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

Calendar Year
2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act), Executive Order (E.O.) 12196, and 29 CFR § 1960 require the heads of federal agencies to submit annual reports on their occupational safety and health (OSH) programs to the Secretary of Labor.

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

- Section 19(a)(5) of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 668(a)(5)) requires federal agency heads to "make an annual report to the Secretary with respect to occupational accidents and injuries and the agency's program under this section."

- E.O. 12196, *Occupational Safety and Health Programs for Federal Employees*, guides the heads of federal Executive Branch agencies in implementing Section 19 of the Act, and directs the Secretary to issue a set of basic program elements to assist agencies in carrying out their responsibilities.

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

Section 19(b) of the Act requires the Secretary to inform the President about the status of federal agencies' OSH programs and the accidents and injuries that occurred at federal worksites. This report provides an analysis of the reports each agency submitted to the Secretary along with an account of the activities that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) conducted at or with federal agencies during Calendar Year (CY) 2019, thereby fulfilling the Secretary's responsibility.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the information federal agencies provided to OSHA in their annual reports, includes the injury and illness rates for federal Executive Branch employees, and describes how federal agencies analyzed trends and improved their programs to assess the government's trends and overall progress toward improving worker safety and health. The report covers the CY 2019 reporting period, which does not include the timeframe for the COVID-19 pandemic.

Annual Report Requirement
Section 19(a)(5) of the Act requires each Executive Branch agency to provide an annual report to the Secretary. This report must include information on occupational accidents, injuries, and illnesses, along with details on the agency's program for providing safe and healthful working conditions. In addition, the report should assess the effectiveness of the agency's OSH program.

Reporting Federal Agency Injury and Illness Information Requirement
Per 29 CFR § 1960.72(a), each agency must submit to the Secretary by May 1 of each year all information included on the agency's previous calendar year's occupational injury and illness recordkeeping forms. The information submitted must include all data entered on OSHA Form 300, Log of Work-Related Injuries and Illnesses (or equivalent); OSHA Form 301, Injury and Illness Incident Report (or equivalent); and OSHA Form 300A, Summary of Work-Related Injuries and Illnesses (or equivalent).

OSHA Activities

OSHA engaged in extensive enforcement, oversight, and compliance assistance activities to address OSH-related issues at federal agencies. Enforcement activities focused on inspections of federal worksites to identify violations of OSHA standards and to monitor agencies' injury and illness rates. Oversight activities consisted of calculating quarterly injury and illness rates and assessing agencies' OSH programs through the annual report submissions. Compliance assistance activities included consulting with federal agencies, explaining the importance of providing safe and healthy working environments, and highlighting the best practices or methods to help agencies accomplish this goal.

Enforcement
In CY 2019, OSHA conducted 388 programmed inspections and 325 unprogrammed inspections at federal worksites. Inspections averaged 1.36 violations per programmed inspection and 0.8 violations per unprogrammed inspection. OSHA inspected federal agencies under a variety of national and local emphasis programs targeting specific hazards (e.g., combustible dust) and types of industries (e.g., maritime). The nationwide Federal Agency Targeting Inspection Program (FEDTARG) targeted federal agency establishments with high injury and illness rates. Compared to CY 2018, the number of programmed inspections increased in CY 2019, as did the average number of violations per programmed inspection. During the same time span, the number of unprogrammed inspections decreased, as did the average number of violations per unprogrammed inspection. In CY 2019, OSHA issued nine federal agency significant/novel cases. Of the nine cases, three involved the Department of Interior (DOI), two involved the Department of Defense (DoD), two involved the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), one involved the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and one involved the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).

Oversight

OSHA calculates injury and illness rates quarterly to allow agencies to track these results, along with other measures, and better assess their OSH programs. OSHA calculates injury and illness incidence rates for individual agencies by using fiscal year (FY) injury and illness claims data reported to DOL's Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP), together with employment data from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). OSHA also tracks workers' compensation costs to document the financial impact of federal worker injuries and illnesses. Workers' compensation benefits provided to employees include payments for medical treatment, rehabilitation services, replacement of lost wages, and survivor benefits. In addition, OSHA's annual report request to federal agencies provided agencies with the opportunity to assess and improve their OSH programs.

In the CY 2019 annual report request, OSHA asked federal agencies to rate the operations, management, and culture components of their OSH programs using a seven-question tool. The tool helps agencies to evaluate how they fulfill specific requirements of 29 CFR § 1960 and E.O. 12196. Agencies' responses indicate that most agencies met the program requirements of 29 CFR § 1960 and have effective OSH programs. Numerous agencies reportedly improved several program elements by increasing safety awareness. Specifically, agencies extended safety-related communications, tools, resources, and training to a broader audience, beyond safety professionals. Agencies also executed new policies requiring the frequent evaluation of facilities. These policies resulted in more robust exposure assessments, development of controls, and improved recordkeeping.

Along with the overall success of agencies' OSH programs, many agencies identified areas of their OSH program for further improvement. A small number of agencies indicated they were not fully aware of their OSH responsibilities or how to implement all the attributes of an effective OSH program.

During the reporting period, OSHA received complete recordkeeping data from 70 of 97 agencies (72 percent) and partial data from an additional eight agencies (8 percent). Failing to provide the number of employees or hours worked for each establishment were the most common submission errors. In addition to the analysis conducted for this report, OSHA will further assess the collection process and available data to identify ways to streamline and simplify the procedure, as well as encourage agencies to submit accurate and timely data.

Compliance Assistance

OSHA assists federal agencies in their efforts to improve worker safety and health by responding to federal agency technical assistance requests (ATARs), encouraging participation in DOL's Field Federal Safety and Health Councils (FFSHCs), and providing OSH training opportunities.

ATARs are consultative services available to federal agencies and are similar to OSHA's Consultation Programs for private-sector employers. Federal agencies may contact an OSHA Area Office and request technical assistance, including hazard abatement advice, training, consultation visits, and/or OSH program assistance. While the request is considered consultative, agencies are expected to abate all hazards identified and correct all violations of the citable program elements under 29 CFR § 1960 or other OSHA standards observed during the visit. During CY 2019, OSHA Area Offices conducted 26 ATARs at the request of DOL, Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), DoD, and USDA.

FFSHCs are federal interagency groups, chartered by the Secretary of Labor, that enable local OSH professionals to share knowledge and resources. In CY 2019, 32 FFSHCs actively carried out efforts to improve the effectiveness of OSH functions within the government. According to the annual reports

FFSHCs submitted to OSHA during CY 2019, 35 departments and agencies participated in council activities and more than 2,000 federal employees attended meetings and/or council-provided training. Each year, OSHA assesses the work of the councils so that the Secretary can recognize councils that best exemplify the intent and purpose of the program. In CY 2019, OSHA identified nine FFSHCs to receive a Secretary's award for their activities.

Under 29 CFR § 1960.17, if an agency cannot comply with an applicable OSHA standard, it may request an alternate standard to ensure appropriate protection for affected employees. An alternate standard is the federal agency equivalent of a private-sector variance from OSHA standards. Currently, there are six OSHA-approved alternate standards to address air traffic control towers, special-purpose ladders, lifting devices, diving standards, weight-handling equipment, and gas-free engineering. Under 29 CFR § 1960.18, if no OSHA standard exists for a specific working condition of federal agency employees, an agency must develop a supplementary standard for that working condition and provide the standard to OSHA. Currently, there are two supplementary standards; one addresses explosives, propellants, and pyrotechnics, and the other covers portable tank transport. OSHA did not approve any new alternate or supplementary standards in CY 2019.

OSHA provides training opportunities to federal agency OSH personnel through a number of venues, including the OSHA Training Institute (OTI). Federal OSH personnel may attend any of OTI's professional and technical courses throughout the year. OSHA also provides federal agency OSH personnel with a week of free training at OTI, commonly referred to as FEDWEEK. During FEDWEEK, OSHA provides nine half-day seminars, each offered twice during the week, covering topics chosen by federal OSH personnel. During 2019, 80 federal employees attended these seminars.

Agency Activities

Fatalities, Hospitalizations, and Amputations

The Act, provisions of 29 CFR § 1960, and other regulations require employers, both private and public, to investigate, track, and promptly report incidents involving work-related fatalities, hospitalizations, and amputations to OSHA. As shown in Table 1, for the CY 2019 reporting period, federal Executive Branch departments and independent agencies reported 14 civilian employee fatalities, 226 hospitalizations, and 31 amputations. Each reported incident is a singular event.

