NORTH CAROLINA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

Program Statistics

October 2008–September 2009



Occupational Safety and Health Division 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101

> Cherie Berry Commissioner of Labor

NORTH CAROLINA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

Program Statistics

October 2008–September 2009



Occupational Safety and Health Division 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101

> Cherie Berry Commissioner of Labor

SOURCES OF INFORMATION REGARDING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH IN NORTH CAROLINA

N.C. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Cherie Berry Commissioner of Labor 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101 Telephone: (919) 733-7166

Allen McNeely Deputy Commissioner for Occupational Safety and Health 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101 Telephone: (919) 807-2900

For information concerning occupational safety and health compliance contact:

East Compliance Bureau

Phil Hooper, Bureau Chief Occupational Safety and Health Division N.C. Department of Labor 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101 Telephone: (919) 779-8570

West Compliance Bureau

Tim Childers, Bureau Chief Occupational Safety and Health Division N.C. Department of Labor 4964 University Parkway, Suite 202 Winston-Salem, NC 27106-2800 Telephone: (336) 776-4420

For occupational safety and health information concerning education, training, presentations, and the development or interpretation of standards or OSH publications contact:

Education, Training and Technical Assistance Bureau

Wanda Lagoe, Bureau Chief Occupational Safety and Health Division N.C. Department of Labor 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101 Telephone: (919) 807-2875 Kevin Beauregard Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Occupational Safety and Health 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101 Telephone: (919) 807-2900

For information concerning occupational safety and health consultative services, safety awards, and the Carolina Star program contact:

Consultative Services Bureau

John R. Bogner Jr., Bureau Chief Occupational Safety and Health Division N.C. Department of Labor 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101 Telephone: (919) 807-2899

For statistical information concerning occupational safety and health program activities and the release of investigative case file documents from occupational safety and health files covered by the North Carolina Public Records Act contact:

Planning, Statistics and Information Management Bureau

Anne P. Weaver, Bureau Chief Occupational Safety and Health Division N.C. Department of Labor 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101 Telephone: (919) 807-2950

For information concerning agriculturally related occupational safety and health contact:

Agricultural Safety and Health Bureau Regina Cullen, Bureau Chief Occupational Safety and Health Division N.C. Department of Labor 1101 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1101 Telephone: (919) 807-2923

All of the above officials may be contacted by calling 1-800-NC-LABOR

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by the Planning, Statistics and Information Management Bureau of the Occupational Safety and Health Division and the Publications Bureau of the N.C. Department of Labor.

Photocopying and wide dissemination of this report are encouraged.

NORTH CAROLINA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Pursuant to Section 18 of the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, the General Assembly of North Carolina in 1973 selected the N.C. Department of Labor, under the commissioner of labor, as the designated agency to administer the state's Occupational Safety and Health Act. The North Carolina program is monitored and funded, in part, by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The expressed purpose of the state act is to assure, so far as possible, every working man and woman in the state of North Carolina safe and healthful working conditions and to preserve human resources. The General Assembly created the Occupational Safety and Health Division within the Department of Labor to carry out the provisions of the act. On Dec. 10, 1997, the U.S. Department of Labor awarded North Carolina final approval under Section 18(e) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 as having a "fully effective" state OSHA program, the highest level of approval possible.

The NCDOL Occupational Safety and Health Division covers all industries in North Carolina except: the federal government; employees subject to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Federal Coal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1969, the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act, and the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970; maritime industries; and those employees whose employer is within that class and type of employment that does not permit federal funding on a matching basis to the state in return for state enforcement of all occupational safety and health issues. The Occupational Safety and Health Division endeavors to focus its resources toward identifying and eliminating safety and health hazards in industries with the highest injury and illness rates.

The Occupational Safety and Health Division consists of the director's administrative staff and six organizational bureaus. The bureaus are East Compliance; West Compliance; Education, Training and Technical Assistance; Consultative Services; Planning, Statistics and Information Management; and Agricultural Safety and Health. The state Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health provides the commissioner of labor with advice in regard to the administration of the act. The N.C. Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, appointed by the governor, provides an appellate opportunity to people adversely affected by safety and health citations.

The primary activities of the division are as follows:

- To conduct public and private sector safety and health inspections to ensure compliance with the act.
- To provide technical assistance and information to employers, employees and organizations on all aspects of safety and health program development and administration.
- To provide on-site consultative services to small public and private sector employers.
- To provide education and training on safety and health to public and private sector employees.
- To review, develop and promulgate standards, rules, procedures and program directives as they apply to the proper administration of the act.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chart No. Page
Executive Summary 1
Statistical Reference—Establishments
Inspection Series
Inspections by Category
1. Statistical Reference—Inspections All
Types Fiscal Years 2007–2009
2. Inspections by Category11
Inspections by Type
3. Statistical Reference—Inspections by
Туре12
4. Inspections by Type13
Inspections by Industry Type
5. Statistical Reference—Inspections by
Industry Type14
6. Inspections by Industry Type15
7. Average Lapse Time for All Inspections 16
Violation Series
Violations by Type
8. Statistical Reference—Violations in
Fiscal Years 2007–200919
9. Statistical Reference—Violations by
Туре20
10. Violations by Type21
Violations per Inspection
11. Inspections In-Compliance
12. Violations per Inspection
13. Violations per Followup Inspection24
14. Violations Reclassified25
Penalty Series
15. Statistical Reference—Penalty Assessment
in Fiscal Years 2007–200928 16. Statistical Reference—Penalty Assessment
by Violation Type
17. Penalty Assessment by Violation Type30
18. Statistical Reference—Penalty Assessment
per Violation
19. Statistical Reference—Penalty Assessment
by Violation Type (Public Sector Only)32
20. Statistical Reference—Penalty Assessment
per Violation (Public Sector Only)33
21. Penalty Retention
Litigation Series
22. Statistical Reference—Contested Cases
and Percentages Fiscal Years 2007–200936
23. Number of Inspections Contested
24. Percent of Inspections With Citations
Contested

Chart No. Page
Occupational Injury and Illness Incidence Rates 25. Total Case Rates by Industry40 26. Lost Workday Case Rates by Industry41
N.C. State Demographic Profile43
 N.C. Top 25 Most Frequently Cited "Serious" 27. Top 25 Most Frequently Cited "Serious" Violations Construction Standards, Fiscal Year 2009
Violations Public Sector, Fiscal Year 200950
Consultation Series 30. Statistical Reference—Total Visits by
Category, Type and Industry Type54 31. Total Visits in Fiscal Years 2007–200955 32. Total Visits by Type in
Fiscal Years 2007–200956 33. Total Visits by Industry in Fiscal Years 2007–200957
34. Hazards by Type58Education, Training and Technical Assistance
Series
35. Distribution of OSH-Related Publications62

Fatality Series

36. Fatalities Investigated by Event in
Fiscal Years 2007–200964
37. Total Fatalities Investigated in
Fiscal Years 2007–200965
38. Leading Causes of Investigated
Fatalities in Fiscal Years 2007–200966
39. N.C. Fatal Events by District Office
Fiscal Years 2007–200967
40. Fatalities by Industry Type68
41. Fatalities by Office Location FY 200969
42. Fatalities by Race/Ethnic Group FY 200970
Construction Series
43. Inspections by Category FY 200974
44. Inspections by Field Office FY 200975
45. Inspections by Type FY 200976
46. Inspections by Type and Percentage
FY 200977
47. SEP Inspections by Type FY 200978
48. Ratio for SWRV Inspections FY 200979
v

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Executive Summary

Background: The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) of the U.S. Department of Labor monitors state programs effectiveness by making comparisons of state data versus federal data. This report highlights North Carolina's occupational safety and health program experience through a comparison to other state programs and the federal program experience for federal fiscal year 2009, Oct. 1, 2008–Sept. 30, 2009.

North Carolina is one of 22 jurisdictions (21 states and one territory—see Text Table 1) with an approved state program for occupational safety and health. Twenty-nine states plus the District of Columbia operate under the exclusive jurisdiction of federal OSHA, with the exception of Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and the Virgin Islands, which have state plans for the public sector only (see Text Table 1). Throughout the report, we compare the North Carolina program experience to the 22 state programs and the 31 federal jurisdictions. Comparisons of the number of establishments covered by the state administered occupational safety and health programs are presented in the Text Tables 2 and 3, respectively.

Methodology: Report data on total numbers and dollar amounts were generated from "United States Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Inspection Report, October 1, 2007–September 30, 2008." Averages and percentages were calculated by the Planning, Statistics and Information Management Bureau, and the graphs and charts were prepared by the Publications Bureau, N.C. Department of Labor.

