agencies).

Agency	Status	Number of Employees		
		2016	2015	2014
Department of Agriculture	⟺	400	400	400
Department of Commerce	?	NR	NR	NR
Department of Defense	⬇	39,309	60,000	46,264
Department of Energy	?	NR	NR	NR
Department of Health and Human Services	?	NR	NR	NR
Department of Homeland Security	⟺	2,100	2,100	2,100
Department of the Interior	?	NR	NR	NR
Department of Justice	⬆	431	426	500
Department of Labor	⬇	0	30	30
Department of State	⬆	59,522	57,888	56,104
Department of Transportation	?	NR	NR	NR
Department of the Treasury	⬆	48	46	0
Department of Veterans Affairs	⟺	0	0	0
Environmental Protection Agency	⬇	183	199	247
General Services Administration	?	NR	NR	12
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	⬆	14	12	NR
Consumer Product Safety Commission	⟺	2	2	0
Millennium Challenge Corporation	⬆	26	22	22
National Endowment for the Humanities	?	NR	NR	8
National Science Foundation	?	NR	NR	NR
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	⟺	4	4	8
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	⬆	5	4	1

Agency	Status	Number of Employees		
		2016	2015	2014
Peace Corps	⬇	186	191	181
Postal Regulatory Commission	⬌	0	0	40
Smithsonian Institution	?	NR	NR	NR
Social Security Administration		0	NR	6
U.S. Trade and Development Agency	⬆	37	30	NR
TOTAL	⬇	102,267	121,354	105,923
Legend				
⬌ No change from CY 2014 report	NR	Not reported		
⬇ Decrease from CY 2014 report	?	Undetermined from reported data		
⬆ Increase from CY 2014 report				

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 report on the OSH-related training they provided to their employees.

Agencies noted a range of employee support services for OSH-related activities. Some reported that employee training was 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 encouraging employees 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. Topics included workplace safety best practices, accident analysis, personal emergency preparedness, and surveillance programs. Agencies reported using conventional 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 monies dedicated for OSH training efforts, it was evident that training budgets varied dramatically, and that agency size was not a determinant. The Holocaust Memorial Museum reported that it is only able to allocate $15,000 for its entire OSH program. Among larger agencies, the Environmental Protection Agency reported that its training budget was $391,800; the Department of Health and Human Services reported allocating $3,000,000; and the Department of the Army noted that its OSH training budget was $26,000,000.

The EPA described an exemplary OSH training program. The Agency routinely identified OSH training needs, provided training, assessed competencies, and tracked the completion of training requirements. It was continually working to strengthen the training program. In 2014 the Agency reported that it was transitioning to a centralized online tracking system, and had 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 2016, nine of the EPA's 10 regions, Environmental Response Team, and portions of the Office of Research and Development had transitioned to the new system. The EPA was working with its remaining region and the rest of its program offices to complete the transition by September 2017. According to the EPA, having this information available in real time would greatly improve efficiency during national response events.

In addition to the above information regarding federal agency OSH training, OSHA asked federal agencies to describe their overall experience with the 2014 *Occupational Safety and Health Training Guidelines for Federal Agencies*. While the majority of agencies did not address their experience with the *Guidelines*, of those that responded to the question, 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 such allegations. OSHA also asked agencies to describe program improvements that may have resulted from these cases of employee-alleged reprisal.

Nearly all agencies indicated awareness of 29 CFR §1960, Subpart G, and reported having functional protection programs. Only two agencies reported investigating allegations of reprisal during CY 2016. The Air Force stated that it opened two cases. The first case was unsubstantiated but in the second case, the Air Force disciplined one employee for whistleblower violations, eventually removing the employee. The Smithsonian Institute reported investigating two allegations of reprisal during the calendar year. In the first matter, a union steward alleged that a union employee was subjected to reprisal after rejecting a buyout offer. The allegations included the employee being assigned to a painting project that was not part of his job description, failing to receive a completed Job Hazard Analysis form, and failing to be issued appropriate personal protective equipment. The Smithsonian Office of the Inspector General (OIG) found that these allegations were unsubstantiated. Upon review of the case, both OSHA and the Smithsonian rejected the safety and health allegations. In the second matter, a union steward alleged that he was subjected to reprisal for reporting the earlier complaint to the Smithsonian's Office of Safety, Health, and Environmental Management, OSHA, and the OIG. The reported reprisal included an unwelcomed shift change, a letter of reprimand, and a proposal to suspend. The OIG found that these allegations were unsubstantiated.