Table 1: *Major Department/Agency Incident Outcome for CY 2019*

Agency	Fatalities	Hospitalizations	Amputations
Department of Agriculture	1	21	1
Department of Commerce	1	19	0
Department of Defense	0	13	2
Department of Health and Human Services	0	8	1
Department of Homeland Security	2	36	2
Department of Justice	1	11	10
Department of Labor	0	2	0
Department of Veterans Affairs	0	26	5
Department of the Air Force	1	13	3
Department of the Army	1	13	4
Department of the Interior	3	21	1
Department of the Navy	4	33	1

Agency	Fatalities	Hospitalizations	Amputations
Environmental Protection Agency	0	1	0
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	0	7	1
Peace Corps	0	1	0
Tennessee Valley Authority	0	1	0
Total	**14**	**226**	**31**

Analyses of the findings across CY 2018 and CY 2019 were done on individual agencies rather than federal agencies as a whole because not all agencies submitted reports in both years. Slips, trips, and falls continued to be the major causes of injuries requiring hospitalizations.

Certified Safety and Health Committees (CSHC)
Under 29 CFR § 1960, Subpart F, any agency can form a certified safety and health committee (CSHC) to monitor and assist with its OSH program. An agency with a CSHC must have committees at both the national and field/regional levels. The national-level committees provide policy guidance, while the local committees monitor and assist in the execution of the agency's OSH policies. An agency with an approved CSHC is exempt from unannounced OSHA inspections. During CY 2019, the following agencies maintained Secretary-approved CSHCs: the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), DOL, and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). These agencies provided information certifying to the Secretary that their respective CSHCs met Subpart F's requirements. Many other agencies have internal OSH committees but have not certified those committees under Subpart F.

Controlling Hazards
In the information request, OSHA asked agencies to report on the most common causes of injuries and the efforts taken to mitigate those causes. Most agencies reported on their efforts to reduce employee slip, trip, and fall or overexertion injuries, largely through implementing engineering and administrative controls to reduce or eliminate exposure. For example, several agencies reported installing warning signage, implementing proactive housekeeping procedures, and conducting ergonomic assessments. Agencies also conducted annual safety training classes and held agency-wide meetings to improve safety awareness. And many agencies reported participating in safety campaigns like OSHA's National Safety Stand-Down to Prevent Falls, held in May 2019. The purpose of the Stand-Down was to have employers pause during the workday for topic discussions, demonstrations, and training on how to recognize related hazards and prevent falls.

Motor Vehicle Safety
OSHA asked agencies to provide details on their motor vehicle safety programs (MVSPs), including the number of motor vehicle accidents that occurred during the reporting period. Most agencies reported having MVSPs that comply with the Executive Orders requiring the use of seatbelts in motor vehicles and banning texting while driving. Several departments and agencies offered hands-on training to employees, such as defensive driving, while most others relied on training courses provided through either the General Services Administration (GSA) or the National Safety Council. In CY 2019, 32 federal agencies reported a total of 12,293 motor vehicle accidents.

Agency's Self-Inspection of Safety and Health Program
For CY 2019, federal agencies reported an overall improvement in the effectiveness of their self-inspections, several attributing their OSH program improvements to an increase in the number of self-inspections. Most agencies indicated that personnel trained in hazard recognition conduct self-evaluations at least quarterly. Most agencies reported that all workplaces were inspected during

CY 2019. While the majority of agencies oversaw self-inspections, a few received inspections from external sources such as the GSA, OSHA, or a contractor. Overall, agencies' responses to internal and external inspections included correcting minor issues on the spot, abating hazards as required by corrective action plans, and updating policy and/or procedural guidance to improve the effectiveness of their OSH programs.

Federal Employee Training
Agencies offered a wide range of OSH training to their stateside employees during CY 2019. While most agencies provided employees with OSH training based on their job responsibilities, some augmented their efforts to ensure that collateral duty OSH personnel received all appropriate training. Many agencies also published OSH information on their websites and in newsletters, encouraged OSH personnel to participate in local FFSHCs and professional OSH organizations, and recognized employees who collaborated with safety professionals to identify and mitigate workplace hazards.

OSH Overseas
Section 19 of the Act, E.O. 12196, and 29 CFR § 1960 all require agencies to provide safe and healthful workplaces and have no geographic limits to the requirements. In CY 2019, agencies reported 63,985 government employees worked overseas.[1] Agencies reported providing OSH coverage to their overseas employees through the DoD, the Department of State (State), or their own programs. All agencies ensured that their employees received prophylactic immunizations, training, and safety and health information prior to deployment.

Whistleblower Protection Programs
As required by 29 CFR § 1960, Subpart G, agencies must ensure that employees are not subjected to restraint, interference, coercion, discrimination, or reprisal for filing a report of unsafe or unhealthy working conditions. In their CY 2019 reports, agencies included information on their whistleblower protection programs, along with information on federal employee allegations of reprisal and the agencies' actions in response to those allegations. Almost all agencies acknowledged their whistleblower responsibilities and reported having a well-designed protection program. The Federal Election Commission (FEC), GSA, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) investigated claims of reprisal during CY 2019. Both the investigations from NASA and FEC found that the reprisal allegations were unsubstantiated. GSA is awaiting findings from its investigation.

Product Safety
Federal agencies reported on their compliance with the provisions of 29 CFR § 1960.34, which address the conflicts that may exist in standards concerning federal buildings, leased space, products purchased or supplied, and other requirements affecting federal employee safety and health. Specifically, agencies described how they comply with the product safety requirements of the standard, including the use of Safety Data Sheets (SDS), and how they respond to product recalls. Sixty-two agencies (76 percent) reported being in compliance with the standard. Twenty agencies (24 percent) indicated that they do not have a product safety program in place and do not use chemicals. OSHA will continue to work with agencies that are not in compliance to ensure awareness of their responsibilities in this area.

Accomplishments
Agencies reported on a broad range of OSH program improvements, such as revising existing policies, procedures, and manuals; implementing new OSH training; and establishing new training methods. In

---

[1] State, which did not submit a report for CYs 2018 and 2019 and therefore is not included in this count, reported close to 60,000 employees in CY 2017.

addition, agencies reported inspecting their facilities more frequently and using risk assessment findings to develop relevant training. Overall, most agencies have invested considerable resources to increase safety awareness and develop robust OSH programs. However, a few agencies are still working to cultivate OSH programs.

Agencies Failing to Submit Annual Reports

OSHA made increased efforts to receive annual reports from all agencies. While OSHA granted several extensions to a number of agencies and repeatedly contacted agencies to remind them of their requirement to submit an annual report, it should be noted the reports were due during the federal government's ongoing COVID-19 pandemic response efforts. Unfortunately, OSHA did not receive Section 19(a)(5) reports from the following 15 agencies:

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Commission of Fine Arts
- Corporation for National Community Service
- Department of State
- Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
- Harry S. Truman Foundation
- Inter-American Foundation
- James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation
- Millennium Challenge Corporation
- Office of Special Counsel
- Overseas Private Investment Corporation
- Presidio Trust
- Selective Service System
- Smithsonian Institution
- U.S. Agency for Global Media

THE SECRETARY'S REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

SECTION 1 - OSHA ACTIVITIES

This section discusses OSHA's enforcement, oversight, and compliance assistance activities; significant/novel enforcement cases involving federal agencies; and agencies' self-evaluations of their OSH programs using components of a provided safety and health evaluation tool. Further, this section includes information on recordkeeping; agencies' reports on fatalities, hospitalizations, and amputations; and OSHA training opportunities available solely to federal personnel.

Enforcement

Inspections

OSHA is committed to strong, fair, and effective enforcement of safety and health requirements in the federal workplace. OSHA's federal workplace inspections assess agencies' compliance with safety and health standards and the requirements of 29 CFR § 1960, thus reducing the number of on-the-job hazards. Inspections fall into one of two categories: programmed or unprogrammed. Programmed OSHA inspections focus resources on and emphasize a particular safety or health issue, workplaces associated with specific hazards or adverse health outcomes/effects, and establishments where rates of injuries and illnesses exceed industry averages. Unprogrammed inspections occur primarily in response to employee complaints about, or notifications of, serious hazards.