Text Table 1 STATES AND TERRITORIES STATES AND TERRITORIES WITH APPROVED PLANS FOR **OPERATED UNDER OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH EXCLUSIVE FEDERAL JURISDICTION** New Mexico Alabama Montana Alaska Arizona North Carolina Arkansas Nebraska California Oregon Colorado New Hampshire Hawaii Puerto Rico Connecticut New Jersey¹ New York¹ South Carolina Delaware Indiana Iowa Tennessee District of Columbia North Dakota Ohio Kentucky Utah Florida Maryland Vermont Georgia Oklahoma Michigan Virginia Idaho Pennsylvania Minnesota Illinois² Washington Rhode Island Nevada Wyoming Kansas South Dakota Texas Louisiana Virgin Islands¹ Maine West Virginia Massachusetts Wisconsin Mississippi Missouri NOTE: 1. Connecticut, New Jersey, New York and the Virgin Islands state plans are public sector only. 2. Effective Sept. 1, 2009, Illinois became the latest state plan for public sector only; however, since the majority of FY 2009 was not applicable, data related to Illinois public sector activity will be reflected in FY 2010.

Highlights: The following summary highlights some of the comparisons contained in this report.

Executive Summary (continued)

Inspections

During fiscal year 2009 (October 2008–September 2009), North Carolina conducted 5,196 inspections, 2,409 more than the average state program and 3,936 more than the average federal jurisdiction.

Of North Carolina's 5,196 inspections, 3,354 (65 percent) were safety and 1,842 (35 percent) were health. In the average state program, 79 percent were safety and 21 percent were health, while in the average federal jurisdiction 85 percent were safety and 15 percent were health.

In the inspection type category, North Carolina programmed inspections accounted for 68 percent of inspection activity, compared to 65 percent in the average state program and 62 percent in the average federal jurisdiction. Complaint inspections accounted for 17 percent of inspections in North Carolina, 14 percent in the average state program, and 17 percent in the average federal jurisdiction.

In the inspection by industry group, North Carolina, the average state program and the average federal jurisdiction are very similar in manufacturing inspections with 20 percent, 16 percent and 19 percent respectively. However, North Carolina conducted 42 percent of inspections in construction compared to 43 percent in the average state program and 61 percent in the average federal jurisdiction.

North Carolina conducted 3 percent of inspections in the public sector compared to 13 percent of inspections in the public sector for the average state program. Federal OSHA does not cover the public sector.

Violations

North Carolina cited 13,695 total violations, a 1 percent increase from the previous year. The average state program cited 5,875 violations, a 6 percent increase, and the average federal jurisdiction cited 2,821 violations, a 1 percent increase. Overall, North Carolina cited more violations per inspection (3.7), than the average state program (3.3), and more than the average federal jurisdiction (2.3). North Carolina cited more serious violations (5,239) in FY 2009 than the average state program (2,502) and more than the average federal jurisdictions (8,194) in FY 2009 than the average federal jurisdictions (8,194) in FY 2009 than the average federal jurisdiction (539).

Penalty Assessments

Total penalty assessments in North Carolina were \$3,235,393 in FY 2009, which was higher than the average state program (\$2,683,683), and higher than the average federal jurisdiction (\$3,056,367). North Carolina assessed a total of \$88,956 in penalties for violations in the public sector in FY 2009.

North Carolina's average penalty per violation was lower than the average state program per serious violation (\$509 vs. \$776), per repeat violation (\$1,284 vs. \$1,756), per nonserious violation (\$8 vs. \$103), and per willful violation (\$14,000 vs. \$19,693). However it was higher per failure-to-abate violation (\$10,933 vs. \$3,376). The average federal jurisdiction penalty per violation was higher than North Carolina's per serious violation (\$963 vs. \$509), per repeat violation (\$3,858 vs. \$1,284), per willful violation (\$33,350 vs. \$14,000), and per nonserious violation (\$234 vs. \$8). However North Carolina's average penalty per failure-to-abate violation (\$10,933 vs. \$8,854) was higher than the average federal jurisdiction.

Litigation

In North Carolina, 3.1 percent of the inspections with citations were contested in FY 2009, higher than FY 2008 (2.1). The average state program had 13.1 percent of the inspections with citations contested, while the average federal jurisdiction had 7.1 percent of the inspections with citations contested.

Executive Summary (continued)

Consultation

The North Carolina consultation program conducted 1,186 total visits in FY 2009. This was a 2 percent increase from FY 2008. Of 1,186 traditional visits, 88 percent were initial visits, 6 percent were training/assistance visits, and 6 percent were followup visits. The industry mix for the traditional consultative visits in FY 2009 was 29 percent manufacturing, 23 percent construction, 31 percent other, and 17 percent public sector.

The consultation program continues to participate in a Region IV pilot project that uses workers' compensation data to target companies for consultation. Participation in this project requires a safety and health program assessment and that the company agree to a three-year commitment with the Department of Labor. The Carolina Star Program awarded Star program status to 13 new companies and awarded three-year recertification to 25 existing companies in FY 2009. There are currently a total of 119 companies in the Star programs.

Education, Training and Technical Assistance

The Education, Training and Technical Assistance Bureau outreach training calendar and newsletter was e-mailed to more than 7,000 employers/employees during FY 2009. The bureau also distributed 53,717 OSHA-related publications in FY 2009, a 29 percent decrease from FY 2008 with 69,504, and a 136 percent decrease from FY 2007 with 126,904. In 2009, the Education, Training and Technical Assistance Bureau provided training for 9,258 employers and employees. During FY 2009 the bureau's training section began offering electronic certificates for 10- and 30-hour workshops and individual topic workshops and webinars.

Fatalities

The NCDOL Occupational Safety and Health Division evaluated and investigated a total of 41 occupational fatalities that occurred during FY 2009. Of the 41 investigated fatalities in FY 2009, 29 percent were related to being "crushed" by an object, 17 percent were related to "falls," 17 percent were related to being "struck by" an object, 5 percent were related to "electrocutions," and 32 percent were related to "other."

Construction Inspections Emphasis

The Occupational Safety and Health Division established a construction special emphasis program (SEP) to decrease fatalities in the construction industry (SIC 15-17 and NAICS 23). The North Carolina counties included in the program are: Dare, Durham, Forsyth, Guilford, Iredell, Mecklenburg and Wake. The Construction Industry Special Emphasis Program accounted for 2,198 inspections during FY 2009 in North Carolina. Of the 2,198 inspections, 80 percent were safety and 20 percent were health. In-compliance inspections totaled 33 percent of all activity within the SEP, and 67 percent of all inspections had citations issued. The construction industry was cited for 2,491 serious, willful and repeat violations during FY 2009. A total of 1,223 inspections were conducted in the SEP counties.

Text Table 2

Comparison of Establishments Covered by State and Federally Administered Occupational Safety and Health Programs

State Administered Programs	Number of Establishments ¹	Federally Administered Programs	Number of Establishments ¹
Total 21 states, 1 jurisdiction	3,219,171	Total 29 states, 2 jurisdictions ³	4,561,893
Region 1—1 state Vermont	22,341 22,341	Region 1—5 states Connecticut ⁴ Maine	382,634 93,615 42,506
Region 2—1 jurisdiction Puerto Rico	47,340 47,340	Massachussetts New Hampshire	176,701 39,453
Region 3—2 states Maryland	341,835 141,332	Rhode Island Region 2—2 states, 1 jurisdiction	30,359 765,422
Virginia Region4—4 states	200,503 593,316	New York ⁴	243,350 519,489
Kentucky North Carolina	93,539 254,029	Virgin Islands ^{2, 4}	2,583
South Carolina Tennessee	107,893 137,855	Region 3—3 states, 1 jurisdiction Delaware District of Colulmbia	392,352 25,521 20,994
Region 5—3 states Indiana Michigan	539,806 152,858 235,422	Pennsylvania West Virginia Region 4—4 states	305,345 40,492
Minnesota Region 6—1 state New Mexico	151,526 46,869 46,869	Alabama Florida	922,772 105,627 523,461
Region 7—1 state	83,158 83,158	Georgia Mississippi Region 5—3 states	231,810 61,874 741,791
Region 8—2 states Utah Wyoming	92,645 71,880 20,765	Illinois ⁵ Ohio Wisconsin	325,206 270,299 146,286
Region 9—4 states Arizona California Hawaii Nevada	1,131,149 142,925 891,997 33,388 62,839	Region 6—4 states Arkansas Louisiana Oklahoma Texas	784,913 67,648 104,622 91,235 521,408
Region 10—3 states Alaska Oregon Washington	318,129 20,198 113,389 184,542	Region 7—3 states Kansas Missouri Nebraska	284,157 77,157 154,483 52,517
		Region 8—4 states Colorado Montana North Dakota South Dakota	243,024 157,882 37,755 21,518 25,869
		Region 9 ³	
		Region 10—1 state Idaho	47,411 47,411

1. Source: Number of Establishments: County Business Patterns—United States, 2007 (Private sector only).

2. Virgin Islands data for 1997. Data are available only every five years.

3. Excludes American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of Pacific Islands (Region 9).

4. Connecticut, New Jersey, New York and the Virgin Islands have state administered occupational safety and health programs for their public sectors.

