# NORTH CAROLINA OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

# **Program Statistics**

# October 2010–September 2011



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 2010–September 2011



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, the development or interpretation of standards, OSH publications, safety awards or the Carolina Star program 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 and SHARP 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 (1-800-625-2267).

### 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 2009–201110
2. Inspections by Category11
Inspections by Type
3. Statistical Reference—Inspections by
Type
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 2009–201119
9. Statistical Reference—Violations by
Type
10. Violations by Type21
Violations per Inspection
11. Inspections In-Compliance
<ul><li>12. Violations per Inspection</li></ul>
14. Violations Reclassified25
Penalty Series
15. Statistical Reference—Penalty Assessment
in Fiscal Years 2009–2011
16. Statistical Reference—Penalty Assessment
by Violation Type
17. Penalty Assessment by Violation Type 30
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 2009–201136
<ul><li>23. Number of Inspections Contested</li></ul>
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
<ul> <li>N.C. Top 25 Most Frequently Cited "Serious"</li> <li>27. Top 25 Most Frequently Cited "Serious" Violations Construction Standards, Fiscal Year 2011</li></ul>
Consultation Series
<ul> <li>30. Statistical Reference—Total Visits by Category, Type and Industry Type</li></ul>
Fiscal Years 2009–201157 34. Hazards by Type58 Education, Training and Technical Assistance
Series 35. Distribution of OSH-Related Publications62

### **Fatality Series**

36. Fatalities Investigated by Event in
Fiscal Years 2009–201164
37. Total Fatalities Investigated in
Fiscal Years 2009–201165
38. Leading Causes of Investigated
Fatalities in Fiscal Years 2009–201166
39. N.C. Fatal Events by District Office
Fiscal Years 2009–201167
40. Fatalities by Industry Type68
41. Fatalities by Office Location FY 201169
42. Fatalities by Race/Ethnic Group FY 201170
Construction Series
43. Inspections by Category FY 201174
44. Inspections by Field Office FY 201175
45. Inspections by Type FY 201176
46. Inspections by Type and Percentage
FY 201177
47. SEP Inspections by Type FY 201178
48. Ratio for SWRV Inspections FY 201179

[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 2011, Oct. 1, 2010–Sept. 30, 2011.

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. Thirty states plus the District of Columbia operate under the exclusive jurisdiction of federal OSHA, with the exception of Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, New York 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, 2010–September 30, 2011." 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 EXCLUSIVE FEDERAL JURISDICTION OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH** Alaska New Mexico Alabama Montana Arizona North Carolina Arkansas Nebraska California Oregon Colorado New Hampshire Hawaii Puerto Rico Connecticut<sup>1</sup> New Jersey<sup>1</sup> New York<sup>1</sup> Indiana South Carolina Delaware Iowa Tennessee District of Columbia North Dakota Ohio Kentucky Utah Florida Maryland Vermont Georgia Oklahoma Michigan Virginia Idaho Pennsylvania Minnesota Illinois<sup>1</sup> Rhode Island Washington Nevada Wyoming Kansas South Dakota Louisiana Texas Maine Virgin Islands<sup>1</sup> West Virginia Massachusetts Wisconsin Mississippi Missouri NOTE: 1. Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, New York and the Virgin Islands state plans are public sector only.

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

## **Executive Summary** (continued)

#### Inspections

During fiscal year 2011 (October 2010–September 2011), North Carolina conducted 4,276 inspections, 1,896 more than the average state program and 3,110 more than the average federal jurisdiction.

Of North Carolina's 4,276 inspections, 2,790 (65 percent) were safety and 1,486 (35 percent) were health. In the average state program, 78 percent were safety and 22 percent were health, while in the average federal jurisdiction 82 percent were safety and 18 percent were health.

In the inspection type category, North Carolina programmed inspections accounted for 60 percent of inspection activity, compared to 58 percent in the average state program and 58 percent in the average federal jurisdiction. Complaint inspections accounted for 18 percent of inspections in North Carolina, 17 percent in the average state program, and 21 percent in the average federal jurisdiction.

In the inspection by industry group, North Carolina accounted for 19 percent of inspections in manufacturing, compared to 16 percent in the average state program and 21 percent in the average federal jurisdiction. However, North Carolina conducted 42 percent of inspections in construction compared to 40 percent in the average state program and 56 percent in the average federal jurisdiction.

North Carolina conducted 4 percent of inspections in the public sector compared to 15 percent of inspections in the public sector for the average state program. Federal OSHA does not cover the public sector.

#### Violations

North Carolina cited 9,742 total violations, a 6 percent decrease from the previous year. The average state program cited 5,148 violations, a 6 percent decrease, and the average federal jurisdiction cited 2,638 violations, a 15 percent decrease. Overall, North Carolina cited more violations per inspection (3.7), than the average state program (3.4), and more than the average federal jurisdiction (2.9). North Carolina cited more serious violations (4,728) in FY 2011 than the average state program (2,260) and more than the average federal jurisdictions (4,804) in FY 2011 than the average federal jurisdictions (4,804) in FY 2011 than the average federal jurisdiction (595).

#### **Penalty Assessments**

Total penalty assessments in North Carolina were \$6,417,852 in FY 2011, which was higher than the average state program (\$3,304,072), and higher than the average federal jurisdiction (\$5,732,246). North Carolina assessed a total of \$259,119 in penalties for violations in the public sector in FY 2011.

North Carolina's average penalty per violation was higher than the average state program per serious violation (\$1,076 vs. \$929), and per willful violation (\$49,500 vs. \$35,665) and per failure-to-abate violation (\$10,789 vs. \$9,280). However, it was lower per repeat violation (\$2,020 vs. \$2,422) and per nonserious violation (\$55 vs. \$130). The average federal jurisdiction penalty per violation was higher than North Carolina's per serious violation (\$2,100 vs. \$1,076), per repeat violation (\$6,974 vs. \$2,020) and per nonserious violation (\$398 vs. \$55). However, it was lower per willful violation (\$40,873 vs. \$49,500) and per failure-to-abate violation (\$4,976 vs. \$10,789).

#### Litigation

In North Carolina, 5.3 percent of the inspections with citations were contested in FY 2011, higher than FY 2010 (4.6). The average state program had 14.9 percent of the inspections with citations contested, while the average federal jurisdiction had 10.9 percent of the inspections with citations contested.