OSHA further categorizes inspections as related to either safety or health. Safety inspections focus on workplace issues such as means of egress, electrical hazards, machine guarding, or confined space entry procedures. Health inspections may focus on worker exposures to specific chemical respiratory hazards, infectious disease agents, or physical hazards such as occupational noise and ergonomics. If OSHA discovers that workplace exposures to safety and/or health hazards exist, OSHA documents the conditions and determines whether they violate an OSHA standard. For federal agencies OSHA issues *Notices of Unsafe or Unhealthful Working Conditions* (Notices), similar to private sector citations but without monetary penalties.

As in the private sector, different types of violations indicate the severity of the hazard or the agency's response to the condition:

- *De Minimis* violations have no direct or immediate relationship to safety or health and do not result in a notice.

- Other-Than-Serious violations describe hazards that cannot reasonably be predicted to cause death or serious physical harm to exposed employees, but do have a direct and immediate relationship to their safety and health.

- Serious violations involve hazards that could cause injury or illness that would most likely result in death or serious physical harm to the employee(s).

- Willful violations exist where an agency has demonstrated either an intentional disregard for the requirements of the Act or a plain indifference to employee safety and health.

- Repeat violations occur when an agency's prior Notice for the same or a substantially similar condition has become a final order.

- Failure-To-Abate violations occur when the agency fails to correct a violation for which OSHA has issued a Notice, and the abatement date has passed or is covered under a settlement agreement. A *failure-to-abate* also exists when the agency has failed to comply with the interim measures of a long-term abatement within the given timeframe.

OSHA Inspection Activity

In CY 2019, OSHA conducted 388 programmed inspections and 325 unprogrammed inspections at federal workplaces. On average, each programmed inspection identified 1.36 violations while each unprogrammed inspection identified 0.8 violations. OSHA found that 70 percent of establishments receiving programmed inspections were not in compliance. Overall, OSHA identified 1,112 violations: 739 Serious, 51 Repeat, and 322 Other-Than-Serious.

OSHA continued to conduct programmed inspections focused on specific federal agency establishments/hazards during CY 2019. As illustrated in Table 2, the number of programmed inspections increased in CY 2019 as compared to CY 2018, and the average number of serious violations also increased. The number of unprogrammed inspections decreased in CY 2019 as compared to CY 2018, along with the average number of serious violations found during unprogrammed inspections.

Table 2. *OSHA Federal Agency Programmed, Unprogrammed Inspection Activity, CY 2017 through CY 2019.*

	CY 2017	CY 2018	CY 2019
Programmed Inspections	509	269	388
Percent in Compliance	23	23.8	30.5
Average Number of Violations per Inspection	3.02	2.81	3.07
Serious, Willful, Repeat Violations	939	486	529
Average Number Serious, Willful, Repeat Violations	1.84	1.81	1.36
Unprogrammed Inspections	318	348	325
Percent in Compliance	51	44.2	50.5
Average Number of Violations per Inspection	2.72	2.54	2.33
Serious, Willful, Repeat Violations	276	290	261
Average Number Serious, Willful, Repeat Violations	0.87	0.83	0.8
Total Inspections	827	617	713

Significant/Novel Cases

In the private sector, significant cases carry penalties more than $180,000. By law OSHA does not assess penalties against federal agencies. Some federal agency enforcement actions become "significant/novel cases" requiring higher-level review prior to headquarters-level interagency communication and discussions.

OSHA issued nine federal agency significant/novel case reports in CY 2019. Of those cases, two involved DoD, three involved DOI, two involved DHS, one involved USDA, and one involved the VA (Table 3).

Table 3. *Summary of OSHA Significant/Novel Cases Involving Federal Agencies.*

Department/Agency	Inspection Type	Violations
VA–New Jersey Healthcare System East Orange, New Jersey	Programmed - Follow-up	Serious: 2
OSHA initiated this follow-up inspection after numerous unsuccessful attempts to obtain abatement verification for the original violation items. OSHA issued two Failure-To-Abate notices for the VA's bloodborne pathogens program.		
DHS – Transportation Security Administration Pellston, Michigan	Programmed - Local Emphasis	Repeat: 1
OSHA initiated this inspection as part of the FEDSAFE Local Emphasis Program for federal agencies, and issued a notice because employees were unable to unlock an exit route door.		
DOI – U.S Fish and Wildlife Service Alpena, Michigan	Programmed - Monitoring	Repeat: 1
OSHA initiated a monitoring inspection examining abatement findings from a previous inspection. OSHA determined that DOI had not conducted a periodic inspection of the energy control procedures at least annually and issued a Serious, Repeat notice. In addition, OSHA sent DOI a hazard alert letter concerning the hazard of falling ice from the water tower on site.		
DoD – U.S. Army Reserve, 63rd Readiness Division Mountain View, California	Unprogrammed - Fatality	Serious: 1 Other-Than-Serious: 1
OSHA initiated this inspection after a coroner reported a recent work-related fatality. OSHA grouped two violations for a Serious notice, which addressed the Division's failure to establish an energy control program and the lack of related procedures for operating and maintaining utility vehicles. The Other-Than-Serious notice addressed the Division's failure to provide copies of the requested injury and illness records.		
DoD – Defense Commissary Agency Kaneohe, Hawaii	Programmed - Regional Emphasis	Serious: 2 Repeat: 5 Other-Than-Serious: 1
OSHA initiated this inspection as part of the FEDSAFE Regional Emphasis Program for federal agencies. During this inspection OSHA found numerous Serious and Repeat instances of electrical safety violations, along with blocked exit routes, all of which created the potential for fire hazards. In addition, OSHA issued an Other-Than-Serious violation for DoD's failure to illuminate exit signs where necessary.		
DOI– National Park Service, Grand Canyon National Park Grand Canyon, Arizona	Unprogrammed - Complaint	Serious: 3
OSHA initiated this inspection following an employee complaint alleging exposure to radioactive materials. OSHA issued three Serious violations for failing to train employees and supervisors on the hazards in their workplaces and for failing to conduct annual inspections of all workplace areas.		

USDA – U.S Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest Vallejo, California	Unprogrammed - Complaint	Serious: 3 Repeat: 1
OSHA initiated this inspection based on a complaint alleging unabated serious hazards concerning employee exposures to numerous chemicals found at illegal marijuana grow sites in the National Forest. OSHA issued a Repeat violation for failure to implement elements of a hazardous waste operation program. In addition, OSHA issued three Serious violations for failure to provide timely medical attention; failure to provide exposure information to exposed employees; and failure to adequately decontaminate exposed employees.		
DHS – Customs and Border Protection, Bellingham Patrol Station Ferndale, Washington	Programmed - Regional Emphasis	Repeat: 2 Other-Than-Serious: 3
OSHA initiated this inspection as part of the FEDSAFE Regional Emphasis Program for federal agencies. OSHA issued two Repeat violations. The first notice addressed employee exposure to lead due to a deficient housekeeping program, and the second notice addressed employees' increased risk of exposure to fire due to uninspected fire extinguishers. Three Other-Than-Serious violations addressed fire extinguishers, lack of electric faceplates, and the failure to review the agency's Exposure Control Plan for their bloodborne pathogen program.		
DOI – Bureau of Indian Education, Chemawa Indian School Salem, Oregon	Programmed - Follow-up	Failure-To-Abate: 4
OSHA initiated this follow-up inspection because the Chemawa Indian School refused to provide abatement certification for violations discovered during the previous inspection. The violations included fixed ladder fall hazards, inadequate guardrail systems around skylights, an exit door that was bolted shut, and uninspected fire extinguishers. OSHA found none of the original hazardous conditions had been abated.		

Oversight

Injury and Illness Statistics and Workers' Compensation Costs
OSHA calculates injury and illness incidence rates for individual agencies using FY injury and illness claims data reported to OWCP together with OPM's employment data.[2] In FY 2019, federal government employment increased by 30,622 (1.42 percent) to 2,190,927 employees. The total injury and illness cases decreased by 8,044 to 33,661 (19 percent) and the total case rate decreased from 1.93 occurrences per 100 to 1.54 (20 percent). The Government's lost-time cases decreased by 4,015 to 18,350 (18 percent) and the lost-time case rate decreased from 1.04 occurrences per 100 to 0.84 (19 percent).