5. Effective Sept. 1, 2009, Illinois became the latest state plan for public sector only; however, since the majority of FY 2009 was not applicable, date related to Illinois public sector activity will be reflected in FY 2010.





[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]



Definitions of Types of Inspections

I. General Schedule Inspections:

- **A. Programmed Planned**—An inspection randomly selected and scheduled from a master list of all employers, or selected from lists of employers in specific industries as part of a national or local occupational safety and health emphasis program.
- **B. Programmed Related**—An inspection of an employer at a multi-employer worksite who was not included in the programmed planned assignment that initiated the worksite visit.

II. Unprogrammed Inspections:

A. Accident:

An accident inspection results from the reporting of the following:

- 1. Fatality—An employee death resulting from an employment accident or illness caused by or related to a workplace hazard.
- **2.** Catastrophe—The hospitalization of three or more employees resulting from an employment accident or illness; in general, from an accident or illness caused by a workplace hazard. Hospitalization is defined as being admitted as an inpatient to a hospital or equivalent medical facility for examination or treatment.
- **3.** Other Significant Incident*—Any other significant incident that actually or potentially resulted in a serious injury or illness.

B. Complaint:

A complaint is a notice given by an employee, a representative of employees, or any other source not identified as a referral source of a hazard or a violation of the act believed to exist in a work-place. A complaint is normally distinguished from a referral by the source providing information on the alleged hazard.

C. Referral:

Notices of hazards or alleged violations originated by the following sources are classified as referrals:

- 1. safety or health compliance officer
- 2. safety and health agency
- 3. other government agency
- 4. media report
- 5. employer report

D. Followup:

A followup inspection is an inspection conducted to determine whether the employer has abated violations previously cited on an OSH inspection.

E. Unprogrammed Related:

An unprogrammed related inspection is an inspection of an employer of a multi-employer worksite who was not identified as an exposing employer in the original unprogrammed inspection assignment (e.g., complaint, accident, referral) that initiated the visit to the worksite.

*Federal OSHA also classifies fatalities and catastrophes as accidents or events. However, in North Carolina other significant incidents of injuries are classified by source. Information about injuries obtained through the media are referrals; incidents reported by co-workers or relatives are complaints.

Inspections Series Highlights

- The number of inspections in North Carolina increased from 5,159 in FY 2008 to 5,196 in FY 2009, an increase of 1 percent.
- The average number of inspections in state programs was 2,787, more than FY 2008 (2,628).
- The average number of inspections in federal jurisdictions was 1,260, more than FY 2008 (1,247).
- The number of safety inspections in North Carolina decreased from 3,477 in FY 2008 to 3,354 in FY 2009, a decrease of 4 percent.
- The number of safety inspections in state programs increased from 2,064 in FY 2008 to 2,192 in FY 2009, an increase of 6 percent.
- The number of safety inspections in federal jurisdictions had less than a 1 percent increase from 1,069 in FY 2008 to 1,073 in FY 2009.
- The number of health inspections in North Carolina increased from 1,682 in FY 2008 to 1,842 in FY 2009, an increase of 9 percent.
- The number of health inspections in state programs increased from 564 in FY 2008 to 595 in FY 2009, an increase of 5 percent.
- The number of health inspections in federal jurisdictions had a 5 percent increase from 178 in FY 2008 to 187 in FY 2009.
- The percentage of inspections conducted in FY 2009 for manufacturing was 20 percent of the total inspections for North Carolina, compared to 16 percent of total inspections for the average state program, and 19 percent of total inspections for the average federal jurisdiction.
- The percentage of inspections conducted in FY 2009 for construction was 42 percent of total inspections for North Carolina, compared to 43 percent of total inspections for the average state program, and 61 percent of the total inspections for the average federal jurisdiction.
- North Carolina conducted 3 percent of the total inspections in the public sector in FY 2009, compared to 13 percent of total inspections in the public sector for the average state program. Federal OSHA does not have jurisdiction over public sector establishments.
- The average number of days from the opening conference until citations were issued for FY 2009 was 20 days for North Carolina, 33 days for the average state program, and 36 for the average federal jurisdiction.

Inspections, All Types

	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009	
Comparison	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average
North Carolina	4,900	4,900	5,159	5,159	5,196	5,196
State Program**	57,556	2,616	57,822	2,628	61,324	2,787
Federal OSHA*	39,404	1,271	38,675	1,247	39,076	1,260

Inspections by Category FY 2009

Comparison	Comparison Safety Total		Health Total	Health Percent
North Carolina 3,354		65 1,842		35
State Program** 2,192		79	595	21
Federal OSHA*	Federal OSHA* 1,073		187	15

*Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

**State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.

Inspections by Category*



*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10.

Inspections by Type

	Accident		Complaint		Programmed	
Comparison	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
North Carolina	114	2	872	17	3,553	68
State Program**	142	5	392	14	1,803	65
Federal OSHA*	27	2	215	17	785	62

	Followup		Referral		Unprogrammed Related	
Comparison	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
North Carolina	47	1	316	6	294	6
State Program**	133	5	204	7	113	4
Federal OSHA*	37	3	142	12	54	4

*Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

**State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.





*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10.

Commention	Consti	ruction	Manufacturing		
Comparison	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	
North Carolina	2,198	42	1,049	20	
State Program**	1,193	43	454	16	
Federal OSHA*	773	61	236	19	

Inspections by Industry Type

Commente	Ot	her	Public Sector***		
Comparison	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	
North Carolina	1,811	35	138	3	
State Program**	784	28	356	13	
Federal OSHA*	251	20	N/A	N/A	

*Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

**State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.

***Federally administered programs do not cover public sector.

Inspections by Industry Type*



*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10.

Average Lapse Time for All Inspections***



*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10.

**Lapse time is the number of days from the opening conference until citations are issued.



Definitions of Types of Violations

1. WILLFUL—A "willful" violation may exist under the North Carolina Occupational Safety and Health Act where the evidence shows that the employer committed an intentional and knowing, as contrasted with inadvertent, violation of the act and the employer is conscious of the fact that what he is doing constitutes a violation of the act; or even though the employer was not consciously violating the act, he was aware that a hazardous condition existed and made no reasonable effort to eliminate the condition. It is not necessary that the violation be committed with malice or an evil intent to be deemed "willful" under the act. It is sufficient that the act was deliberate, voluntary or intentional as distinguished from those that were inadvertent, accidental or ordinarily negligent.

2. SERIOUS—A serious violation exists in a place of employment if there is a substantial probability that death or serious physical harm could result from a condition that exists, or from one or more practices, means, methods, operations or processes that have been adopted or are in use at such place of employment, unless the employer did not know and could not, with the exercise of reasonable diligence, know of the presence of the violation. A citation for serious violations may be issued for a group of individual violations which, when taken by themselves, would not be serious, but when considered together would be serious in the sense that in combination they present a substantial probability of injury resulting in death or serious physical harm to employees.

3. OTHER-THAN-SERIOUS (NONSERIOUS)—This type of violation is cited where an accident or occupational illness resulting from violation of a standard would probably not cause death or serious physical harm but would have a direct or immediate relationship to the safety or health of employees. An example of an "other" violation is the lack of guardrails at a height from which a fall would more probably result in only a mild sprain or cut and abrasions, i.e., something less than serious physical harm.

4. REPEAT—A citation for a repeat violation may be issued where upon reinspection a second violation of the previous cited section of a standard, regulation, rule, order or condition violating the General Duty Clause is found and:

- (a) The citation is issued within three years of the final order of the previous citation; or
- (b) The citation is issued within three years of the final abatement date of that citation, whichever is later.