## **Executive Summary** (continued)

#### Consultation

The North Carolina consultation program conducted 1,273 total visits in FY 2011. This was a 5 percent increase from FY 2010. Of 1,273 traditional visits, 86 percent were initial visits, 8 percent were training/assistance visits, and 6 percent were followup visits. The industry mix for the traditional consultative visits in FY 2011 was 29 percent manufacturing, 15 percent construction, 39 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 eight new companies and awarded recertification to 44 existing companies in FY 2011. There are currently a total of 137 companies in the Star programs.

#### Education, Training and Technical Assistance

The Education, Training and Technical Assistance Bureau outreach training calendar and newsletter was emailed to more than 73,000 employers/employees during FY 2011. The bureau also distributed 48,120 OSHA-related publications in FY 2011, a 12 percent decrease from FY 2010 with 53,960, and a 12 percent decrease from FY 2009 with 53,717. In 2011, the Education, Training and Technical Assistance Bureau provided training for 7,429 employers and employees.

#### Fatalities

The NCDOL Occupational Safety and Health Division evaluated and investigated a total of 54 occupational fatalities that occurred during FY 2011. Of the 54 investigated fatalities in FY 2011, 15 percent were related to being "crushed by" an object, 24 percent were related to "falls," 35 percent were related to being "struck by" an object, 4 percent were related to "electrocutions," and 18 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: Cleveland, Dare, Durham, Forsyth, Iredell, Mecklenburg and Wake. The Construction Industry Special Emphasis Program accounted for 1,812 inspections during FY 2011 in North Carolina. Of the 1,812 inspections, 83 percent were safety and 17 percent were health. In-compliance inspections totaled 38 percent of all activity within the SEP, and 62 percent of all inspections had citations issued. The construction industry was cited for 2,251 serious, willful and repeat violations during FY 2011. A total of 1,098 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 <sup>1</sup>	Federally Administered Programs	Number of Establishments <sup>1</sup>
Total 21 states, 1 jurisdiction	3,061,780	Total 29 states, 2 jurisdictions <sup>2</sup>	4,420,079
Region 1—1 state	<b>21,567</b>	<b>Region 1—5 states</b>	<b>367,692</b>
Vermont	21,567	Connecticut <sup>3</sup>	90,048
Region 2—1 jurisdiction	<b>45,549</b>	Maine	40,616
Puerto Rico	45,549	Massachussetts	170,473
Region 3—2 states Maryland Virginia Region4—4 states	<b>329,651</b> 135,633 194,018 <b>545,803</b>	New Hampshire Rhode Island <b>Region 2—2 states, 1 jurisdiction</b> New Jersey <sup>3</sup> New York <sup>3</sup>	37,873 28,682 <b>749,850</b> 231,186 515,819
Kentucky	90,661	Virgin Islands <sup>3</sup>	2,845
North Carolina	218,987	<b>Region 3—3 states, 1 jurisdiction</b>	383,155
South Carolina	103,254	Delaware	24,523
Tennessee	132,901	District of Columbia	21,210
<b>Region 5—3 states</b>	<b>514,152</b>	Pennsylvania	298,432
Indiana	146,017	West Virginia	38,990
Michigan	221,682	<b>Region 4—4 states</b>	<b>871,009</b>
Minnesota	146,453	Alabama	100,805
Region 6—1 state	<b>44,986</b>	Florida	491,249
New Mexico	44,986	Georgia	219,348
Region 7—1 state	<b>80,971</b>	Mississippi	59,607
Iowa	80,971	<b>Region 5—3 states</b>	<b>712,389</b>
<b>Region 8—2 states</b>	<b>89,824</b>	Illinois <sup>3</sup>	314,977
Utah	69,464	Ohio	256,551
Wyoming	20,360	Wisconsin	140,861
<b>Region 9—4 states</b>	<b>1,084,060</b>	<b>Region 6—4 states</b>	<b>778,210</b>
Arizona	134,072	Arkansas	65,451
California	857,831	Louisiana	103,384
Hawaii	32,372	Oklahoma	90,347
Nevada	59,785	Texas	519,028
<b>Region 10—3 states</b>	<b>305,217</b>	<b>Region 7—3 states</b>	<b>277,223</b>
Alaska	19,901	Kansas	74,698
Oregon	108,040	Missouri	150,892
Washington	177,276	Nebraska	51,633
		<b>Region 8—4 states</b> Colorado Montana North Dakota South Dakota	<b>236,251</b> 152,997 36,326 21,445 25,483
		Region 9 <sup>2</sup>	
		Region 10—1 state Idaho	<b>44,300</b> 44,300

1. Source: Number of Establishments: County Business Patterns-United States, 2009 (Private sector only).

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

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

## Text Table 3 Comparison of Number of Establishments



5

[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 decreased from 4,500 in FY 2010 to 4,276 in FY 2011, a decrease of 5 percent.
- The average number of inspections in state programs was 2,380, less than FY 2010 (2,611).
- The average number of inspections in federal jurisdictions was 1,166, less than FY 2010 (1,324).
- The number of safety inspections in North Carolina decreased from 2,801 in FY 2010 to 2,790 in FY 2011, a decrease of less than 1 percent.
- The number of safety inspections in state programs decreased from 2,058 in FY 2010 to 1,859 in FY 2011, a decrease of 11 percent.
- The number of safety inspections in federal jurisdictions had a 14 percent decrease from 1,109 in FY 2010 to 958 in FY 2011.
- The number of health inspections in North Carolina decreased from 1,699 in FY 2010 to 1,486 in FY 2011, a decrease of 13 percent.
- The number of health inspections in state programs decreased from 553 in FY 2010 to 521 in FY 2011, a decrease of 6 percent.
- The number of health inspections in federal jurisdictions had a 3 percent decrease from 215 in FY 2010 to 208 in FY 2011.
- The percentage of inspections conducted in FY 2011 for manufacturing was 19 percent of the total inspections for North Carolina, compared to 16 percent of total inspections for the average state program, and 21 percent of total inspections for the average federal jurisdiction.
- The percentage of inspections conducted in FY 2011 for construction was 42 percent of total inspections for North Carolina, compared to 40 percent of total inspections for the average state program, and 56 percent of the total inspections for the average federal jurisdiction.
- North Carolina conducted 4 percent of the total inspections in the public sector in FY 2011, compared to 15 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 2011 was 23 days for North Carolina, 37 days for the average state program, and 45 for the average federal jurisdiction.