The costs related to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (workers' compensation for the federal sector) for chargeback year (CBY) 2019 were approximately $1.5 billion compared to CBY 2018 ($1.5

---

[2] OWCP data are available only on an FY basis.

billion), CBY 2017 ($1.5 billion), and CBY 2016 ($1.6 billion).[3] Workers' compensation benefits provided to employees include payments for medical treatment, rehabilitation services, replacement of lost wages, and compensation benefits to their survivors in cases of death.

Evaluations

Based on the information collected from federal agencies' annual reports, and as required by CFR § 1960.80 and Section 1-401(h) of E.O. 12196, OSHA evaluated agencies' OSH programs. While federal operations and worksites range from office spaces to construction sites, 29 CFR § 1960 requires agencies to integrate OSH programs into organizational structures, systematically determine whether policies and procedures are appropriately developed and implemented, and develop and maintain safety and health management systems. Within this framework, OSHA assesses these diverse federal settings to determine if an agency regularly monitors, and modifies if necessary, its OSH program policies and procedures to correct problems, adapt to changing worksite environments, and promote workplace safety and health.

In order to make an assessment of federal agencies, OSHA uses parts of an evaluation tool it developed in 1985. Specifically, OSHA developed and validated its Form 33 to measure the effectiveness of private sector employers' safety and health management systems. Based on the concept of an organizational safety and health program, Form 33 uses 58 attributes to assess the three main components of a structured OSH program: operations, management, and culture.

The operational component measures whether a program has a well-defined and communicated system to identify, correct, and control hazards. The managerial component assesses whether the program incorporates effective planning, administration, training, leadership, and supervision to support the prevention or elimination of workplace hazards. Finally, the cultural component evaluates whether the program has developed an effective culture in which management and labor collaborate to successfully reduce or eliminate hazards. While the attributes within each of the components are distinct, they are interdependent.

For the last several years, OSHA has asked agencies to evaluate their programs using elements of Form 33. For the CY 2019 report, OSHA selected the following seven of the tool's 58 attributes to assess agencies' OSH programs.

Table 4. *Evaluation Components and Attributes*

Operational Component – 2 Attributes
Hazard Anticipation and Detection   1. **Effective safety and health self-inspections are performed regularly**—determines if personnel in the agency are regularly performing effective OSH inspections.
Hazard Prevention and Control   2. **Effective safety and health rules and work practices are in place**—determines if the agency has established both general workplace rules and specific work practices that prescribe safe and healthful behavior and task performance methods.

---

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

Managerial Component – 3 Attributes

Planning and Evaluation
3. **Hazard incidence data are effectively analyzed**—determines if the agency uses hazard incidence data to set safety and health priorities.
4. **A review of the overall safety and health management system is conducted at least annually**—determines if the agency periodically audits the management aspects of its Safety and Health Management System (SHMS), identifying progress and needed changes/improvements.

Administration and Supervision
5. **Individuals with assigned safety and health responsibilities have the necessary knowledge, skills, and timely information to perform their duties**—determines if the agency's personnel have the understanding, skill, and current information needed to effectively fulfill their OSH responsibilities.

Cultural Component – 2 Attributes

Management Leadership
6. **Managers allocate the resources needed to properly support the agency's safety and health program**—determines if the agency's managers demonstrate OSH leadership, promote a culture of safety and health in the organization, and support effective operation of the OSH program by allocating needed resources.

Employee Participation
7. **There is an effective process to involve employees in safety and health issues**—determines if there is an established organizational process that employees know, trust, and use to provide input regarding safety and health issues.

OSHA asked agencies to rate each of the seven attributes based on their CY 2019 reporting period experiences and select one of the following responses: does not exist, needs major improvements, needs minor improvements, or is highly effective. The response "does not exist" indicates that the attribute was not in place at all, while the response "is highly effective" indicates the attribute was completely effective and integrated into the OSH program without need for improvement. The other ratings indicate some aspect of the attribute is present, needing either major or minor improvements, respectively. If an agency believed an attribute did not apply to its program, it selected "not applicable." In addition to scoring each attribute, OSHA asked agencies to provide detailed information supporting each chosen attribute rating.

 Overall Assessment
For the CY 2019 reporting period, OSHA received responses from 82 of 97 agencies, an 85 percent response rate. Of the responding agencies, 19 (23 percent) provided an average rating of "highly effective" for each of the seven attributes, and 49 agencies (60 percent) indicated a need for minor improvements in most of their OSH program components. Ten of the responding agencies (12 percent) indicated that most elements of their OSH programs require major improvements. Four agencies (5 percent) indicated that most of the elements of their OSH programs do not exist.

Agencies' assessment scores indicate that, overall, the organizations recognized the benefits of having effective safety and health programs. Several agencies indicated that, while they were committed to taking safety precautions in the course of their daily business operations, they did not employ safety and health or collateral duty staff during CY 2019. These agencies also stated that the attributes did not apply to their operations because they had very few employees and their operations were limited to

administrative functions. For example, the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Foundation stated that, given the size of the agency and nature of its mission, it did not have formal safety programs.

Table 5a. *Major Departments/Independent Agencies' Average Safety and Health Program Rating*

Agency	Rating	Agency	Rating
Department of Agriculture	▲	Department of Veterans Affairs	▲
Department of Commerce	▲	Department of the Air Force	▲
Department of Defense	▲	Department of the Army	●
Department of Education	▲	Department of the Interior	▲
Department of Energy	▲	Department of the Navy	▲
Department of Health and Human Services	▲	Department of the Treasury	▲
Department of Homeland Security	▲	Environmental Protection Agency	▲
Department of Housing and Urban Development	▲	General Services Administration	●
Department of Justice	▲	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	★
Department of Labor	▲	Social Security Administration	★
Department of State	NR	Tennessee Valley Authority	▲
Department of Transportation	▲		
Score Explanation			

★ Highly Effective – Completely in place
▲ Needs Minor Improvements – Mostly in place with only minor improvements needed
● Needs Major Improvements – Some portion/aspect is present but major improvement is needed
⊙ Does Not Exist – No discernible indication that a portion or aspect is even in place
NR – Data not reported by agency

Table 5b. *Smaller Independent Agencies' Average Safety and Health Program Rating*

Agency	Rating	Agency	Rating
AbilityOne Commission	●	International Trade Commission	▲
Access Board	▲	James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation	NR
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	NR	John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	●
African Development Foundation	★	Marine Mammal Commission	▲
Agency for Global Media	NR	Merit Systems Protection Board	▲
Agency for International Development	▲	Millennium Challenge Corporation	NR
American Battle Monuments Commission	▲	Morris K. Udall & Stewart L. Udall Foundation	★

Agency	Rating	Agency	Rating
Armed Forces Retirement Home	★	National Archives and Records Administration	▲
Central Intelligence Agency	▲	National Capital Planning Commission	★
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	★	National Council on Disability	▲
Commission of Fine Arts	NR	National Credit Union Administration	▲
Commission on Civil Rights	▲	National Endowment for the Arts	★
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	○	National Endowment for the Humanities	★
Consumer Product Safety Commission	▲	National Gallery of Art	▲
Corporation for National Community Service	NR	National Labor Relations Board	▲
Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency	★	National Mediation Board	★
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	▲	National Science Foundation	▲
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	▲	National Transportation Safety Board	○
Export-Import Bank of the United States	○	Nuclear Regulatory Commission	▲
Farm Credit Administration	▲	Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	▲
Federal Communications Commission	★	Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission	★
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	NR	Office of Government Ethics	▲
Federal Election Commission	★	Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	▲
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	▲	Office of Personnel Management	●
Federal Housing Finance Agency	▲	Office of Special Counsel	NR
Federal Labor Relations Authority	●	Overseas Private Investment Corporation	NR
Federal Maritime Commission	★	Peace Corps	○
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services	▲	Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	▲
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission	★	Postal Regulatory Commission	▲
Federal Reserve Board	●	Presidio Trust	NR

Agency	Rating	Agency	Rating
Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board	▲	Railroad Retirement Board	★
Federal Trade Commission	★	Securities and Exchange Commission	▲
Harry S. Truman Foundation	NR	Selective Service System	NR
Holocaust Memorial Museum	★	Small Business Administration	●
Institute of Museum and Library Services	▲	Smithsonian Institution	NR
Inter-American Foundation	NR	Social Security Advisory Board	▲
International Boundary and Water Commission	▲	Trade and Development Agency	▲
Score Explanation			