Repeat violations differ from willful violations in that they may result from an inadvertent, accidental or ordinarily negligent act. A willful violation need not be one for which the employer has been previously cited. If a repeat violation is also willful, a citation for the latter violation will be issued.

Repeat violations are also to be distinguished from a failure-to-abate violation. If upon reinspection a violation of a previously cited standard is found, if such violation does not involve the same piece of equipment or the same location within an establishment or worksite, the violation may be a repeat. If upon reinspection a violation of a previously cited standard is found on the same piece of equipment or in the same location, and the evidence indicates that the violation has continued uncorrected since the original inspection, then there has been a failure-to-abate. If, however, the violation was not continuous, i.e., if it has been corrected and reoccurred, the subsequent reoccurrence is a repeat violation. The violation can be classified as repeat-serious or repeat other-than-serious using the criteria normally applied for serious and other-thanserious violations.

The violation can be classified as repeat-serious or repeat other-than-serious using the criteria normally applied for serious and other-than-serious violations.

5. FAILURE-TO-ABATE—If an employer has not corrected an alleged violation for which a citation has been issued, the violation can be classified as failure-to-abate serious or other-than-serious using the criteria normally applied for serious and other-than-serious violations.

SOURCE: North Carolina Field Operations Manual, Chapter IV, "Violations," and Chapter VI, "Penalties."

Violation Series Highlights

- The total number of violations cited by North Carolina decreased 1 percent from 13,815 in FY 2008 to 13,695 in FY 2009.
- The total number of violations cited in FY 2009 by the average state program was 5,875, a 6 percent increase from FY 2008 (5,522).
- The average federal jurisdiction experienced a 1 percent increase in the total violations cited, from 2,798 in FY 2008 to 2,821 in FY 2009.
- North Carolina cited 5,239 serious violations in FY 2009, a 1 percent decrease from 5,290 serious violations in FY 2008.
- The average state program cited 2,502 serious violations in FY 2009, a 6 percent increase from FY 2008 with 2,363.
- The average federal jurisdiction cited 2,174 serious violations in FY 2009, a 2 percent increase from 2,123 serious violations in FY 2008.
- North Carolina continues to cite more nonserious violations 8,194, compared to the average state program with 3,249 nonserious violations and the average federal jurisdiction with 539 nonserious violations cited in FY 2009.
- Overall, North Carolina cited more violations per inspection (3.7) than the average state program (3.3) and more violations per inspection than the average federal jurisdiction (2.3).
- In FY 2009, North Carolina reclassified 1.8 percent of the violations, compared to 4.8 percent of violations reclassified in the average federal jurisdiction.

CHART 8

	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009	
Comparison	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average
North Carolina	12,934	12,934	13,815	13,815	13,695	13,695
State Program**	123,423	5,610	121,488	5,522	129,250	5,875
Federal OSHA*	87,863	2,834	86,753	2,798	87,469	2,821

Violations in Fiscal Years 2007–2009

*Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

**State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.

Violations by Type

	Serious			Nonserious		
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent
North Carolina	5,239	5,239	38	8,194	8,194	60
State Program**	55,049	2,502	43	71,472	3,249	55
Federal OSHA*	67,411	2,174	77	16,703	539	19

	Repeat			Willful			
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent	
North Carolina	246	246	2	1	1	0	
State Program**	2,040	93	2	171	8	0	
Federal OSHA*	2,750	89	3	395	13	1	

	Failure-to-Abate			Unclassified			
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent	
North Carolina	15	15	0	0	0	0	
State Program**	504	23	0	14	0	0	
Federal OSHA*	200	6	0	10	0	0	

*Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

**State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.





*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10. **"Other" violations include repeat, willful, failure-to-abate and unclassified violations.

Inspections In-Compliance or With Citations Issued* (Excluding Followup Inspections)







*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10.

Violations per Followup Inspection*



*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10.

Violations Reclassified*



*Data from Interim State Indicator Report (SIR), 10-29-09.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]



Penalty Series Highlights

- North Carolina assessed a total of \$3,235,393 in penalties for violations cited in FY 2009, compared to a total of \$2,683,683 assessed by the average state program and \$3,056,367 assessed by the average federal jurisdiction.
- The average penalty per serious violation was \$509 in FY 2009, lower than \$776 in the average state program and lower than \$963 in the average federal jurisdiction.
- North Carolina assessed a total of \$88,956 in penalties for violations cited in the public sector in FY 2009, a 10 percent decrease from \$97,644 assessed in FY 2008.
- In FY 2009, North Carolina retained 71.3 percent of penalties assessed compared to 63.2 percent of penalties assessed by the average federal jurisdiction.

CHART 15

	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009	
Comparison	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average
North Carolina	\$ 3,037,213	\$3,037,213	\$ 3,483,810	\$3,483,810	\$ 3,235,393	\$3,235,393
State Program**	\$50,271,141	\$2,285,051	\$55,346,249	\$2,515,738	\$59,041,037	\$2,683,683
Federal OSHA*	\$82,873,980	\$2,673,354	\$94,367,204	\$3,044,103	\$94,747,395	\$3,056,367

Penalty Assessment, All Types

*Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

**State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.

Penalty Assessment by Violation Type

	Serious			Nonserious			
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent	
North Carolina	\$ 2,667,933	\$2,667,933	83	\$ 73,587	\$ 73,587	2	
State Program**	\$42,740,545	\$1,942,752	72	\$7,400,208	\$336,373	13	
Federal OSHA*	\$64,967,242	\$2,095,717	69	\$3,920,523	\$126,468	4	

	Repeat			Willful			
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent	
North Carolina	\$ 315,873	\$315,873	10	\$ 14,000	\$ 14,000	0	
State Program**	\$ 3,594,305	\$163,378	6	\$ 3,466,130	\$157,551	6	
Federal OSHA*	\$10,644,402	\$343,368	11	\$13,440,230	\$433,556	14	

	Failure-to-Abate			Unclassified***			
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent	
North Carolina	\$ 164,000	\$164,000	5	\$ 0	\$ 0	0	
State Program**	\$1,708,349	\$ 77,652	3	\$131,500	\$ 5,977	0	
Federal OSHA*	\$1,646,998	\$ 53,129	2	\$128,000	\$ 4,129	0	

*Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

**State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.

***Unclassified penalties are assessed as part of settlement agreements. North Carolina has not adopted this procedure.
Penalty Assessment by Violation Type*



*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10.

Penalty Assessment per Violation

Comparison	Serious	Nonserious	Repeat	Willful	Failure-to- Abate	Unclassified***
North Carolina	\$509	\$8	\$1,284	\$14,000	\$10,933	\$ 0
State Program**	\$776	\$103	\$1,756	\$19,693	\$ 3,376	\$ 5,977
Federal OSHA*	\$963	\$234	\$3,858	\$33,350	\$ 8,854	\$ 4,129

^{*}Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

^{**}State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.

^{***}Unclassified penalties are assessed as part of settlement agreements. North Carolina has not adopted this procedure.

Penalty Assessment by Violation Type Public Sector*

	Penalty Assessment (All Types)						
Comparison	Total	Average					
North Carolina	\$ 88,956	\$ 88,956					
State Program***	\$3,538,587	\$160,844					
Federal OSHA**	N/A	N/A					

	Serious			Nonserious					
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent			
North Carolina	\$ 86,106	\$ 86,106	97	\$ 750	\$ 750	1			
State Program***	\$2,240,253	\$101,830	63	\$516,415	\$23,473	15			
Federal OSHA**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

	Repeat			Willful				
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent		
North Carolina	\$ 2,100	\$2,100	2	\$ 0	\$ 0	0		
State Program***	\$217,177	\$9,872	6	\$14,700	\$668	1		
Federal OSHA**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

	Fa	ilure-to-Aba	ite	Unclassified****				
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent		
North Carolina	\$ 0	\$ 0	0	\$ 0	\$ 0	0		
State Program***	\$540,792	\$24,581	15	\$9,250	\$420	0		
Federal OSHA**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

*Penalties were imposed upon North Carolina state agencies effective July 23, 1992, and local government penalties were imposed effective Jan. 1, 1993.

**Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

***State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.

****Unclassified penalties are assessed as part of settlement agreements. North Carolina has not adopted this procedure.

Penalty Assessment per Violation Public Sector*

Comparison	Serious	Nonserious	Repeat	Willful	Failure-to- Abate	Unclassified****
North Carolina	\$755	\$6	\$1,050	\$0	\$ 0	\$0
State Program***	\$218	\$75	\$3,290	\$668	\$2,731	\$0
Federal OSHA**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Penalties were imposed upon North Carolina state agencies effective July 23, 1992, and local government penalties were imposed effective Jan. 1, 1993.