## **Inspections, All Types**

FY 2009		2009	FY 2	2010	FY 2011	
Comparison	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average
North Carolina	5,196	5,196	4,500	4,500	4,276	4,276
State Program**	61,324	2,787	57,457	2,611	52,369	2,380
Federal OSHA*	39,076	1,260	41,058	1,324	36,147	1,166

## **Inspections by Category FY 2011**

Comparison	oarison Safety Total		Health Total	Health Percent
North Carolina 2,790		65	1,486	35
State Program** 1,859		78	521	22
Federal OSHA*	Federal OSHA* 958		208	18

\*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 1-10-12.

## **Inspections by Type**

	Accident		Complaint		Programmed	
Comparison	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
North Carolina	118	3	784	18	2,550	60
State Program**	135	6	406	17	1,369	58
Federal OSHA*	25	2	243	21	675	58

	Followup		Referral		Unprogrammed Related	
Comparison	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
North Carolina	157	4	354	8	313	7
State Program**	121	5	243	10	106	4
Federal OSHA*	39	3	139	12	45	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 1-10-12.

Commention	Consti	ruction	Manufacturing		
Comparison	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	
North Carolina	1,812	42	799	19	
State Program**	943	40	385	16	
Federal OSHA*	649	56	250	21	

## **Inspections by Industry Type**

Guine	Ot	her	Public Sector***		
Comparison	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	
North Carolina	1,503	35	162	4	
State Program**	699	29	353	15	
Federal OSHA*	267	23	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 1-10-12.

## **Average Lapse Time\*\* for All Inspections\***



\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-10-12.

\*\*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 6 percent from 10,387 in FY 2010 to 9,742 in FY 2011.
- The total number of violations cited in FY 2011 by the average state program was 5,148, a 6 percent decrease from FY 2010 (5,465).
- The average federal jurisdiction experienced a 15 percent decrease in the total violations cited, from 3,111 in FY 2010 to 2,638 in FY 2011.
- North Carolina cited 4,728 serious violations in FY 2011, less than a 1 percent decrease from 4,748 serious violations in FY 2010.
- The average state program cited 2,260 serious violations in FY 2011, a 5 percent decrease from FY 2010 with 2,373.
- The average federal jurisdiction cited 1,918 serious violations in FY 2011, a 20 percent decrease from 2,403 serious violations in FY 2010.
- North Carolina continues to cite more nonserious violations (4,804), compared to the average state program with 2,768 nonserious violations and the average federal jurisdiction with 595 nonserious violations cited in FY 2011.
- Overall, North Carolina cited more violations per inspection (3.7) than the average state program (3.4) and more violations per inspection than the average federal jurisdiction (2.9).
- In FY 2011, North Carolina reclassified 1.9 percent of the violations, compared to 4.8 percent of violations reclassified in the average federal jurisdiction.

#### CHART 8

	FY 2009		FY 2010		FY 2011	
Comparison	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average
North Carolina	13,695	13,695	10,387	10,387	9,742	9,742
State Program**	129,250	5,875	120,231	5,465	113,251	5,148
Federal OSHA*	87,469	2,821	96,447	3,111	81,796	2,638

## **Violations in Fiscal Years 2009–2011**

\*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	4,728	4,728	49	4,804	4,804	49
State Program**	49,731	2,260	44	60,896	2,768	54
Federal OSHA*	59,467	1,918	73	18,457	595	22

	Repeat			Willful			
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent	
North Carolina	181	181	2	10	10	0	
State Program**	1,991	90	2	298	14	0	
Federal OSHA*	3,025	97	4	571	18	1	

	Failure-to-Abate			Unclassified			
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent	
North Carolina	19	19	0	0	0	0	
State Program**	328	15	0	7	1	0	
Federal OSHA*	269	9	0	7	1	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 1-10-12. \*\*"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 1-10-12.

754



\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-10-12.

## **Violations per Followup Inspection\***



\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-10-12.

## **Violations Reclassified\***



\*Data from Interim State Indicator Report (SIR), 10-11-11.

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]



## **Penalty Series Highlights**

- North Carolina assessed a total of \$6,417,852 in penalties for violations cited in FY 2011, compared to a total of \$3,304,072 assessed by the average state program and \$5,732,246 assessed by the average federal jurisdiction.
- The average penalty per serious violation was \$1,076 in FY 2011, higher than \$929 in the average state program and lower than \$2,100 in the average federal jurisdiction.
- North Carolina assessed a total of \$259,119 in penalties for violations cited in the public sector in FY 2011, a 79 percent increase from \$55,493 assessed in FY 2010.
- In FY 2011, North Carolina retained 68.4 percent of penalties assessed compared to 62.8 percent of penalties assessed and retained by the average federal jurisdiction.

### CHART 15

	FY 2009		FY 2	010	FY 2011	
Comparison	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average	Total	Program Average
North Carolina	\$ 3,235,393	\$3,235,393	\$ 5,850,453	\$5,850,453	\$ 6,417,852	\$6,417,852
State Program**	\$59,041,037	\$2,683,683	\$ 69,690,141	\$3,167,734	\$ 72,689,585	\$3,304,072
Federal OSHA*	\$94,747,395	\$3,056,367	\$179,981,532	\$5,805,856	\$177,699,613	\$5,732,246

## **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	\$ 5,086,010	\$5,086,010	79	\$ 266,284	\$266,284	4	
State Program**	\$ 46,171,128	\$2,098,688	63	\$7,897,785	\$358,990	11	
Federal OSHA*	\$124,881,114	\$4,028,423	70	\$7,335,250	\$236,621	4	

	Repeat			Willful			
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent	
North Carolina	\$ 365,558	\$365,558	6	\$ 495,000	\$495,000	8	
State Program**	\$ 4,848,583	\$220,390	7	\$10,677,050	\$485,320	15	
Federal OSHA*	\$20,969,701	\$676,442	12	\$22,807,340	\$735,721	13	

	Failure-to-Abate			Unclassified***			
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent	
North Carolina	\$ 205,000	\$205,000	3	\$ 0	\$ 0	0	
State Program**	\$3,062,664	\$139,212	4	\$ 32,375	\$ 1,472	0	
Federal OSHA*	\$1,388,433	\$ 44,788	1	\$317,775	\$10,251	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\***



<sup>\*</sup>Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-10-12.