Product Safety Programs

In the CY 2016 information request, OSHA asked the agencies describe their compliance with the provisions of 29 CFR 1960.34, specifically addressing how each agency ensured that the products and services it procured complied with the product safety requirements of the standard, including the use of safety data sheets (SDSs), and responding to product recalls. Of the 73 responding agencies, 47 reported their compliance with the standard, and 26 indicated that such a program did not exist within their respective agencies. The remaining agencies did not respond to this item.

Most agencies provided few details on their programs, noting program-specific authority was 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 required purchases to 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 its component OSH program managers monitored product recalls, and local offices received follow-up information as appropriate using alerts and electronic webpage postings. Among smaller agencies, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) reported that it only purchased and used products that are UL (Underwriters Laboratory) listed and used in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations and guidelines. It also noted that it strictly adhered to its Hazard Communication Program requirements, including issuing and reviewing all SDSs, and maintained an electronic SDS database for all products used at FDIC. The Corporation stated that its managers followed product recalls in their program areas.

The Environmental Protection Agency's product safety program was noteworthy. The EPA reported that its OSH program was covered under its Safety, Health and Environmental Management Program (SHEMP), implemented throughout all levels of the EPA. The EPA also reported that it subscribed to ChemWatch, a database that provides access to Safety Data Sheets for millions of chemicals. SHEMP managers used this repository to learn about the properties and potential hazards associated with new chemicals that entered their facilities. According to the agency's report, although it had not developed a comprehensive product safety program to address 29 CFR 1960.34(b), 89 percent of its operating locations had procedures in place to ensure that OSH managers were notified when new chemicals, such as cleaning agents, pesticides, and laboratory reagents, were introduced into their processes. The OSH managers then determined the associated introduced risks. Safety professionals and relevant employees reviewed the SDSs, and kept them available for reference. Moreover, EPA indicated that in a recent questionnaire, 89 percent of its operation location OSH managers reported compliance with labeling hazardous materials, wearing the correct personal protective equipment and adhering to special handling procedures, and complying with product recalls.

Specific Agency Reporting Requirements

OSHA's regulations "Basic Program Elements for Federal Employees", 29 CFR 1960, Subpart E requires GSA and NIOSH to assist federal agencies with specific activities affecting federal employee safety and health. OSHA requested that GSA and NIOSH provide details on these activities in their annual reports. Specifically, OSHA asked GSA to report on its programs for ensuring that federal facilities are designed, operated, and maintained in accordance with OSH requirements and best practices. OSHA also asked the agency to address how it 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 requested that NIOSH provide information on its Request for Technical Assistance[8] program, and the program's effect on federal agencies.

General Services Administration

As requested, GSA reported on its processes pertaining to facilities and operations, indicating that it continually updated the safety and health requirements in the governing standards and

---

[8] A Request for Technical Assistance to NIOSH, by a federal agency, usually involves a Health Hazard Evaluation (HHE), a workplace study to learn whether workers are exposed to hazardous materials or harmful conditions. On the basis of the information provided, NIOSH answers an HHE/ technical assistance request in one of the following ways: responds in writing with pertinent information or a referral to a more appropriate agency; calls to discuss the problems and how they might be solved; or, visits 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 an 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.

requirements regarding both federally-owned facilities and those commercially leased to federal tenants. It also reported that both its operations and maintenance and custodial services required safety and health specifications, which were current. In CY 2016, GSA did not implement any significant changes within its products and services function. It continued to require that products and services met applicable federal and non-government standards, such as those of the EPA, Underwriters Laboratory, and National Fire Protection Association. There were no product recalls issued in the 2016 reporting period.

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

NIOSH reported it received 43 federal agency technical assistance requests for health hazard evaluations. It completed 36 of those requests, performing four field investigations and 32 record reviews/consultations. Federal agencies' requests varied by both exposure groups and health problems. For the reporting period, the exposure group categories of indoor environmental quality, biological, and chemical accounted for over 95 percent of assistance requests. The health problem category of respiratory accounted for nearly 38 percent of assistance requests, with the categories of mental/behavioral and nervous comprising another 38 percent of the grouping. (Please see Appendix 4 for a breakdown of agencies' requests to NIOSH for technical assistance.)

Appendices

Appendix 1: Safety and Health Program Attributes Evaluated in CY 2016

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)**
    - **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.
    - **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.
    - **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.

- **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.