^{**}Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

^{***}State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.

^{****}Unclassified penalties are assessed as part of settlement agreements. North Carolina has not adopted this procedure.



Penalty Retention*

*Data from Interim State Indicator Report (SIR), run 10-29-09.



Litigation Series Highlights

- The number of inspections with citations contested in North Carolina was higher in FY 2009 (114), than in FY 2008 (78). The number of contested cases in the average state program was 233, and the number of contested cases in the average federal jurisdiction was 65.
- The percentage of inspections with citations that were contested in North Carolina was 3.1 percent in FY 2009, higher than the 2.1 percent in FY 2008.
- The percentage of inspections with citations that were contested in the average state program was 14.3 percent in FY 2008 and FY 2009.
- The percentage of inspections with citations that were contested in the average federal jurisdiction was higher in FY 2009 at 7.1 than in FY 2008 at 6.8.

CHART 22

Contested Cases October 2006–September 2009

		FY 200'	7	FY 2008				
Comparison	Inspections Contested Total	Program Average	Percent Inspections With Citations Contested	Inspections Contested Total	Program Average	Percent Inspections With Citations Contested		
North Carolina	75	75	2.0	78	78	2.1		
State Program**	5,348	243	14.4	5,215	237	14.3		
Federal OSHA*	1,946	62	6.8	1,885	60	6.8		

		FY 200	9
Comparison	Inspections Contested Total	Program Average	Percent Inspections With Citations Contested
North Carolina	114	114	3.1
State Program**	5,132	233	13.1
Federal OSHA*	2,018	65	7.1

*Federal OSHA represents the 31 jurisdictions (29 states plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands) that have federally administered occupational safety and health programs.

**State program represents the 22 jurisdictions (21 states and Puerto Rico) that have state-administered occupational safety and health programs.

Number of Inspections Contested*



*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10.

Percent of Inspections With Citations Contested*



*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-11-10.

Occupational Injury and Illness Incident Rates

N.C. Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Division Calendar Years 2001–2008

Total Case Rates* Occupational Injuries and Illnesses by Industry A Comparison Between North Carolina and the United States**

	20	01	20	02	2003		2004	
Industry	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.
Private Sector	5.7	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.3	4.0	4.8	4.1
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	7.3	6.2	6.2	4.6	6.4	4.6	6.4	6.7
Mining	4.0	3.3	3.3	2.5	4.0	2.5	3.8	2.5
Construction	7.9	6.8	6.8	4.7	7.1	4.7	6.4	4.4
Manufacturing	8.1	6.8	6.8	5.4	7.2	5.4	6.6	5.3
Transportation	6.9	5.5	5.5	4.7	6.1	4.7	5.5	4.8
Wholesale Trade	5.3	4.7	4.7	3.9	5.2	3.9	4.5	4.1
Retail Trade	5.7	5.3	5.3	4.0	5.3	4.0	5.3	4.6
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.1	1.7	1.1	1.6	1.3
Services	4.6	4.4	4.4	3.3	4.6	3.3	4.2	3.6
State and Local Government								
(Public Sector)	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.1	N/A	5.1	N/A	4.9

	2005		2006		2007		2008	
Industry	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.
Private Sector	4.6	4.0	4.4	4.0	4.2	3.7	3.9	3.4
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	6.1	7.6	6.0	6.1	5.4	6.4	5.3	4.5
Mining	3.6	2.7	3.5	2.3	3.1	2.1	2.9	2.4
Construction	6.3	4.6	5.9	4.9	5.4	4.0	4.7	3.7
Manufacturing	6.3	5.1	6.0	5.1	5.6	4.4	5.0	4.2
Transportation	5.2	4.6	5.0	4.6	4.9	4.1	4.4	3.7
Wholesale Trade	4.5	3.8	4.1	3.7	4.0	3.0	3.7	2.8
Retail Trade	5.0	4.6	4.9	4.3	4.8	4.3	4.4	3.8
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.5	.08
Services	4.1	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.1
State and Local Government								
(Public Sector)	N/A	4.7	N/A	4.7	N/A	4.3	N/A	4.7

*Total Case Rates represent the number of recordable injuries and illnesses per 100 full-time employees. **U.S. data are from the USDOL Bureau of Labor Statistics' *Survey of Occupational Injuries and Illnesses*, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. N.C. data are from the NCDOL Research and Policy Division, Safety and Health Survey Section's *Injuries and Illnesses in North Carolina*, conducted as part of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' survey, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005.

N.C. Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Division Calendar Years 2001–2008

Lost Workday Case Rates* by Industry A Comparison Between North Carolina and the United States**

	20	01	20	02	2003		2004	
Industry	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.
Private Sector	2.8	2.2	2.8	2.2	2.6	2.0	2.5	2.0
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	3.6	2.2	3.3	1.2	3.3	2.0	3.7	3.4
Mining	2.4	1.5	2.6	1.5	2.0	1.9	2.3	1.7
Construction	4.0	3.1	3.8	2.3	3.6	2.6	3.4	2.5
Manufacturing	4.1	3.1	4.1	2.9	3.8	2.8	3.6	2.9
Transportation	4.3	3.0	4.0	2.9	3.2	2.5	3.1	2.7
Wholesale Trade	2.8	2.4	3.1	2.5	2.8	1.8	2.7	2.7
Retail Trade	2.4	1.7	2.5	2.1	2.7	2.1	2.7	2.1
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.6
Services	2.2	1.6	2.2	1.7	2.3	1.7	2.2	1.7
State and Local Government								
(Public Sector)	N/A	2.3	N/A	2.4	N/A	2.3	N/A	2.3

	20	05	20	06	2007		20	08
Industry	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.
Private Sector	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.0	1.7
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	3.3	4.5	3.2	3.2	2.8	3.1	2.9	2.3
Mining	2.2	1.5	2.1	1.5	2.0	1.2	2.0	1.3
Construction	3.4	2.5	3.2	2.8	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.3
Manufacturing	3.5	2.8	3.3	2.8	3.0	2.4	2.7	2.3
Transportation	3.0	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.3	2.6	2.0
Wholesale Trade	2.7	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.4	1.7	2.2	1.3
Retail Trade	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.3	1.9
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.3	.7	1.0	1.5	0.5
Services	2.1	1.8	2.0	1.7	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.4
State and Local Government								
(Public Sector)	N/A	2.3	N/A	2.1	N/A	1.9	N/A	2.2

*Lost Workday Case Rates represent those cases that involved one or more days an employee is away from work or limited to restricted work activity due to an occupational injury or illness. The rate is calculated per 100 full-time employees.

**U.S. data are from the USDOL Bureau of Labor Statistics' Survey of Occupational Injuries and Illnesses, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. N.C. data are from the NCDOL Research and Policy Division, Safety and Health Survey Section's Injuries and Illnesses in North Carolina, conducted as part of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' survey, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008. [THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

State Demographic Profile

Introduction

The purpose of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of North Carolina is "to assure so far as possible every working man and woman in the State of North Carolina safe and healthful working conditions and to preserve our human resources." The state's Five Year Strategic Plan is designated to promote the achievement of this purpose through the specific goals and objectives established by the NCDOL Occupational Safety and Health Division and its employees.

The division has established two primary strategic goals as part of the Five Year Strategic Plan. Goal One is to reduce the rate of workplace fatalities by 5 percent by the end of FY 2013. Goal Two is to reduce the rate of workplace injuries and illnesses by 15 percent by the end of FY 2013.

From these two broad strategic goals, specific areas of emphasis and outcome goals are included in the Strategic Plan. These areas of emphasis include comparisons of the number of employees and establishments covered by the North Carolina occupational safety and health program as presented in Text Tables 4, 5 and 6, respectively.

Text Table 4 State Demographic Profile Private Sector

Private Sector	NAICS	SIC	Establishments*	Employees*
Construction	23	15-17	27,813	191,509
Manufacturing	31-33	20-39	10,305	439,440
Transportation	48-49	40-59	6,195	123,736
Wholesale and Retail Trade	42-45	50-59	51,160	607,214
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	51-53	60-67	27,181	267,790
Services	54-81	70-89	106,589	1,859,045
All Other			18,934	60,849
Total Private Sector			248,177	3,549,583

Text Table 5 State Demographic Profile Public Sector

Public Sector	Establishments*	Employees*
State	1,642	176,886
Local	4,435	402,133
Total Public Sector	6,077	579,019

*Source: *Employment and Wages in North Carolina*, Employment Security Commission, N.C. Department of Commerce, Third Quarter 2009.