# **Penalty Assessment per Violation**

Comparison	Serious	Nonserious	Repeat	Willful	Failure-to- Abate	Unclassified***
North Carolina	\$1,076	\$ 55	\$2,020	\$49,500	\$10,789	\$ 0
State Program**	\$ 929	\$130	\$2,422	\$35,665	\$ 9,280	\$ 1,472
Federal OSHA*	\$2,100	\$398	\$6,974	\$40,873	\$ 4,976	\$10,251

<sup>\*</sup>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.

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

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>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	\$ 259,119	\$259,119					
State Program***	\$5,283,314	\$240,151					
Federal OSHA**	N/A	N/A					

	Serious			Nonserious				
Comparison	Total	Average	Percent	Total	Average	Percent		
North Carolina	\$ 251,850	\$251,850	97	\$ 1,169	\$ 1,169	1		
State Program***	\$2,513,739	\$114,261	48	\$544,710	\$24,760	10		
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	\$ 6,100	\$ 6,100	2	\$ 0	\$ 0	0			
State Program***	\$505,530	\$22,979	10	\$551,500	\$551,500 \$25,068				
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***	\$1,167,835	\$53,083	22	\$0	\$0	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	\$1,702	\$8	\$2,033	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$0	
State Program***	\$ 239	\$81	\$1,915	\$25,068	\$13,271	\$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.

<sup>\*\*</sup>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.

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

<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>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 10-11-11.



# **Litigation Series Highlights**

- The number of inspections with citations contested in North Carolina was higher in FY 2011 (144), than in FY 2010 (138). The number of contested cases in the average state program was 224, and the number of contested cases in the average federal jurisdiction was 98.
- The percentage of inspections with citations that were contested in North Carolina was 5.3 percent in FY 2011, higher than the 4.6 percent in FY 2010.
- The percentage of inspections with citations that were contested in the average state program was 14.5 percent in FY 2010, lower than FY 2011 with 14.9.
- The percentage of inspections with citations that were contested in the average federal jurisdiction was higher in FY 2011 at 10.9 than in FY 2010 at 8.1.

### CHART 22

### Contested Cases October 2008–September 2011

		FY 2009	9	FY 2010				
Comparison	Inspections Contested Total	Program Average	Percent Inspections With Citations Contested	Inspections Contested Total	Program Average	Percent Inspections With Citations Contested		
North Carolina	114	114	3.1	138	138	4.6		
State Program**	5,132	233	13.1	5,163	235	14.5		
Federal OSHA*	2,018	65	7.1	2,475	80	8.1		

		FY 201	1
Comparison	Inspections Contested Total	Program Average	Percent Inspections With Citations Contested
North Carolina	141	141	5.3
State Program**	4,933	224	14.9
Federal OSHA*	3,028	98	10.9

\*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 1-10-12.

# **Percent of Inspections With Citations Contested\***



\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Inspection Report," run 1-10-12.

# Occupational Injury and Illness Incident Rates

### N.C. Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Division Calendar Years 2003–2010

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

	20	03	20	04	20	05	20	06
Industry	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.
Private Sector	5.3	4.0	4.8	4.1	4.6	4.0	4.4	4.0
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	6.4	4.6	6.4	6.7	6.1	7.6	6.0	6.1
Mining	4.0	2.5	3.8	2.5	3.6	2.7	3.5	2.3
Construction	7.1	4.7	6.4	4.4	6.3	4.6	5.9	4.9
Manufacturing	7.2	5.4	6.6	5.3	6.3	5.1	6.0	5.1
Transportation	6.1	4.7	5.5	4.8	5.2	4.6	5.0	4.6
Wholesale Trade	5.2	3.9	4.5	4.1	4.5	3.8	4.1	3.7
Retail Trade	5.3	4.0	5.3	4.6	5.0	4.6	4.9	4.3
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	1.7	1.1	1.6	1.3	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.3
Services	4.6	3.3	4.2	3.6	4.1	3.6	3.9	3.5
State and Local Government								
(Public Sector)	N/A	5.1	N/A	4.9	N/A	4.7	N/A	4.7
	20	2007 2008		08	08 2009		2010	
Industry	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.
D: + C +	1.0	2.7	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.1	2.5	2.1

Industry	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.
Private Sector	4.2	3.7	3.9	3.4	3.6	3.1	3.5	3.1
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	5.4	6.4	5.3	4.5	5.3	6.1	4.8	2.9
Mining	3.1	2.1	2.9	2.4	2.4	2.0	2.3	2.1
Construction	5.4	4.0	4.7	3.7	4.3	3.1	4.0	3.0
Manufacturing	5.6	4.4	5.0	4.2	4.3	3.5	4.4	3.7
Transportation	4.9	4.1	4.4	3.7	4.1	3.7	4.1	3.6
Wholesale Trade	4.0	3.0	3.7	2.8	3.3	3.0	3.4	3.0
Retail Trade	4.8	4.3	4.4	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.1	3.4
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	1.4	1.6	1.5	.08	1.5	0.7	1.3	0.9
Services	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.1	3.4	3.0	3.4	3.0
State and Local Government								
(Public Sector)	N/A	4.3	N/A	4.7	N/A	4.5	N/A	4.3

\*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*, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010. 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, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010.

### N.C. Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Division Calendar Years 2003–2010

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

	2003 2004 20		2005 200		06			
Industry	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.
Private Sector	2.6	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.0
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	3.3	2.0	3.7	3.4	3.3	4.5	3.2	3.2
Mining	2.0	1.9	2.3	1.7	2.2	1.5	2.1	1.5
Construction	3.6	2.6	3.4	2.5	3.4	2.5	3.2	2.8
Manufacturing	3.8	2.8	3.6	2.9	3.5	2.8	3.3	2.8
Transportation	3.2	2.5	3.1	2.7	3.0	2.7	2.9	2.7
Wholesale Trade	2.8	1.8	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.2	2.5	2.3
Retail Trade	2.7	2.1	2.7	2.1	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.2
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.3
Services	2.3	1.7	2.2	1.7	2.1	1.8	2.0	1.7
State and Local Government								
(Public Sector)	N/A	2.3	N/A	2.3	N/A	2.3	N/A	2.1

	20	07	20	08	2009		20	10
Industry	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.	U.S.	N.C.
Private Sector	2.1	1.9	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.8	1.6
Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing	2.8	3.1	2.9	2.3	2.9	3.5	2.7	1.7
Mining	2.0	1.2	2.0	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.4	1.2
Construction	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.3	1.7	2.1	1.6
Manufacturing	3.0	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.3	1.9	2.4	2.6
Transportation	2.8	2.3	2.6	2.0	2.4	2.0	2.4	2.0
Wholesale Trade	2.4	1.7	2.2	1.3	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.0
Retail Trade	2.5	2.3	2.3	1.9	2.2	1.7	2.2	2.0
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	0.7	1.0	1.5	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.6	0.5
Services	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.4	1.7	1.4	1.7	1.5
State and Local Government								
(Public Sector)	N/A	1.9	N/A	2.2	N/A	2.1	N/A	1.9

\*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, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010. 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, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010.