★ Highly Effective – Completely in place
▲ Needs Minor Improvements – Mostly in place with only minor improvements needed
● Needs Major Improvements – Some portion/aspect is present but major improvement is needed
⭕ Does Not Exist – No discernible indication that a portion or aspect is even in place
NR – Data not reported by agency

Operational Component Assessment

Most agencies reported that both attributes of the operational component were generally effective, indicated by a "needs minor improvements" or a "highly effective" rating. Specifically, 76 agencies (93 percent) provided a rating of "needs minor improvements" or "highly effective" for the *self-inspection* attribute. Most agencies stated their methods for hazard recognition and control included employee identification and reporting of workplace and work process hazards. Many agencies noted that employees could report hazards to managers and safety personnel verbally and by email. Other avenues for reporting unsafe conditions included electronic hazard reporting systems and anonymous hotlines. DoD reported that each of its divisions had specific reporting procedures that were unique to their work locations and provided the most efficient process for reporting workplace hazards. These reporting procedures included employee anonymity if desired, prompt and impartial investigation of reprisal allegations if they occurred, and administrative action on any substantiated allegations.

In CY 2019, most agencies conducted regular self-inspections to ensure compliance with applicable safety and health standards. The Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH), for example, noted that it performed daily inspections on an ongoing cycle in all areas accessible to its residents, employees, and visitors. AFRH reported correcting deficiencies identified during self-inspections immediately or tracking them until abated. Also, AFRH used deficiencies that showed a pattern or trend as a basis for staff education and training. USDA reported performing its annual inspections on the highest-risk workplaces first with the remainder of workplaces prioritized as time and resources allowed. In addition to assigning OSH professionals to perform workplace evaluations, USDA used chemists, biologists, engineers, and other professionals knowledgeable in workplace hazards.

Similarly, 75 agencies (91 percent) rated their agencies as "needs minor improvements" or "highly effective" for the *work rules and practices* attribute. The agencies reported that implemented policies and procedures supported robust OSH programs. Several agencies reported implementing engineering

controls to eliminate or reduce workplace hazards. DOI, for example, noted that it eliminated exposure conditions via engineering, work practice, and administrative controls rather than relying solely on personal protective equipment (PPE). It also adopted a Risk Assessment System to increase awareness of safety controls and train employees in safe work procedures. Other agencies, such as the Social Security Administration (SSA), conducted Job Safety Analyses for tasks to identify hazards and recommend appropriate PPE.

A few agencies indicated a need for major improvements in the operational component of their OSH programs. For example, three agencies (four percent) provided ratings of "needs major improvements" and "does not exist" for the *self-inspection* attribute. With very limited motor vehicle usage, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CTFC) does not have a formal program to monitor seat belt use or texting by employees and did not indicate future plans to improve its Motor Vehicle Safety Program. The Peace Corps recently hired an OSH program manager to complete a gap analysis of its OSH program and revise its OSH policies. GSA continued to improve its Job Safety Analyses by developing categories of risk based on employee job descriptions and facility type.

In CY 2019, a few agencies provided ratings of "not applicable" or "not reported" for *self-inspections* (three agencies, four percent) and *work rules and practices* (five agencies, six percent) attributes. OSHA continues to work with these agencies to help them determine how best to implement these programs.

Managerial Component Assessment
Agencies reported that all three attributes of the managerial component were generally effective, as indicated by a "needs minor improvements" or a "highly effective" rating. Of the 82 responding agencies, 53 (65 percent) provided higher ratings for the incident data attribute in the managerial component. DoD reported that it was developing common mishap reporting and recordkeeping data elements to improve the consistency of mishap information agency-wide. Like other agencies, the Department of Energy (DOE) compared its accident and injury data to previous years in an effort to identify trends. DOE used the results of its analysis to create new standard operating procedures (SOPs) or modify existing SOPs to identify the need for additional health and safety training modules or awareness campaigns and implement hazard controls. Several agencies providing lower ratings for this attribute reported finding no workplace hazards during CY 2019, so they had no data to analyze. The Peace Corps reported that it did not have a consolidated reporting and tracking system because all identified hazards and associated corrective actions are managed at the local level. However, the agency noted that it was in the process of procuring a mishap reporting system to analyze its injury and illness data.

Agencies providing the higher ratings on the *annual SHMS review* attribute (66 agencies, 80 percent) offered examples of the steps taken to assess and improve their programs. DHS conducted an annual evaluation of each of its divisions to ensure compliance with federal and DHS safety standards, identify/control risk, and prevent workplace injuries by focusing leadership's attention on critical safety and health issues. DoD reported that it conducted an annual review using leading indicators of program performance and lagging indicators of each division to determine program effectiveness. During the 2019 review, DoD recognized that its divisions were using different information management systems to record and report mishaps. As a result, DoD was evaluating those various information management systems to capture best practices for use department-wide. Agencies that reported lower ratings for this attribute indicated that they were implementing a SHMS or working to improve the system already in place. For example, the African Development Foundation was working on a comprehensive program.

During the CY 2019 reporting period, the *knowledge, skills, and information* attribute OSHA used to assess the Administration/Supervision subcomponent received the highest number of "needs minor improvements" and "highly effective" ratings (72 agencies, 88 percent) within the managerial component.

Like many agencies, AFRH reported that individual facilities' Safety Officers were responsible for conducting inspections, and monitoring and reporting safety requirements. To ensure that its Safety Officers were well prepared to perform their duties, AFRH provided training on NFPA's Life Safety Code and OSHA regulations, and also required continuing education. DoD stated that it received regular briefings from OSH staff regarding any safety and health challenges that required leadership resolutions or necessitated additional resources. DoD was working to establish and execute a Career Program for staff with OSH responsibilities, including formal training and curriculum for Safety and Health Managers. In addition, it was developing pre-command training that would include safety topics for military leaders at all levels of command. In general, agencies reporting lower ratings indicated that they did not employ safety personnel because they had small workforces and low injury and illness rates. The Peace Corps, for example, did not hire a safety and health staff member until July 2019. In addition, the agency reported that, in general, those with OSH-related authority lacked formal training in safety and health matters. Supervisors—who also lack OSH training—conducted informal walkthroughs but did not typically document these activities.

While ratings overall suggested agencies had relatively strong managerial components for the safety program, a few agencies either assessed the attributes as "not applicable" or simply did not respond. Specifically, agencies provided "not applicable" or "not reported" ratings for the *incidence data* (18 agencies, 22 percent), and *annual SHMS review* (seven agencies, nine percent) attributes. And four agencies (five percent) provided "not applicable" or "not reported" ratings for the *knowledge, skills, and information* attribute. OSHA will work with these agencies to determine how best to incorporate some level of managerial aspects to ensure the safety of their workforces.

Cultural Component Assessment
Similar to the other two components, most federal agencies provided a "needs minor improvements" or "highly effective" rating for both cultural component attributes. Seventy-four agencies (90 percent) provided a "needs minor improvements" or "highly effective" rating for the *resource allocation* attribute, while three agencies (four percent) reported "not applicable" or "not rated" for the same attribute. Most agencies reported that managers received the resources they needed to support their OSH program. Several agencies, such as the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), reported obtaining program support through an annual budget, which provided the resources necessary to efficiently accomplish the program requirements. Agencies reporting lower ratings, such as the Small Business Administration, did not have such support in place.

Regarding employee involvement, 70 agencies (85 percent) provided a "needs minor improvements" or "highly effective" rating for the *process involvement* attribute. Several agencies reported they had an effective process for involving employees in safety issues. The Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (CSB), for example, reported staff were chemical or mechanical engineers, industrial safety experts, and other specialists, and regularly sought employee input on OSH matters. All CSB employees had stop work authority, which they could use if they discovered an uncontrolled hazard. The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) also noted a large cadre of safety professionals, who were very engaged in the agency's OSH program. Other agencies, such as the Department of Commerce (Commerce), used a variety of strategies to engage employees on elements of their safety programs. Commerce noted that employees completed climate assessment surveys, participated in facility inspections, received extensive OSH training, and participated in OSH councils,

committees, and working groups. The Department conducted regular meetings with employee representative organizations to review, discuss, and solicit input on safety-related policies, procedures, and issues of concern. Agencies with a lower rating for employee involvement generally described having basic elements in place, such as OSH surveys. The Federal Communication Commission (FCC) reported that it asked employees to participate in OPM's Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey to provide their input on the agency's OSH program.