Text Table 6 State Demographic Profile By Private Sector Employees*



*Source: *Employment and Wages in North Carolina*, Employment Security Commission, N.C. Department of Commerce, Third Quarter 2009.

North Carolina Top 25 Most Frequently Cited "Serious" Violations

Top 25 Most Frequently Cited "Serious" Violations Construction Standards*

Standard Violated	Total Violations	Serious Violations	Serious Percent	Willful Violations	Repeat Violations	Other Violations	Brief Description
1926.20(b)(2)	337	287	85%	0	12	38	General safety and health provisions—Accident prevention—Frequent and regular inspections
1926.501(b)(13)	285	252	89%	0	27	6	Fall protection—Residential construction—Employees protected 6 feet or more above lower level
1926.102(a)(1)	204	178	87%	0	7	19	PPE—Eye and face protection—General requirements
1926.1053(b)(1)	189	174	92%	0	2	13	Ladders-Must extend 3 feet above landing or be properly secured to access upper landing
1926.501(b)(1)	167	155	93%	0	6	6	Fall protection—Unprotected sides and edges—Employees protected 6 feet or more above lower level
1926.501(b)(11)	136	126	92%	0	9	1	Fall protection—Steep roofs—Employees protected 6 feet or more above lower level
1926.100(a)	127	108	85%	0	6	13	PPE—Head protection—General requirement
1926.503(a)(1)	113	101	89%	0	2	10	Fall protection—Training program
1926.451(e)(1)	104	98	94%	0	2	4	Scaffolds—Access by various means
1926.451(g)(4)(i)	94	84	89%	0	9	1	Scaffolds-Guardrail systems-Installed on open sides and ends of platforms
1926.21(b)(2)	94	81	86%	0	0	13	Safety training and education-Instruction to avoid unsafe conditions
1926.20(b)(1)	85	78	92%	0	1	6	General safety and health provisions-Accident prevention program
1926.454(a)	79	71	90%	0	2	6	Scaffold—Training—Hazard recognition for type of scaffold in use
1926.503(b)(1)	96	67	70%	0	2	27	Fall protection—Certification of training
1926.451(g)(1)(vii)	70	65	93%	0	2	3	Scaffolds-Fall protection-Employees protected by personal fall arrest/guardrail system
1926.453(b)(2)(v)	63	60	95%	0	0	3	Scaffolds—Aerial lifts—Extensible and articulating boom platforms—Body belts and lanyards worn/used
1926.501(b)(10)	62	55	89%	0	4	3	Fall protection—Low slope roofs—Employees protected 6 feet or more above lower level
1926.451(f)(7)	55	51	93%	0	1	3	Scaffolds—Use—Erected, moved, dismantled or altered under supervision of competent person
1926.1053(b)(13)	51	50	98%	0	0	1	Ladders—Use—Top step used as a step
1926.1060(a)	53	47	89%	0	0	6	Stairways and ladders—Training program
1926.652(a)(1)	50	45	90%	0	2	3	Excavations-Protection of persons in excavations
1926.451(b)(1)(i)	47	44	94%	0	2	1	Scaffolds-Platform construction-Platform unit installation
1926.451(b)(1)	44	42	96%	0	1	1	Scaffolds—Platform construction—Fully decked and planked
1926.451(g)(1)	44	42	96%	0	0	2	Scaffolds—Fall protection—Employees protected 10 feet or more above lower level
1926.503(c)(3)	42	39	93%	0	0	3	Fall protection-Retraining when employee inadequacies in knowledge or use identified

*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Freq. Violated Stds. Report," run 1-11-10.

Top 25 Most Frequently Cited "Serious" Violations General Industry Standards*

Standard Violated	Total Violations	Serious Violations	Serious Percent	Willful Violations	Repeat Violations	Other Violations	Brief Description
1910.212(a)(1)	238	205	86%	0	7	26	Machine guarding—General requirements
1910.215(b)(9)	265	192	73%	0	3	70	Machine guarding—Abrasive wheel machinery—Exposure adjustment
1910.215(a)(4)	209	138	66%	0	2	69	Machine guarding—Abrasive wheel machinery—Work rests
1910.151(c)	160	122	76%	0	3	35	Medical and first aid-Eyewash and emergency showers
NCGS 95-129(1)	108	105	97%	0	2	1	General Duty Clause
1910.304(g)(5)	215	102	48%	0	13	100	Electrical—Grounding—Path to ground
1910.133(a)(1)	102	83	81%	0	0	19	Eye and face protection—General requirements
1910.305(b)(1)(ii)	191	74	39%	0	2	115	Electrical cabinets, boxes and fittings-Unused openings effectively closed
1910.23(c)(1)	111	73	66%	0	1	37	Walking and working surfaces-Protect open sided floors, platforms and runways
1910.212(a)(3)(ii)	71	62	87%	0	1	8	Machine guarding—Point of operation guarding
1910.147(c)(4)(i)	67	57	85%	0	1	9	Lockout/tagout—Energy control procedures
1910.132(a)	62	47	76%	0	1	14	Personal protective equipment-General requirements-Provided when necessary
1910.1200(e)(1)	430	45	10%	0	3	382	Hazard communication—Written program
1910.212(b)	148	45	31%	0	1	101	Machine guarding-Fixed machinery-Anchored to prevent moving/walking
1910.147(c)(1)	65	45	69%	0	1	19	Lockout/tagout—Energy control program
1910.219(d)(1)	41	39	95%	0	0	2	Machine guarding-Pulleys-Guarded within 7 feet or less of floor
1910.242(b)	110	38	35%	0	1	71	Hand and portable power tools—Compressed air for cleaning—Chip guard and PPE with pressure reduced to 30 psi
1910.178(l)(1)	67	38	57%	0	0	29	Powered industrial trucks-Operator training-Ensure operator competency
1910.132(d)(1)	81	37	46%	0	0	44	Personal protective equipment-Hazard assessment
1910.1200(h)(1)	178	35	20%	0	2	141	Hazard communication—Training
1910.305(b)(2)(i)	102	33	32%	0	1	68	Electrical-Covers and canopies-Pull and junction boxes and fittings with approved covers
1910.147(c)(6)(i)	77	31	40%	0	1	45	Lockout/tagout—Periodic inspection
1910.305(g)(2)(iii)	196	28	14%	0	2	166	Electrical—Flexible cords and cables—Strain relief
1910.178(q)(7)	102	28	27%	0	0	74	Powered industrial trucks-Maintenance
1910.147(c)(4)(ii)	55	26	47%	0	0	29	Lockout/tagout—Energy control procedure—Clear and outlines scope, purpose and authorizations

*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Freq. Violated Stds. Report," run 1-11-10.

Top 10 Most Frequently Cited "Serious" Violations Public Sector*

Standard Violated	Total Violations		Serious Percent		Repeat Violations	Other Violations	Brief Description
1910.151(c)	8	8	100%	0	0	0	Medical and first aid-Eyewash and emergency showers
NCGS 95-129(1)	7	7	100%	0	0	0	General Duty Clause
1910.133(a)(1)	6	5	83%	0	0	1	Eye and face protection-General requirements
1910.304(g)(5)	6	4	67%	0	0	2	Electrical—Grounding—Path to ground
1910.305(b)(1)(ii)	5	4	80%	0	0	1	Electrical-Cabinets, boxes and fittings-Unused openings effectively closed
1910.212(a)(1)	4	4	100%	0	0	0	Machine guarding—General requirements
1910.303(b)(1)(ii)	4	4	100%	0	0	0	Electrical-General-Examination, installation and use-Mechanical strength and durability
1910.23(c)(1)	5	3	60%	0	0	2	Walking/working surfaces—Open sided floors/platforms 4 feet or more above adjacent ground require standard railings
1910.132(d)(1)	4	3	75%	0	0	1	Personal protective equipment-Hazard assessment
1910.134(c)(1)	4	3	75%	0	0	1	Personal protective equipment-Respiratory protection-Written program

*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Freq. Violated Stds. Report," run 1-11-10.