[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	26,578	177,972
Manufacturing	31-33	20-39	10,266	436,927
Transportation	48-49	40-59	6,764	125,649
Wholesale and Retail Trade	42-45	50-59	54,800	617,632
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	51-53	60-67	28,703	267,894
Services	54-81	70-89	121,269	1,916,329
All Other			3,667	47,812
Total Private Sector			252,047	3,590,215

# Text Table 5 State Demographic Profile Public Sector

Public Sector	Establishments*	Employees*
State	1,717	177,948
Local	4,494	391,420
Total Public Sector	6,211	569,368

\*Source: *Employment and Wages in North Carolina*, Division of Employment Security, N.C. Department of Commerce, Third Quarter 2011.







North Carolina Top 25 Most Frequently Cited "Serious" Violations

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

Standard Violated	Total Violations		Serious Percent	Willful Violations	Repeat Violations	Other Violations	Brief Description
1926.501(b)(13)	321	295	92%	1	23	2	Fall protection—Residential construction—Employees protected 6 feet or more above lower level
1926.20(b)(2)	238	203	85%	14	0	21	General safety and health provisions—Accident prevention—Frequent and regular inspections
1926.1053(b)(1)	176	165	94%	1	6	4	Ladders-Must extend 3 feet above landing or be properly secured to access upper landing
1926.102(a)(1)	173	165	95%	0	4	4	PPE-Eye and face protection-General requirements
1926.100(a)	109	100	92%	0	3	6	PPE—Head protection—General requirements
1926.503(a)(1)	102	100	98%	0	2	0	Fall protection—Training program
1926.501(b)(11)	89	79	89%	1	8	1	Fall protection—Steep roofs—Employees protected 6 feet or more above lower level
1926.501(b)(1)	81	77	95%	0	1	3	Fall protection—Unprotected sides and edges—Employees protected 6 feet or more above lower level
1926.20(b)(1)	64	57	89%	0	0	7	General safety and health provisions-Accident prevention program
1926.501(b)(10)	55	53	96%	0	2	0	Fall protection—Low slope roofs—Employees protected 6 feet or more above lower level
1926.21(b)(2)	54	48	89%	0	0	6	Safety training and education-Instruction to avoid unsafe conditions
1926.1060(a)	51	43	84%	0	2	6	Stairways and ladders—Training program
1926.501(c)(3)	46	42	91%	0	3	1	Fall protection-Protection from falling objects-Barricade area to which objects could fall
1926.1053(b)(13)	41	39	95%	0	0	2	Ladders—Use—Top step used as a step
1926.454(a)	44	37	84%	0	1	6	Scaffolds-Training-Hazard recognition for type of scaffold in use
1926.451(e)(1)	40	33	82%	0	1	6	Scaffolds—Access by various means
1926.1053(b)(4)	40	31	78%	0	0	9	Ladders-Use-Used for the purpose for which desgined
1926.501(b)(14)	32	30	94%	0	0	2	Fall protection—Wall openings—Employees protected 6 feet or more above lower level
1926.503(a)(2)	36	28	78%	0	1	7	Fall protection-Training-Each employee trained by competent person
1926.451(g)(4)(i)	29	28	97%	0	0	1	Scaffolds-Guardrail systems-Installed on open sides and ends of platforms
1926.453(b)(2)(v)	29	28	97%	0	0	1	Scaffolds—Aerial lifts—Extensible and articulating boom platforms—Body belts and lanyards worn/used
1926.451(g)(1)(vii)	31	27	87%	0	2	2	Scaffolds-Fall protection-Employees protected by personal fall arrest/guardrail system
1926.451(g)(1)	28	27	96%	0	0	1	Scaffolds—Fall protection—Employees protected 10 feet or more above lower level
1926.503(b)(1)	73	26	36%	0	2	45	Fall protection—Certification of training
NCGS 95-129(1)	26	26	100%	0	0	0	General Duty Clause

\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Freq. Violated Stds. Report," run 1-10-12.

# 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)	110	103	94%	0	1	6	Machine guarding—General requirements
NCGS 95-129(1)	90	90	100%	0	0	0	General Duty Clause
1910.215(b)(9)	104	81	78%	0	0	23	Machine guarding-Abrasive wheel machinery-Exposure adjustment
1910.151(c)	104	80	77%	0	2	22	Medical and first aid-Eyewash and emergency showers
1910.1200(e)(1)	278	77	28%	0	4	197	Hazard communication-Written program
1910.133(a)(1)	67	59	88%	0	1	7	Eye and face protection—General requirements
1910.304(g)(5)	101	57	56%	0	3	41	Electrical—Grounding—Path to ground
1910.215(a)(4)	85	57	67%	0	0	28	Machine guarding-Abrasive wheel machinery-Work rests
1910.1200(h)(1)	131	50	38%	0	1	80	Hazard communication—Training
1910.23(c)(1)	67	50	75%	0	1	16	Walking and working surfaces-Protect open-sided floors, platforms and runways
1910.132(a)	55	48	87%	0	0	7	Personal protective equipment-General requirements-Provided when necessary
1910.1200(f)(5)(i)	162	39	24%	0	1	122	Hazard communication-Labeling-Identity of chemical
1910.305(b)(1)(ii)	85	37	44%	0	1	47	Electrical cabinets, boxes and fittings-Unused openings effectively closed
1910.147(c)(6)(i)	56	37	66%	0	3	16	Lockout/tagout-Periodic inspection
1910.242(b)	62	36	58%	0	1	25	Hand and portable power tools—Compressed air for cleaning—Chip guard and PPE with pressure reduced to less than 30 psi
1910.147(c)(4)(i)	39	36	92%	0	2	1	Lockout/tagout-Energy control procedures
1910.132(d)(1)	73	35	48%	0	0	38	Personal protective equipment—Hazard assessment
1910.178(q)(7)	65	34	52%	0	0	31	Powered industrial trucks-Maintenance
1910.147(c)(4)(ii)	39	34	87%	0	1	4	Lockout/tagout—Energy control procedure—Clear and outlines scope, purpose and authorizations
1910.212(a)(3)(ii)	38	34	89%	0	1	3	Machine guarding—Point of operation guarding
1910.1200(g)(1)	104	31	30%	0	1	72	Hazard communication-MSDS for each chemical in the workplace
1910.147(c)(1)	39	31	79%	0	1	7	Lockout/tagout—Energy control program
1910.1030(c)(1)(i)	38	30	79%	0	0	8	Bloodborne pathogens-Written exposure control plan
1910.219(f)(3)	30	30	100%	0	0	0	Mechanical power transmission apparatus-Sprockets/chains enclosed
1910.219(d)(1)	26	25	96%	0	0	1	Machine guarding—Pulleys—Guarded within 7 feet or less of floor