- o **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.
- o **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)**
  - o **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, which sets worker safety and health as an organizational priority.
  - o **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.
  - o **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.
  - o **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 OHS 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)**
  - **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.
  - **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.
  - **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.
  - **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	0	0
Access Board	1	1	1
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	1	0	0
African Development Foundation	1	1	1
Agency for International Development	5	0	0
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	1
Armed Forces Retirement Home	2	2	2
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	5	5	5
Broadcasting Board of Governors	32	29	1
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	2	2	2
Commission of Fine Arts	1	1	1
Commission on Civil Rights	6	0	0
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	4	4	4
Consumer Product Safety Commission	3	3	3
Corporation for National and Community Service	1	1	1
Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency	12	12	12
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	1	1	1
Department of Agriculture	2,301	861	861
Department of the Air Force	542	535	0
Department of the Army	692	505	259
Department of Commerce	709	663	63
Department of Defense	950	900	329
Department of Education	25	0	0

Department/Agency	Number of Establishments		
	Total	Submitted Data	Submitted Usable Data
Department of Energy	53	51	51
Department of Health and Human Services	1,110	447	96
Department of Homeland Security	1,193	463	252
Department of Housing and Urban Development	95	7	7
Department of the Interior	2,130	0	0
Department of Justice	1,581	1,051	233
Department of Labor	966	958	958
Department of the Navy	571	0	0
Department of State	396	0	0
Department of Transportation	1,092	887	887
Department of the Treasury	1,012	0	0
Department of Veterans Affairs	1,961	1,042	1,042
Environmental Protection Agency	165	108	108
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	54	50	50
Export-Import Bank	13	13	13
Farm Credit Administration	6	5	5
Federal Communications Commission	27	27	27
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	95	95	95
Federal Election Commission	1	1	1
Federal Housing Finance Agency	6	1	1
Federal Labor Relations Authority	7	7	7
Federal Maritime Commission	7	6	6
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	1	1	1
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission	3	3	3

Department/Agency	Number of Establishments		
	Total	Submitted Data	Submitted Usable Data
Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board	1	1	1
Federal Trade Commission	0	0	0
General Services Administration	445	0	0
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	0	0
Marine Mammal Commission	1	1	1
Merit Systems Protection Board	9	0	0
Millennium Challenge Corporation	22	1	1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	15	11	11
National Archives and Records Administration	42	41	41
National Capital Planning Commission	1	1	1
National Council on Disability	1	1	1
National Credit Union Administration	6	1	1
National Endowment for the Arts	1	1	1
National Endowment for the Humanities	1	0	0
National Gallery of Art	0	0	0
National Labor Relations Board	53	53	53
National Mediation Board	2	2	2

Department/Agency	Number of Establishments		
	Total	Submitted Data	Submitted Usable Data
National Science Foundation	1	1	1
National Transportation Safety Board	7	6	6
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	0	0	0
Office of Personnel Management	66	66	66
Office of Special Counsel	0	0	0
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	1	1	1
Peace Corps	78	1	1
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	4	4	4
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	32	32	32
Social Security Administration	1,896	1,610	1,610
Social Security Advisory Board	1	1	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	91	83	83
Trade and Development Agency	1	1	1
Udall Foundation	2	2	2

Department/Agency	Number of Establishments		
	Total	Submitted Data	Submitted Usable Data
Vietnam Education Foundation	1	1	1
Total	20,968	10,776	7,416

Appendix 3: Field Federal Safety & Health Councils

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

Region 2:
- Central New York FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Hudson Valley FFSHC
- Puerto Rico 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
- Minneapolis FFSHC

Region 6:
- Dallas/Fort Worth FFSHC
- Oklahoma 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 2016 by Federal Department/Agency

Department of Agriculture
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater Kansas FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- North Carolina FFHSC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC

Department of Commerce
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- North Carolina FFSHC

Department of Defense
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC

Department of Energy
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Department of Health and Human Services
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC

Department of Homeland Security
- Atlanta
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Detroit FFSHC
- Duluth FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Greater Omaha FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- Phoenix FFSHC
- San Francisco FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC

Department of Justice
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater Omaha FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- North Carolina FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC

Department of Labor
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Greater Omaha FFSHC
- Hudson Valley FFSHC

- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- North Carolina FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
- Southern New Jersey FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Department of State
- South Florida FFSHC

Department of Transportation
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Detroit FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater Omaha FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC

Department of Veterans Affairs
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Detroit FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Greater Omaha FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Hudson Valley FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Department of the Interior
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC

- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC

Department of the Treasury
- Dallas/Ft. worth
- Detroit 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 Kansas FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- North Carolina FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC

General Services Administration
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater Kansas FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania 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
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Hudson Valley FFSHC

US Air Force
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Detroit FFSHC
- Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- Greater Omaha FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- North Carolina FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

US Army
- Detroit FFSHC
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC

- Greater New York FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- North Carolina FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