Similar to the other components, some agencies did not assess cultural attributes. Three agencies (four percent) rated the resource allocation attribute as either "not applicable" or "not reported," while five agencies (six percent) provided similar responses regarding the process involvement attribute. OSHA continues to work with agencies to ensure they fully understand the importance of managerial leadership and employee involvement.

Table 6. *Number of Federal Agencies Self-Assigned Ratings to Safety and Health Program Attributes*

Operational Component		Number of Agencies with the Self-Assigned Rating					
Subcomponent	**Attribute**	★	▲	●	◎	NA	NR
Hazard Anticipation/Detection	Self-inspection	57	19	2	1	0	3
Hazard Prevention/Control	Work Rules and Practices	54	21	2	0	2	3
Managerial Component		**Number of Agencies with the Self-Assigned Rating**					
Subcomponent	**Attribute**	★	▲	●	◎	NA	NR
Planning/Evaluation	Incidence Data	26	27	4	7	17	1
Planning/Evaluation	Annual SHMS Review	34	32	5	4	6	1
Administration/Supervision	Knowledge, Skills, and Information	39	33	5	1	3	1
Cultural Component		**Number of Agencies with the Self-Assigned Rating**					
Subcomponent	**Attribute**	★	▲	●	◎	NA	NR
Management Leadership	Resource Allocation	42	32	5	0	2	1
Employee Participation	Process Involvement	52	18	5	2	2	3
Score Explanation							

★ Highly Effective – Completely in place
▲ Needs Minor Improvements – Mostly in place with only minor improvements needed
● Needs Major Improvements – Some portion/aspect is present but major improvement is needed
◎ Does Not Exist – No discernible indication that a portion or aspect is even in place
NA – Not applicable
NR – Data not reported by agency

Recordkeeping
As set forth in 29 CFR § 1966, federal agencies must maintain injury and illness records in the same format as the private sector. The recordkeeping requirement allows agencies and OSHA to identify worksites with the highest injury and illness rates and federal agency training needs. DOL, through its Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), annually collects the statutorily required injury and illness records from all Executive Branch agencies and provides the records to OSHA.

The OSHA data collection cycle first began in CY 2014; the sixth completed data collection cycle occurred in CY 2019. OSHA provided agencies with guidance on the data collection process and followed up with information on errors identified in the submissions. Working with BLS, OSHA tracked the data collected and monitored the quality. In addition, OSHA worked with OWCP to assist

agencies using the Employees' Compensation Operations & Management Portal (ECOMP) to explain the procedures for transferring the data from ECOMP to BLS.[4]

During the reporting period, OSHA received complete establishment data from 70 of 97 agencies (72 percent) and partial data from an additional eight agencies (8 percent). The most common errors were failures to provide the number of employees or hours worked for each establishment. OSHA will analyze the collected data for key findings and the collection process for lessons learned to further streamline and simplify the procedure. In addition, OSHA will work with BLS to improve the response rate.

Compliance Assistance

Agency Technical Assistance Request
OSHA's ATAR service is similar to the On-Site Consultation Program OSHA provides for private-sector employers. Federal agencies may contact an OSHA Area Office and request technical assistance, such as hazard abatement advice, training, a partial or comprehensive visit, and/or program assistance. While the request is considered consultative, an agency's subsequent failure or refusal to abate serious hazards may result in an inspection referral.

In CY 2019, three OSHA Area Offices conducted a total of 24 ATARs:

- The Cleveland, Ohio Area Office conducted 15 ATARs related to ergonomics for several DOL divisions in Cleveland, Ohio.
    - Energy Employee Occupational Illness Compensation Program: 12 ATARs
    - Office of Labor Management Standards: one ATAR
    - OWCP: two ATARs

    The ATARs investigated ergonomic issues arising from upper extremity disorders, back injuries or disorders, and other ergonomic hazards. OSHA evaluated individual workstations in the offices and suggested improvements that the divisions implemented.

- The St. Louis, Missouri Area Office conducted eight ATARs during CY 2019. OSHA conducted air, bulk, and surface wipe sampling for lead, arsenic, and asbestos, and no contamination was found in seven of the locations:
    - DoD's Defense Contract Audit Agency
    - DoD's Defense Information Systems Agency
    - HHS' Federal Occupational Health
    - USDA's Farm Service Agency
    - USDA's Office of the Chief Information Officer
    - USDA's Rural Development
    - USDA's Office of the Inspector General

    OSHA detected lead on elevated surfaces during an ATAR at a local USDA's Food Safety Inspection Service facility. Following the ATAR, GSA revised the cleaning contract and now requires cleaning of elevated surfaces.

- The Sioux Falls, South Dakota Area Office began an ATAR for USDA's Agricultural Research Service in Brookings, South Dakota. USDA requested industrial hygiene help regarding

---

[4] ECOMP is an electronic claims filing system for OWCP information that also allows federal agencies to maintain their OSHA-required injury and illness data.

potential silica exposures. OSHA's sampling determined that silica levels were below the detection limit. This ATAR will close in CY 2020.

Field Federal Safety and Health Councils

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

In CY 2019, 32 FFSHCs actively carried out efforts to improve the effectiveness of OSH functions within the government.[5] According to the annual reports submitted to OSHA, 35 departments and agencies participated in the FFSHCs and more than 2,000 federal employees attended meetings and/or council-provided training. Participation decreased for some because of limited funds and personnel shortages. Agency involvement in council activities varied from extensive engagement to occasional attendance at FFSHC meetings. DoD, for example, reported that approximately 20 percent of its subagencies participated in local FFSHCs during CY 2019.

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

In determining award recipients, OSHA forms three categories, based on the size of the federal populations served, which allows FFSHCs to compete with those that possess approximately the same resources and serve similar populations. Each annual report to the Secretary is evaluated, rated, and ranked against other FFSHCs in its category. The top three scoring FFSHCs in each category receive awards for Superior Performance, Meritorious Achievement, and Notable Recognition.

In CY 2019, nine FFSHCs were identified as eligible for a Secretary's Award for their activities. By category, these are noted as follows:

Category I: Federal employee population exceeding 24,000
- Superior Performance – Oklahoma
- Meritorious Achievement – Middle Tennessee
- Notable Recognition – Dallas/Fort Worth

Category II: Federal employee population between 12,000 and 24,000
- Superior Performance – Greater Kansas City
- Meritorious Achievement – Minneapolis
- Notable Recognition – Greater St. Louis

Category III: Federal employee population of fewer than 12,000
- Superior Performance – Western New York
- Meritorious Achievement – North Carolina
- Notable Recognition – Mississippi Gulf Coast

---

[5] Please see Appendix 1 for a complete listing of active FFSHCs in CY 2019.

Alternate and Supplementary Standards

Under 29 CFR § 1960.17, if an agency cannot comply with an applicable OSHA standard, the agency may submit a request to OSHA for an alternate standard.[6] There are six OSHA-approved alternate standards:

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

Under 29 CFR § 1960.18, if no existing OSHA standard applies to a working condition of an agency's federal employees, the agency must develop a supplementary standard. There are two supplementary standards:

- NASA – *Safety Standard for Explosives, Propellants, and Pyrotechnics*; and
- DOI/National Park Service – *Supplementary Standard for Containers and Portable Tanks Transport*.

FEDWEEK

Each year, OSHA provides a week of training, known as FEDWEEK, specifically for federal agency OSH personnel. The tuition-free training is held at OSHA Training Institute (OTI) in Arlington Heights, Illinois. OSHA seeks input from federal agencies when developing the FEDWEEK curriculum. While attendance decreased slightly, there were more federal agencies represented at the CY 2019 event than in prior years
(Table 7). In CY 2019, OSHA provided nine half-day seminars, offered twice during the week. Federal OSH employee participants could attend up to six different sessions on various topics, including fall protection, cranes in construction, electrical standards, emergency preparedness at the federal workplace, management of change, safety and health programs for federal agencies, lead hazard awareness, managing an effective respiratory protection program, and industrial hygiene sampling.