Consultation Series

Consultation Series Highlights

- The Consultative Services Bureau conducted 1,186 total consultative visits in FY 2009:
 - 783 (66%) safety visits and 403 (34%) health visits.
 - 1,040 (88%) initial visits, 70 (6%) training assistance visits and 76 (6%) followup visits.
 - 989 (83%) private sector visits and 197 (17%) public sector visits.
 - 345 (29%) manufacturing visits, 269 (23%) construction visits, 375 (31%) other type visits and 197 (17%) public sector visits.
- Hazards identified and eliminated as a result of consultative visits totaled 7,517 in FY 2009, higher than in FY 2008 (7,074) and in FY 2007 (7,463).
- Of the identified hazards, 6,030 (80%) were serious hazards and 1,487 (20%) were other-than-serious hazards.
- In FY 2009 consultants also conducted 763 safety and health interventions, which included speeches, training programs, program assistance, interpretations, conference/seminars, outreach and other interventions.
- The Safety Awards Program celebrated its 63rd year with another successful season. The Gold Award was presented to employer sites with a total lost workday case rate (lost and restricted workdays included) at least 50 percent below the state average. The Silver Award went to employer sites with a lost workday rate at least 50 percent below the state average. Thirty-one safety award banquets were held—with a total of 3,100 in attendance. There were a total of 2,715 annual safety awards applications, of those 2,342 qualified for awards: 2,027 Gold Awards and 315 Silver Awards. A total of 71 Million-Hour Safety Awards were distributed in FY 2009. The very first 50th year plaque was presented during this safety award season.
- The recognition programs enjoyed another year of growth and success. Thirteen new Star sites were recognized, 25 Star sites were recertified, and 85 first time Star interventions were conducted. There are currently a total of 119 companies in the Star programs.
- During FY 2009 the recognition programs, while managed by the Consultative Services Bureau, continue to utilize resources provided by the Compliance Bureau for on-site evaluations with Compliance and Education, Training and Technical Assistance helping to promote participation in the recognition programs.
- The bureau continues to reach small employers and encourage participation in the Safety and Health Achievement Recognition Program (SHARP). In FY 2009 the bureau recognized 54 SHARP-related worksites. There are currently 87 SHARP-related worksites.

Carolina Star Program

The Carolina Star Program encourages employers and employees in their efforts to reduce hazards, institute new programs and perfect existing programs for providing safe and healthy working conditions. The Carolina Star Program is the state's most prestigious way to provide official recognition of excellent safety and health programs, assistance to employers in their efforts to reach that level of excellence, and the benefits of a cooperative approach to resolve potential safety and health problems. Not only do Star sites affect major industry in the state, these sites are mentors and help all businesses of all sizes in improving their safety and health programs. During FY 2009 the following companies were awarded the Carolina Star, Rising Star, Building Star, or Public Sector Star status or were recertified.

Star Site Name and Location	Site Approval Date	Recertification Date
Yonkers Industries Inc.	Oct. 16, 2008	
John Deere Turf Care	Nov. 18, 2008	
Syngenta Crop Protection Inc.	Nov. 18, 2008	
Nucor Steel		Jan. 6, 2009
Georgia-Pacific Corp.—Dudley Chip-N-Saw		Jan. 6, 2009
International Paper Co.—Shorewood Packaging		Feb. 12, 2009
Hospira Inc.	Feb. 12, 2009	
Monteith Construction Corp.	April 1, 2009	
The Wackenhut Corp.		April 1, 2009
Security Forces Inc.		April 1, 2009
Mundy Industrial Contractors		April 1, 2009
Gilead Sciences Inc.	April 15, 2009	
PCS Phosphate Company Inc.—Aurora Division (Provisional)		April 28, 2009
Bimbo Bakeries USA Inc. (Formerly George Weston Bakeries)		April 28, 2009
Metal Tech of Murfreesboro-Murfreesboro, N.C.	April 28, 2009	
Regulator Marine Inc.	May 19, 2009	
Energizer Battery Manufacturing Inc. (Plant #1)		May 19, 2009
Glen Raven Technical Fabrics—Finishing Facility (Provisional)		May 19, 2009
City of Mount Airy		May 19, 2009
Davidson County (Provisional)		May 12, 2009
N.C. Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services— Standards Division—Lab Section	July 13, 2009	
The Sherwin-Williams Co.—Aerosol Division, Howard Street Facility	July 13, 2009	
Performance Fibers Operations Inc.		July 13, 2009
West Fraser Inc.—Armour Lumber Mill		July 13, 2009
International Paper Co.—Snow Hill Chip Mill		July 13, 2009
Clean Harbors Environmental Services		July 13, 2009
Progress Energy Carolinas—Energy Information Center		July 29, 2009
Mundy Maintenance and Services Inc.—Invista/Fortron Site		July 30, 2009
North American Energy Services—Roanoke Valley Energy		July 30, 2009
Samet Corp.		Aug. 31, 2009
Berry Plastics Corp.	Aug. 31, 2009	
Person County—Public Works Department		Sept. 10, 2009
Glen Raven Custom Fabrics—Plant #1		Sept. 10, 2009
The Sherwin-Williams Co.—Chemical Coatings Factory (Promotion)		Sept. 10, 2009
E.J. Pope d.b.a. Pope Transport	Sept. 30, 2009	
Preformed Line Products Inc. (Promotion)	Sept. 30, 2009	
Jelliff Corp.—LGM Division		Sept. 30, 2009

Total Visits by Category

Category	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Safety	749	774	783
Health	389	384	403
Total	1,138	1,158	1,186

Total Visits by Type

Туре	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Initial	959	994	1,041
Training and Assistance	88	102	69
Followup	91	62	76
Total	1,138	1,158	1,186

Total Visits by Industry Type

Industry	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
Manufacturing	291	366	345
Construction	306	322	269
Other	335	279	375
Public Sector	206	191	197
Total	1,138	1,158	1,186



*FY 2009 data from IMIS internal reports prepared 12-15-09.





*FY 2009 data from IMIS internal reports prepared 12-15-09.

Total Traditional Visits by Industry*



*FY 2009 data from IMIS internal reports prepared 12-15-09.



*FY 2009 data from IMIS internal reports prepared 12-15-09.

Education, Training and Technical Assistance Series

Education, Training and Technical Assistance Series Highlights

- The ETTA Bureau continued to focus on increasing efficiency and effectiveness in providing outreach training to workers in high-risk industries and affirming its role to ensure adherence to terms of agreement for partnerships and alliances. The work of the bureau included rulemaking, publications, partnerships, alliances, training and outreach.
- ETTA began releasing the first of more than 60 standard safety and health presentations to the public. Presentations are now available on the Internet for download so that each employer can tailor training to meet specific employee needs. The remaining presentations will be released during the next several months. After release of the initial standard presentations, ETTA plans to focus on industry-specific presentations, beginning with those industries included in the OSH Division's special emphasis programs.
- ETTA hosted multiple 30- and 10-hour general industry and construction awareness courses. These included two general industry 30-hour courses, five general industry 10-hour courses, two construction industry 30-hour courses and 10 construction industry 10-hour courses. Four of the construction 10-hour courses were delivered in Spanish. Nearly 100 percent of students who attended the courses found them to be useful in the workplace.
- ETTA continued to offer a variety of training topics to the public via the speaker's bureau, web training and individual topic workshops at the Charlotte, Raleigh, Winston-Salem, Wilmington and Asheville field offices. Nineteen of these events were conducted in Spanish.
- ETTA offered more than 200 courses, forums and workshops and also provided an exhibit at numerous health and safety and industrial conferences. The OSH Division provided training for 9,258 employers and employees during this fiscal year. The training section continued to expand and improve its outreach training calendar and newsletter. The training calendar is available on the NCDOL website, while the newsletter was e-mailed monthly to more than 7,000 employees/employers during this reporting period. The calendar outlines course offerings and allows for online registration for all courses. The newsletter outlines the current training schedule and offers information with regard to a variety of NCDOL services.
- The training section continues to provide training to workers in high-risk industries such as construction, logging and agriculture at or near their worksites using the Labor One Mobile Training Unit. Seven training events were hosted using Labor One.
- The training section began offering electronic certificates for 10-hour workshops, 30-hour workshops, individual topic workshops and webinars.
- The standards section adopted several new rules during this year including acetylene, PPE consensus standard updates, PPE training requirements, marine terminal, maritime, electrical, and state-specific cranes and derricks rules.
- Additionally, at least 27 Field Information System documents were reviewed by the standards section and approved for use or revised during this time including six federal compliance directives, the new H1N1 directive, 10 field operations manual chapters and 10 operational procedure notices, including a state-specific notice on dry-laid masonry walls.