\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Freq. Violated Stds. Report," run 1-10-12.

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

Standard Violated	Total Violations	Serious Violations	Serious Percent		Repeat Violations	Other Violations	Brief Description
1910.146(c)(1)	6	6	100%	0	0	0	Permit-required confined space entry—Evaluation to determine if there are permit-required confined spaces
1910.147(c)(6)(i)	7	5	71%	0	0	2	Lockout/tagout—Periodic inspection
1910.146(c)(2)	5	5	100%	0	0	0	Permit-required confined space entry-Posting permit-required confined spaces
1910.147(c)(4)(ii)	5	5	100%	0	0	0	Lockout/tagout—Energy control procedure—Clear and outlines scope, purpose and authorizations
1910.305(b)(1)	5	4	80%	0	0	1	Conductors entering cabinets, boxes, or fittings protected from abrasion, and openings effectively closed
NCGS 95-129(1)	4	4	100%	0	0	0	General Duty Clause
1910.151(c)	4	4	100%	0	0	0	Medical and first aid-Eyewash and emergency showers
1910.157(e)(2)	13	3	23%	0	0	10	Portable fire extinguishers-Monthly visual inspection
1910.1200(e)(1)	8	3	38%	0	0	5	Hazard communication-Written program
1910.134(f)(2)	6	3	50%	0	1	2	Respiratory protection-Fit testing for tight-fitting respirators

\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Freq. Violated Stds. Report," run 1-10-12.

# **Consultation Series**

# **Consultation Series Highlights**

- The Consultative Services Bureau conducted 1,273 total consultative visits in FY 2011:
  - 775 (61 percent) safety visits and 498 (39 percent) health visits.
  - 1,091 (86 percent) initial visits, 102 (8 percent) training assistance visits and 80 (6 percent) followup visits.
  - 1,062 (83 percent) private sector visits and 211 (17 percent) public sector visits.
  - 365 (29 percent) manufacturing visits, 191 (15 percent) construction visits, 506 (39 percent) other type visits and 211 (17 percent) public sector visits.
- Hazards identified and eliminated as a result of consultative visits totaled 6,783 in FY 2011, lower than in FY 2010 (6,895) and in FY 2009 (7,517).
- Of the identified hazards, 5,496 (81%) were serious hazards and 1,287 (19%) were other-than-serious hazards.
- In FY 2011 consultants also conducted 632 safety and health interventions, which included speeches, training programs, program assistance, interpretations, conference/seminars, outreach and other interventions.
- The Safety Awards Program celebrated its 65th 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-two safety award banquets were held—with a total of 3,243 in attendance. There were a total of 3,135 annual safety awards applications, of those 2,814 qualified for awards: 2,218 Gold Awards, 504 Silver Awards. A total of 92 Million-Hour Safety Awards were distributed in FY 2011
- In FY 2011, the recognition programs also enjoyed another year of growth and success. Eight new Star sites were recognized, 44 Star sites were recertified, and eight first-time Star interventions were conducted. There are currently 137 companies in the Star programs.
- During FY 2011 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 2011 the bureau recognized 50 SHARP-related worksites. There are currently 102 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 2011 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	<b>Recertification Date</b>
Frito-Lay Inc.—Charlotte		Nov. 22, 2010
Avdel USA LLC—Acument Global Tech.—Stanfield		Nov. 22, 2010
Skanska USA Building Inc.—Durham		Nov. 22, 2010
Turner Construction Co. Inc.—Charlotte		Nov. 22, 2010
McDonald-York Building Co.—Raleigh		Nov. 22, 2010
Tyco Valves & Controls—Black Mountain		Nov. 30, 2010
Pfizer—Sanford		Jan. 20, 2011
Corning Cable Systems—Hickory Cable Facility— Hickory (Provisional)		
		Feb. 2, 2011
Kimberly-Clark Corp.—Lexington Mill—Linwood		Feb. 28, 2011
NACCO Materials Handling Group Inc.—Greenville	March 8, 2011	
CNA Holdings Inc.—Ticona LLC—Shelby		March 8, 2011
The Forest at Duke—Durham (Provisional)		April 13, 2011
American Emergency Vehicles—Jefferson		March 28, 2011
Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation Department— Park Operations Division—Charlotte		April 28, 2011
Facility Logistic Services—Lexington	May 26, 2011	
Energizer Battery Manufacturing Inc.—Plant #2—Asheboro		May 26, 2011
Eaton Corp.—Truck Group—Clutch Division (Promotion)	May 26, 2011	
Champion Home Builders Co.—Lillington (Provisional)		June 15, 2011
Milliken & Co.—Hatch Plant		June 30, 2011
Milliken & Co.—Golden Valley Plant		June 30, 2011
General Electric Energy—Industrial Solutions		June 30, 2011
Performance Fibers Operations Inc. (Provisional)		July 26, 2011
City of Burlington—Fire Department		July 28, 2011
Georgia-Pacific Corp.—Roxboro Engineered Lumber		July 28, 2011
Crowder Construction Co.		July 28, 2011
Caterpillar Inc. (Status changed from CS to RS)		July 28, 2011
Pike Electric—Mount Airy Operations	Aug. 16, 2011	
D.H. Griffin Construction Co.		Aug. 30, 2011
Archer Western Contractors Ltd.		Aug. 30, 2011
Lend Lease Construction—Durham		Aug. 30, 2011
Mallard Creek Polymers Inc.		Aug. 30, 2011
Mount Olive Pickle Co. Inc. (Provisional)		Aug. 30, 2011
Syngenta Crop Protection LLC		Sept. 13, 2011
Patterson & Wilder Construction Co. Inc.		Sept. 13, 2011
Yonkers Industries Inc.		Sept. 13, 2011
CH2MHill E&C Inc.		Sept. 13, 2011
John Deere Turf Care		Sept. 13, 2011
Honeywell International Inc.—Rocky Mount		Sept. 13, 2011
ConvaTec Inc.		Sept. 21, 2011
Permatech Inc.		Sept. 21, 2011
Glen Raven Technical Fabrics LLC (Provisional)		Sept. 26, 2011
UTC Fire & Security	Sept. 28, 2011	
Georgia-Pacific Corp.—Dudley Plywood Plant		Sept. 28, 2011
Lend Lease (U.S.) Construction Inc.		Sept. 28, 2011
Preformed Line Products (Provisional)		Sept. 29, 2011
Nucor Steel—Hertford County (Provisional)		Sept. 29, 2011
Cintas Corp.—Charlotte	Sept. 30, 2011	
Eaton Corp.—Kings Mountain Facility	Sept. 30, 2011	
Piedmont Natural Gas—Hickory Operation	Sept. 30, 2011	
Metal Tech of Murfreesboro—Nucor Hertford Operations		Sept. 30, 2011
Huntsman International LLC—Charlotte		Sept. 30, 2011
E.J. Pope & Son Inc.—Corp. Office & Maintenance Division		Sept. 30, 2011