Table 7. *FEDWEEK Participation by Attendees and Calendar Year (2017–19)*

	Calendar Year		
	2017	**2018**	**2019**
Participants	76	98	80
Agencies Represented	18	19	30

---

[6] An alternate standard is the federal sector's equivalent of a private-sector variance. Any alternate standard must provide protection for the affected federal employees that is equal to or greater than the applicable OSHA standard.

Federal Agency OSH Managers' Roundtable

The Federal Agency OSH Managers' Roundtable is a valuable tool that allows agencies to exchange information on safety and health issues and share best practices. In 2019, OSHA held Roundtable meetings in March and August and addressed a range of topics, including ECOMP, recordkeeping requirements, and the yearly National Safety Stand-Down for Fall Prevention. Individual agency presentations included the Federal Reserve Board's Bleeding Control Program, an overview of DOL's FFSHC program, and DoD's Occupational Exposure Limit development.[7] All roundtable meetings included a general discussion session to allow federal agency representatives to talk about their experiences with the topics presented and/or express concerns about safety and health in their respective agencies.

---

[7] The Federal Reserve Bleeding Program implements the goals of the STOP THE BLEED® campaign, which was initiated by a federal interagency workgroup convened by the National Security Council Staff and The White House. The purpose of the campaign is to build national resilience by better preparing the public to save lives by raising awareness of basic actions to stop life threatening bleeding following everyday emergencies and man-made and natural disasters. The Department of the Defense owns the STOP THE BLEED® logo and phrase—trademark pending.

SECTION 2 – FEDERAL AGENCY OSH ACTIVITIES

This section contains agency-specific OSH program information. Agencies' annual reports include data on fatalities, hospitalizations, and amputations; injury and illness trend analyses and hazard mitigation methods; OSH training programs; OSH committee and council participation; and whistleblower protection provisions.

In accordance with 29 CFR §§ 1960.34 and 1960.35, GSA and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), respectively, must provide specified services to federal agencies to support improved safety and health conditions for federal employees. A summary of their reported activities is at the end of this section.

Fatalities, Hospitalizations, and Amputations

The Act, provisions of 29 CFR § 1960, and other regulations require employers to investigate, track, and promptly report to OSHA findings that involve work-related fatalities, hospitalizations, and amputations.

Major Departments and Agencies
Overall, the departments and agencies reported 271 fatalities, hospitalizations, and amputations. Since not all agencies submitted reports for both years, year-over-year comparisons are limited to the individual department or agency. Ten of the departments/agencies showed a decrease in reported incidents, while seven showed an increase.

Department and/or agency summaries follow Table 8a only for those departments and agencies that realized a significant year-over-year change within the context of the overall reported number. DOE, for example, reported no incidents in CY 2019, resulting in a 100 percent decrease in overall total reports because that agency reported seven incidents in CY 2018. Given this context, no further assessment was made.

Table 8a. *Major Department and/or Agency Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Agencies	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent Change
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	
Department of Agriculture	0	1	10	21	1	1	↑ 109
Department of Commerce	0	1	4	19	0	0	↑ 400
Department of Defense	1	0	8	13	1	2	↑ 50
Department of Energy	1	0	6	0	0	0	↓ 100
Department of Health and Human Services	1	0	1	8	0	1	↑ 350
Department of Homeland Security	2	2	44	36	0	2	↓ 13
Department of Justice	4	1	13	11	7	10	↓ 8
Department of Labor	0	0	2	2	3	0	↓ 60
Department of Veterans Affairs	2	0	15	26	2	5	↑ 63

Agencies	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent Change
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	
Department of the Air Force	0	1	23	13	0	3	↓ 26
Department of the Army	3	1	8	13	4	4	↑ 20
Department of the Interior	3	3	32	21	0	1	↓ 29
Department of the Navy	1	4	13	33	2	1	↑ 138
Department of the Treasury	0	0	0	0	1	0	↓ 100
Department of Veterans Affairs	2	0	15	26	2	5	↑ 63
Environmental Protection Agency	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	0	NR	1	NR	0	NR	**
Federal Trade Commission	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
General Services Administration	1	0	0	0	0	0	↓ 100
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	0	0	0	7	0	1	*
Peace Corps	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Smithsonian Institute	0	NR	4	NR	0	NR	**
Social Security Administration	0	0	0	0	1	0	↓ 100
Tennessee Valley Authority	0	0	1	1	0	0	↔

*The ↑ indicates a respective increase, ↓ indicates a respective decrease, and ↔ indicates no changes in the Total Reports in CY 2019 compared to CY 2018. "NR" indicates no response. The * indicates that zero incidents were reported for CY 2018, so change could not be calculated. The ** indicates that data were not reported for one of the calendar years.*

Major Department and/or Agency Summaries

The **Department of Agriculture** reported 109 percent more incidents in CY 2019 than in CY 2018. Hospitalizations more than doubled (from 10 to 21) and accounted for the greatest increase in the number of incidents. USDA's workers experienced an increase in slips, trips, and falls and heat/dehydration[8] cases in CY 2019; all of these incidents resulted in hospitalizations. CY 2018 hospitalizations were attributed to only four separate conditions, whereas in CY 2019, hospitalizations were attributed to eight conditions.

- Trends: Slips, trips falls
  - Accounted for 40 percent, or 4 of the 10 hospitalizations in CY 2018
  - Accounted for 38 percent, or 8 of the 21 hospitalization incidents CY 2019
- Trends: Heat, dehydration
  - Accounted for 20 percent, or 2 of the 10 hospitalizations in CY 2018
  - Accounted for 24 percent, or 5 of the 21 hospitalizations in CY 2019

---

[8] Heat includes reported diagnoses of rhabdomyolysis, which is a serious syndrome due to direct or indirect muscle injury and can include hyperthermia or heat stroke.

Table 8b. *USDA Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent Change
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	
Crushed by, caught in	0	0	0	0	1	1	↔
Fire	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Heat, dehydration	0	0	2	5	0	0	↑ 150
Illness	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Slip, trip, fall	0	0	4	8	0	0	↑ 100
Strain, over-exertion	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Struck, struck by	0	0	3	3	0	0	↔
Unclassified	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Vehicular (land)	0	0	1	1	0	0	↔
Vehicular (air)	0	1	0	0	0	0	*
Total	**0**	**1**	**10**	**21**	**1**	**1**	↑ 109

The **Department of Commerce** reported 20 incidents in CY 2019, compared to 5 in CY 2018. Since there were relatively few incidents overall, the increase was a 400 percent change, primarily due to 15 hospitalizations at the U.S. Census Bureau. Overall, hospitalizations accounted for the greatest increase in the number of incidents. Whereas CY 2018 hospitalizations were attributed to two separate conditions, in CY 2019, hospitalizations were attributed to five separate conditions. Hospitalizations associated with falls were the greatest contributor in each year.

- Trend: Slips, trips, falls
    - Accounted for 75 percent, or 3 of the 4 hospitalizations in CY 2018
    - Accounted for 42 percent, or 8 of the 19 hospitalizations in CY 2019

Table 8c. *Commerce Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent Change
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	
Explosion	0	1	0	0	0	0	*
Heat, dehydration	0	0	0	3	0	0	*
Slip, trip, fall	0	0	3	8	0	0	↑ 167
stress	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Struck, struck by	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
Unclassified	0	0	0	3	0	0	*
Vehicular (land)	0	0	0	4	0	0	*
Total	**0**	**1**	**4**	**19**	**0**	**0**	↑ 400

The **Department of Defense** reported a 50 percent increase in incidents, which was an increase from 8 to 13 incidents. In CY 2019 there were no fatalities, five more hospitalizations, and one more amputation.

Table 8d. *DoD Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent Change	
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19		
Crushed by, caught in	0	0	0	2	1	1	↑	200
Slip, trip, fall	0	0	7	8	0	0	↑	14
Struck, struck by	0	0	0	1	0	1	*	
Vehicular (land)	1	0	1	2	0	0	↔	
Total	**1**	**0**	**8**	**13**	**1**	**2**	↑	**50**

The **Department Health and Human Services** reported an increase in incidents from 2 in CY 2018 to 9 in CY 2019, which resulted in a 350 percent change. In CY 2019 Indian Health Services accounted for seven of the eight hospitalizations.