US Navy
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- Mississippi Gulf Coast FFSHC

US Postal Service
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Dallas/Ft. Worth FFSHC
- Detroit FFSHC
- Greater Des Moines FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Phoenix FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC
- North Carolina FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC

FFSHCs with Non-Appointed Representatives in CY 2016 by Federal Department/Agency

Department of Agriculture
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Central New York FFSHC
- San Francisco FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Department of Commerce
- Louisville Area FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Department of Defense
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- San Francisco FFSHC

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

Department of Health and Human Services
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Chicago FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Phoenix FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Department of Homeland Security
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
- South Texas FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

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

Department of Justice
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- San Francisco FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Department of Labor
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Department of Transportation
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- Greater St. Louis FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC

Department of Veterans Affairs
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Central New York FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Louisville Area FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC

Department of the Interior
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Central Florida
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Louisville FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC
- San Francisco FFSHC

Department of the Treasury
- Chicago FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC
- San Francisco Bay FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
- South Texas FFSHC

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

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

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC

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

Small Business Administration
- Western New York FFSHC

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

US Air Force
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Central Florida FFSHC
- Central New York FFSHC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Kansas FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- South Texas FFSHC

US Army
- Central New York FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Louisville Area FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC
- San Francisco FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC
- South Texas FFSHC

US Navy
- Central Florida FFHSC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Minneapolis FFSHC.
- South Texas FFSHC

US Postal Service
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Central New York FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Hampton Roads FFSHC
- Oklahoma FFSHC
- San Francisco FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Departments/Agencies that Appointed New Representatives to FFSHCs in CY 2016

Department of Agriculture
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC

Department of Commerce
- **Greater Kansas City FFSHC**
- Minneapolis FFSHC

Department of Defense
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC

Department of Education
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC

Department of Energy
- Greater New York FFSHC

Department of Health and Human Services
- Greater Kansas City
- Minneapolis FFSHC

Department of Homeland Security
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Phoenix FFSHC
- Puerto Rico FFSHC

Department of Justice
- Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC

Department of Labor
- Atlanta FFSHC
- Duluth/Superior FFSHC
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC

Department of Transportation
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC

Department of Veterans Affairs
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Northeastern Pennsylvania FFSHC
- South Florida FFSHC

Department of the Interior
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC

Department of the Treasury
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Western New York FFSHC

Environmental Protection Agency
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC

General Services Administration
- Greater New York FFSHC
- Mt. Rainier FFSHC

Social Security Administration
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC

US Air Force
- Central Florida FFSHC

US Navy
- Minneapolis FFSHC

US Postal Service
- Greater Kansas City FFSHC
- Greater New York FFSHC

Appendix 4: Agency Requests to NIOSH for Technical Assistance

Technical Assistance Requests, and Completed Investigations by Type, CY 2014 through CY 2016

Department/ Agency	Technical Assistance Requests			Completed Investigation by Type					
				Desktop			Field		
	2016	2015	2014	2016	2015	2014	2016	2014	2014
Agriculture	3	3		4				1	
Commerce	1		2	1		1			
Defense	9	3	2	5	1	2	1	1	
General Services	1								
Health & Human Services	2	2	4	1		3			
Homeland Security	2	4	7	3	1	4	1	2	2
Interior	3	1	3		3	1			3
Justice	4			3		1	1		
U.S. Postal Service	1	4	5		3	3			
Social Security Administration	4	2	3	5	1	4			
Transportation	2	1	3			3			
State		1			1				
Treasury	3	1	1	4		1			
Veterans Affairs	6	5	4	4	5	2	1		
Other	2		3	2		1			3
Total	43	27	37	32	15	26	4	4	8

2016 Assistance Requests by Department/Agency and Exposure Group

Department/Agency	Exposure Group*							
	Chemical	Biologic	Indoor Environmental Quality	Noise	Heat	Stress	Radiation	Ergonomics
Agriculture			3					
Commerce	1							
Defense	3		5					
General Services			1					
Health Human Services			1					
Homeland Security	1				1	1		
Interior	2							1
Justice	1	1	3					
U.S. Postal Service								
Social Security	2		3					
Transportation	1							
Treasury	2	2	3					
Veterans Affairs	1		3					
Other	1		1					
Total	15	3	23		1	1		1

* 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.'

2016 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		1		1	1
Commerce			1					
Defense	3				1		1	1
General Services	1							
Health Human Services	1				1		1	1
Justice	2							
Social Security	1							
Treasury					1			1
Veterans Affairs	1				1			1
Other			1					
Total	10		3		5		3	5