# **Total Visits by Category**

Category	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Safety	783	797	775
Health	403	416	498
Total	1,186	1,213	1,273

### Total Visits by Type

Туре	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Initial	1,041	1,047	1,091
Training and Assistance	69	79	102
Followup	76	87	80
Total	1,186	1,213	1,273

# Total Visits by Industry Type

Industry	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011
Manufacturing	345	393	365
Construction	269	254	191
Other	375	341	506
Public Sector	197	225	211
Total	1,186	1,213	1,273



**Total Visits\*** 

\*FY 2011 data from IMIS internal reports prepared 12-15-11.

CHART 32





<sup>\*</sup>FY 2011 data from IMIS internal reports prepared 12-15-11.

# **Total Traditional Visits by Industry\***



\*FY 2011 data from IMIS internal reports prepared 12-15-11.





# Education, Training and Technical Assistance Series

# **Education, Training and Technical Assistance Series Highlights**

- ETTA offers a wide variety of safety and health training and outreach services to employers and employees across the state of North Carolina. These services include a speakers bureau, free training, technical support and outreach support for safety and health schools, conferences and workshops. Training is offered on demand, as well as through a regularly scheduled training series, which can be accessed through the on-line calendar. In addition to traditional leader-led instruction, ETTA offers a webinar series as well. Training is offered at employers' worksites, the OSH field offices and select community colleges throughout the state. All training presentations are available to the public and can be downloaded from the NCDOL website. To keep the public informed of upcoming courses, ETTA sent out more than 73,000 newsletter emails during the fiscal year.
- In FY 2011, ETTA hosted and/or participated in 297 courses and events with a total of 7,429 personnel trained. These included six 10-hour and two 30-hour general industry awareness courses, and seven 10-hour and two 30-hour construction industry awareness courses. Nearly 100 percent of students who attended the courses found them to be useful in the workplace. In addition to the larger courses, ETTA offered 106 90-minute webinars and 32 60-minute workshops at the OSH field offices. ETTA staff also provided and exhibited at 23 safety and health fairs, industrial conferences and workshops. In addition to ETTA training numbers, the Consultative Services Bureau and both Compliance Bureaus trained another 3,374 employees, for a total of 10,803 workers trained for FY 2011
- Four construction industry 30-hour awareness courses, nine construction 10-hour awareness courses and three general industry10-hour awareness courses were offered through the OSH Train the Trainer Program. A total of 166 students were trained by OSH authorized trainers. ETTA offered the second round of 500 and 501 courses to the citizens of North Carolina in August and September 2012. Through the program, individuals who complete a one-week trainer course are authorized to teach OSH 10-hour and 30-hour courses in construction or general industry.
- ETTA also designed, developed and delivered the first OSH maritime course for internal personnel. The course included three days of classroom training and a one day field trip to a port. The course content covered subparts 1915 and 1917 and relevant CPLs. Other core internal classes that were offered included the 100 Initial Compliance course and the 125 Health Standards course. In addition, CSHOs had access to over 120 other continuing education classes.
- Staff from ETTA and the Compliance East Bureau co-chair a division-wide committee that manages the OSH Partnership and Alliance Program. The purpose of the program is to foster relationships with industry that will leverage OSH resources and decrease the number of injuries and illnesses in the state. At the end of FY 2011, the division had 13 active partnerships and alliances. In FY 2012, the alliance program will focus specifically on OSH special emphasis industries. Currently ETTA is pursuing alliances in long term care, food manufacturing and wood products industries.
- The standards section answered 5,146 inquiries for standards interpretation by phone or written correspondence for employers and employees across the state. This is approximately a 20 percent decrease from the previous year. This is likely due to the fewer number of changes in standards during this year.
- The standards section developed industry guides for occupational exposure to isocyanates and hexavalent chromium and a new logging safety supplemental booklet. New hazard alerts developed included scissor lifts, excavation and trenching dangers, heat stress and working in hot conditions, marina safety and pyrotechnics. One Spanish quick card was developed for excavation and trenching safety. Fact sheets on rigging and cranes and derricks were published and posted to the website.