Education, Training and Technical Assistance Series Highlights (Continued)

- The standards section developed new industry guides on transportation safety and combustible dust. The bureau also created new publications on several topics in English and Spanish such as excavations, process safety management, pneumatic nail guns and confined spaces.
- The bureau mailed three hazard alerts to industries during this fiscal year. The subjects of the alerts were ammonia, golf cart hazards and health hazards special emphasis program.
- The bureau also answered 4,592 inquiries for standards interpretation by phone or written correspondence.





^{*}Data from the Bureau of Education, Training and Technical Assistance.



Fatality Series Highlights

- The NCDOL Occupational Safety and Health Division evaluated and investigated a total of 41 fatalities in FY 2009, a decrease from the 47 fatalities in FY 2008 and 53 in FY 2007.
- Of the 41 fatalities in FY 2009, 17 percent were related to "struck by"; 17 percent were related to "falls"; 29 percent were related to "crushed by object"; 5 percent were related to "electrocutions"; 22 percent were related to "fire/explosion"; and 10 percent were related to "other."
- In FY 2009, 27 percent of the fatalities were related to "construction"; 32 percent were related to "manufacturing"; 17 percent were related to "services"; 7 percent were related to "agriculture, forestry, fishing"; 7 percent were related to "transportation and public utilities"; 5 percent were related to "government"; and 5 percent were related to "wholesale trade."
- The N.C. Department of Labor's OSH Division consists of three major reporting districts (Raleigh/Wilmington Area, Charlotte/Asheville Area and Winston-Salem Area). During FY 2009, the Asheville field office entered several months of inspection data generated by their office into the Charlotte IMIS system and then switched and began entering their data into the Winston-Salem system. Due to the difficulty of making that distinction within this report, the Asheville office will be reflected as part of the Charlotte IMIS system for FY 2009.
- Of the 41 investigated fatalities in FY 2009, 56 percent were conducted in the Raleigh/Wilmington Area, 22 percent were in the Charlotte/Asheville Area, and 22 percent were in the Winston-Salem Area.
- In FY 2009 the OSH Division fatality rate by race/ethnic group was 51 percent white, 22 percent Hispanic, 22 percent black and 5 percent other.

CHART 36

Cause of Death	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	Totals by Event**
Crushed by Object/Equipment	22	10	12	44
Electrocution	2	5	2	9
Explosion/Fire	0	3	9	12
Falls	8	12	7	27
Struck by Object	15	11	7	33
Other	6	6	4	16
Total Fatalities**	53	47	41	141

Fatality Comparison*

*Data from the Occupational Fatality Investigation Review (OFIR) Report.

**Totals do not include deaths by natural causes and/or non work-related deaths.

Fatalities Investigated*



*Data from the Occupational Fatality Investigation Review (OFIR) Report.

**Totals do not include deaths by natural causes and/or non work-related deaths.


*Data from the Occupational Fatality Investigation Review (OFIR) Report.

**Other total includes "fire/explosion" and other events.

***Totals do not include deaths by natural causes and/or non work-related deaths.

North Carolina Fatal Events by District Office*

FY 2007

Event Type	Charlotte/Asheville Office	Raleigh/Wilmington Office	Winston-Salem Office	Totals by Event Type**
Crushed by Object/Equipment	6	14	2	22
Electrocution	0	1	1	2
Explosion/Fire	0	0	0	0
Falls	2	5	1	8
Struck by Object	5	6	3	14
Other	1	4	2	7
Totals by Office**	14	30	9	53

FY 2008

Event Type	Charlotte/Asheville Office	Raleigh/Wilmington Office	Winston-Salem Office	Totals by Event Type**
Crushed by Object/Equipment	2	6	2	10
Electrocution	1	3	1	5
Explosion/Fire	3	0	0	3
Falls	9	3	0	12
Struck by Object	3	6	2	11
Other	1	5	0	6
Totals by Office**	19	23	5	47

FY 2009

Event Type	Charlotte/Asheville Office	Raleigh/Wilmington Office	Winston-Salem Office	Totals by Event Type**
Crushed by Object/Equipment	4	4	4	12
Electrocution	0	1	1	2
Explosion/Fire	0	9	0	9
Falls	2	4	1	7
Struck by Object	3	1	3	7
Other	0	4	0	4
Totals by Office**	9	23	9	41

*Data from the Occupational Fatality Investigation Review (OFIR) Report.

**Totals do not include deaths by natural causes and/or non work-related deaths.



**Total 41

27%

*Data from the Occupational Fatality Investigation Review (OFIR) Report. **Total does not include deaths by natural causes and/or non work-related deaths.

Fatalities by Office Location*

FY 2009





*Data from the Occupational Fatality Investigation Review (OFIR) Report.

**Total does not include deaths by natural causes and/or non work-related deaths.

Fatalities by Race/Ethnic Group*





*Data from the Occupational Fatality Investigation Review (OFIR) Report. **Total does not include deaths by natural causes and/or non work-related deaths.

Construction Series

Definition of the Construction Special Emphasis Program

The Occupational Safety and Health Division has a Special Emphasis Program (SEP) for the construction industry that began in FY 1998. This SEP was implemented because the construction industry accounts for 27 percent of workplace fatalities statewide and only 5 percent of the workforce in North Carolina. SEPs are implemented as a strategy for reducing occupational fatalities. A county is included in this SEP if it has experienced more than one construction-related fatality during a fiscal year. If so, the county will come under this emphasis program of compliance, consultation and/or education and training from the OSH Division.

The following counties constituted the SEP for FY 2009:

- Dare
- Durham
- Forsyth
- Guilford
- Iredell
- Mecklenburg
- Wake

Construction Series Highlights

- There were 2,198 construction industry inspections conducted in North Carolina in FY 2009.
- Of the 2,198 inspections conducted, 1,759 were safety inspections, which accounted for 80 percent of the total inspections in the construction industry.
- North Carolina conducted 439 health inspections in the construction industry, which accounted for 20 percent of the total for FY 2009.
- 33 percent (732) of all construction industry inspections statewide were in-compliance compared to 67 percent (1,466) of the total inspections with citations for FY 2009.
- The construction industry was cited for 2,491 serious, willful and repeat violations during FY 2009.
- Of the 2,198 inspections conducted, 1,223 resulted from the Construction Special Emphasis Program in FY 2009.
- Carpentry, roofing, siding and sheet metal contractors accounted for 30 percent of all FY 2009 construction industry inspections in North Carolina.

Construction Inspections by Category*

FY 2009



Total 2,198

*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-11-10.

Construction Inspections by OSH Field Office*



*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-11-10.

Туре	Number of Inspections	Percent
Accident	39	2
Complaint	146	7
Referral	184	8
Followup	6	0
Unprogrammed Related	178	8
Programmed Planned	1,428	65
Programmed Related	217	10
Programmed Other	0	0
Monitoring	0	0
TOTAL	2,198	100

Construction Inspections by Type*

*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-11-10.



Construction Inspections by Type and Percentage*

*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-11-10.

**Other total includes "programmed other," "followup" and "monitoring" construction inspections.

SEP County Construction Inspections by Type*

County	Accident	Complaint	Referral	Followup
Dare	0	2	0	2
Durham	0	4	3	0
Forsyth	1	3	2	1
Guilford	2	2	3	0
Iredell	3	2	1	0
Mecklenburg	10	18	12	1
Wake	5	24	9	0
Total	21	55	30	4

County	Unprogrammed Related	Programmed Planned	Programmed Related	Programmed Other**
Dare	0	35	2	0
Durham	4	64	7	0
Forsyth	2	181	2	0
Guilford	5	109	37	0
Iredell	6	41	0	0
Mecklenburg	19	305	62	0
Wake	29	170	33	0
Total	65	905	143	0

*Special Emphasis County data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-11-10. **"Programmed other" total also includes "monitoring" inspections.

Ratio for SWRV** Construction Inspections (Safety and Health Combined)*

Number of	SWRVs	SWRV Ratio
Inspections	Cited	per Inspection
2,198	2,491	1.1

Construction Inspections by SEP County*

County	Number of Inspections	In-Compliance Rate	SWRV Ratio
Dare	41	73	0.6
Durham	82	18	0.9
Forsyth	192	26	1.4
Guilford	158	40	1.1
Iredell	53	45	1.1
Mecklenburg	427	43	0.9
Wake	270	40	1.1
Total Inspections	1,223	N/A	N/A

*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-11-10.

**Serious, willful and repeat violations (SWRV).

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]