### Education, Training and Technical Assistance Series Highlights (Continued)

- The bureau began development of industry guides that are focused on safety and health program management for each of the six special emphasis programs and one for general industry. The bureau continues to expand the new health hazard series with an industry guide on silica in development.
- The bureau distributed 48,120 publications in support of the division's outreach and regulatory goals, which represents a 6 percent decrease from the previous year. Comprising that number were occupational safety and health standards for the construction industry and for general industry that the division adopted or that the division promulgated as state-specific standards, industry guides, quick cards, labor law posters, brochures and hazard alerts that were sent to targeted industries that experienced accidents and/or fatalities related to a specific hazard.
- The bureau continued to expand the number and type of publications offered to employers and employees throughout the state. The bureau expanded its web-based A-Z topics list, delivering more training information and materials through the NCDOL website. The list covers many safety and health topics with links to in-depth information to include training resources, publications including sample programs, applicable standards, operating documents, and other agency resources.
- The standards section adopted the Standards Improvement Project Phase III and Shipyards—General Working Conditions and they became effective in October 2011 in North Carolina. Compliance directives for PPE in general industry and construction were adopted along with emphasis programs, such as primary metals.



<sup>\*</sup>Data from the Education, Training and Technical Assistance Bureau.



# **Fatality Series Highlights**

- The NCDOL Occupational Safety and Health Division evaluated and investigated a total of 54 fatalities in FY 2011, an increase from the 44 fatalities in FY 2010 and 41 in FY 2009.
- Of the 54 fatalities in FY 2011, 35 percent were related to "struck by"; 24 percent were related to "falls"; 15 percent were related to "crushed by object"; 4 percent were related to "electrocutions"; 4 percent were related to "fire/explosion"; and 18 percent were related to "other."
- In FY 2011, 32 percent of the fatalities were related to "construction"; 9 percent were related to "manufacturing"; 6 percent were related to "services"; 13 percent were related to "agriculture, forestry, fishing"; 11 percent were related to "transportation and public utilities"; 9 percent were related to "retail trade"; 7 percent were related to "government"; and 13 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 Area and Winston-Salem/Asheville Area).
- Of the 54 investigated fatalities in FY 2011, 55 percent were conducted in the Raleigh/Wilmington Area, 28 percent were in the Charlotte Area, and 17 percent were in the Winston-Salem/Asheville Area.
- In FY 2011 the OSH Division fatality rate by race/ethnic group was 44 percent white, 28 percent Hispanic, 22 percent black, and 6 percent other.

Cause of Death	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	Totals by Event**
Crushed by Object/Equipment	12	6	8	26
Electrocution	2	5	2	9
Explosion/Fire	9	0	2	11
Falls	7	16	13	36
Struck by Object	7	12	19	38
Other	4	5	10	19
Total Fatalities**	41	44	54	139

### CHART 36

# **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 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

#### FY 2010

Event Type	Charlotte Office	Raleigh/Wilmington Office	Winston-Salem/ Asheville Office	Totals by Event Type**
Crushed by Object/Equipment	3	3	0	6
Electrocution	2	1	2	5
Explosion/Fire	0	0	0	0
Falls	4	8	4	16
Struck by Object	4	5	3	12
Other	1	1	3	5
Totals by Office**	14	18	12	44

#### FY 2011

Event Type	Charlotte Office	Raleigh/Wilmington Office	Winston-Salem/ Asheville Office	Totals by Event Type**
Crushed by Object/Equipment	2	6	0	8
Electrocution	0	2	0	2
Explosion/Fire	0	2	0	2
Falls	6	4	3	13
Struck by Object	6	10	3	19
Other	1	6	3	10
Totals by Office**	15	30	9	54

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

# **Fatalities by Office Location\***

FY 2011





\*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\*

FY 2011





\*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 31 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 2011:

- Cleveland
- Dare
- Durham
- Forsyth
- Iredell
- Mecklenburg
- Wake

# **Construction Series Highlights**

- There were 1,812 construction industry inspections conducted in North Carolina for FY 2011.
- Of the 1,812 inspections conducted, 1,497 were safety inspections, which accounted for 83 percent of the total inspections in the construction industry.
- North Carolina conducted 315 health inspections in the construction industry, which accounted for 17 percent of the total for FY 2011.
- 38 percent (690) of all construction industry inspections statewide were in-compliance compared to 62 percent (1,122) of the total inspections with citations for FY 2011.
- The construction industry was cited for 2,251 serious, willful and repeat violations during FY 2011.
- Of the 1,812 inspections conducted, 1,098 resulted from the Construction Emphasis Program in FY 2011.
- General building contractors of residential buildings and carpentry contractors accounted for 40 percent of all FY 2011 construction industry inspections in North Carolina.

# **Construction Inspections by Category\*** FY 2011





\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-10-12.

# **Construction Inspections by OSH Field Office\***



\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-10-12.

Туре	Number of Inspections	Percent
Accident	46	3
Complaint	151	8
Referral	224	12
Followup	19	2
Unprogrammed Related	199	11
Programmed Planned	1,001	55
Programmed Related	171	9
Programmed Other	1	0
Monitoring	0	0
TOTAL	1,812	100

# **Construction Inspections by Type\***

\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-10-12.



### **Construction Inspections by Type and Percentage\***

\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-10-12.

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

# **SEP County Construction Inspections by Type\***

County	Accident	Complaint	Referral	Followup
Cleveland	0	0	0	0
Dare	0	1	1	0
Durham	2	10	1	0
Forsyth	2	5	45	3
Iredell	0	0	1	2
Mecklenburg	10	19	4	2
Wake	3	26	7	3
Total	17	61	59	10

County	Unprogrammed Related	Programmed Planned	Programmed Related	Programmed Other**
Cleveland	2	18	18	0
Dare	0	14	2	0
Durham	20	55	17	0
Forsyth	2	59	1	0
Iredell	0	57	0	0
Mecklenburg	9	325	16	0
Wake	15	253	68	0
Total	48	781	122	0

<sup>\*</sup>Special Emphasis County data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-10-12. \*\*"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
1,812	2,251	1.2

# **Construction Inspections by SEP County\***

County	Number of Inspections	In-Compliance Rate	SWRV Ratio
Cleveland	38	84	0.1
Dare	18	6	1.3
Durham	105	38	1.2
Forsyth	117	28	1.4
Iredell	60	27	1.6
Mecklenburg	385	30	1.4
Wake	375	49	0.8
Total Inspections	1,098	N/A	N/A

\*Data from an IMIS micro-to-host report, "Scan Report," run 1-10-12.

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

[THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]