Table 8e. *HHS Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent Change	
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19		
Bite	0	0	0	0	0	1	*	
Chemical	0	0	0	1	0	0	*	
Crushed by, caught in	0	0	0	1	0	0	*	
Slip, trip, fall	0	0	1	3	0	0	↑	200
Strain, over-exertion	0	0	0	2	0	0	*	
Struck, struck by	0	0	0	1	0	0	*	
Unclassified	1	0	0	0	0	0	↓	100
Total	**1**	**0**	**1**	**8**	**0**	**1**	↑	**350**

The **Department of Homeland Security** reported a 13 percent decrease in incidents in CY 2019 compared to CY 2018. The Transportation Security Administration and the U.S. Coast Guard reported no incidents in CY 2019, as opposed to six and four hospitalizations, respectively, in CY 2018. While DHS' largest decrease in hospitalizations was due to a decrease in slips, trips, and falls, the largest increases were due to firearm and vehicular incidents.
- Trend: Slips, trips, falls
  - Accounted for 23 percent, or 10 of the 44 hospitalizations in CY 2018
  - Accounted for 11 percent, or 4 of the 36 hospitalizations in CY 2019
- Trend: Firearm
  - Accounted for 2 percent, or 1 of the 44 hospitalizations in CY 2018
  - Accounted for 11 percent, or 4 of the 36 hospitalizations in CY 2019
- Trend: Vehicular (land)
  - Accounted for 18 percent, or 8 of the 44 hospitalizations in CY 2018
  - Accounted for 33 percent, or 12 of the 36 hospitalizations in CY 2019

Table 8f. *DHS Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	Change
Assault	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
Bite	0	0	3	1	0	1	↓ 33
Crushed by, caught in	0	0	2	0	0	0	↓ 100
Cut, pierce	0	0	3	2	0	0	↓ 33
Firearm	0	0	1	4	0	0	↑ 300
Heart attack	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Heat, dehydration	0	0	6	3	0	0	↓ 50
Illness	1	0	1	3	0	0	↑ 50
Slip, trip, fall	0	0	10	4	0	0	↓ 60
Strain, over-exertion	0	0	1	1	0	0	↔
Struck, struck by	0	0	2	3	0	0	↑ 50
Unclassified	0	1	5	2	0	0	↓ 40
Vehicular (air)	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
Vehicular (land)	1	1	8	12	0	1	↑ 56
Total	**2**	**2**	**44**	**36**	**0**	**2**	**↓ 13**

The **Department of Justice** reported an 8 percent decrease in incidents in CY 2019 compared to CY 2018. The Bureau of Prisons accounted for 10 of the 11 hospitalizations and 7 of the 10 amputations in CY 2019. The Federal Bureau of Investigations saw a decrease in hospitalizations from seven in CY 2018 to one in CY 2019.

Table 8g. *DOJ Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	Change
Burn	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Chemical	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Crushed by, caught in	1	0	0	0	5	2	↓ 67
Cut, pierce	0	0	0	0	1	8	↑ 700
Electrical	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
Explosion	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Firearm	2	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
Heart attack	0	1	0	0	0	0	*
Heat, dehydration	0	0	2	3	0	0	↑ 50
Slip, trip, fall	0	0	6	2	0	0	↓ 67
Strain, over-exertion	1	0	0	1	0	0	↔
Struck, struck by	0	0	1	1	1	0	↓ 50
Unclassified	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
Vehicular (land)	0	0	1	1	0	0	↔
Total	**4**	**1**	**13**	**11**	**7**	**10**	**↓**

The **Department of Labor** reported a 60 percent decrease in incidents in CY 2019 compared to CY 2018. Unlike CY 2018, when DOL experienced three amputations, there were none in CY 2019. Job Corps reported two incidents in CY 2019, compared to five in CY 2018.

Table 8h. *DOL Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent Change	
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19		
Crushed by, caught in	0	0	0	0	2	0	↓	100
Cut, pierce	0	0	0	2	1	0	↑	100
Struck, struck by	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓	100
Vehicular (land)	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓	100
Total	**0**	**0**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**0**	**↓**	**60**

The **Department of the Air Force** reported a 26 percent decrease in incidents in CY 2019 compared to CY 2018. The greatest decrease in incidents occurred in (1) slip, trip, and fall and (2) strain, over-exertion incidents.

Table 8i. *USAF Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent Change	
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19		
Burn	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓	100
Crushed by, caught in	0	0	2	0	0	2	↔	
Cut, pierce	0	0	3	2	0	1	↔	
Electrical	0	0	1	1	0	0	↔	
Slip, trip, fall	0	0	9	6	0	0	↓	33
Strain, over-exertion	0	0	5	1	0	0	↓	80
Struck, struck by	0	0	1	3	0	0	↑	200
Vehicular (land)	0	1	1	0	0	0	↔	
Grand Total	**0**	**1**	**23**	**13**	**0**	**3**	**↓**	**26**

The **Department of the Army** reported a 20 percent increase in incidents in CY 2019 compared to CY 2018. The greatest increase in incidents were seen in (1) slip, trip, and fall and (2) struck, struck-by incidents.

Table 8j. *Army Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent Change	
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19		
Chemical	0	0	0	1	0	0	*	
Crushed by, caught in	1	0	1	1	4	2	↓	50
Cut, pierce	0	0	0	0	0	1	*	
Fire	2	1	3	0	0	0	↓	80
Slip, trip, fall	0	0	2	6	0	0	↑	200
Struck, struck by	0	0	1	4	0	1	↑	400
Vehicular (land)	0	0	1	1	0	0	↔	
Total	**3**	**1**	**8**	**13**	**4**	**4**	**↑**	**20**

The **Department of the Interior** reported a 29 percent decrease in incidents in CY 2019 compared to CY 2018. There were no heat, dehydration incidents in CY 2019, as opposed to the four reported in CY 2018. The National Park Service had the majority of incidents, all 13 of which were hospitalizations.

Table 8k. *DOI Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities		Hospitalizations		Amputations		Percent
	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	CY18	CY19	Change
Bite	0	0	3	4	0	0	↑ 33
Crushed by, caught in	0	1	0	1	0	0	*
Cut, pierce	0	0	1	0	0	1	↔
Fire	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
Firearm	0	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
Heart attack	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Heat, dehydration	0	0	4	0	0	0	↓ 100
Illness	0	0	3	1	0	0	↓ 67
Lightning	0	1	0	0	0	0	*
Slip, trip, fall	1	0	10	9	0	0	↓ 18
Strain, over-exertion	1	0	1	0	0	0	↓ 100
Struck, struck by	1	0	5	2	0	0	↓ 67
Unclassified	0	0	2	0	0	0	↓ 100
Vehicular (land)	0	1	1	3	0	0	↑ 300
Total	**3**	**3**	**32**	**21**	**0**	**1**	↓ **29**

The **Department of the Navy** reported a 138 percent increase in incidents in CY 2019 compared to CY 2018. An analysis indicates that while the number of slip, trip, and fall incidents increased, their percentage of all incidents did not. In contrast struck, struck-by incidents increased, and captured a greater percentage overall.

- Trend: Slips, trips, falls
  - Accounted for 38 percent, or 5 of the 13 hospitalizations in CY 2018
  - Accounted for 42 percent, or 14 of the 33 hospitalizations in CY 2019
- Trend: Struck, struck-by
  - Accounted for 8 percent, or 1 of the 13 hospitalizations in CY 2018
  - Accounted for 18 percent, or 6 of the 33 hospitalizations in CY 2019

Table 8l. *Navy Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities CY18	Fatalities CY19	Hospitalizations CY18	Hospitalizations CY19	Amputations CY18	Amputations CY19	Percent Change
Assault	0	2	0	0	0	0	*
Burn	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Chemical	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Crushed by, caught in	0	0	2	1	1	1	↓ 33
cut, pierce	0	0	1	1	1	0	↓ 50
Firearm	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Heat, dehydration	0	0	2	3	0	0	↑ 50
Illness	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Slip, trip, fall	0	1	5	14	0	0	↑ 200
Strain, over-exertion	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Struck, struck by	0	1	1	6	0	0	↑ 600
Unclassified	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Vehicular (land)	1	0	2	2	0	0	↓ 33
Total	**1**	**4**	**13**	**33**	**2**	**1**	**↑ 138**

The **Department of Veterans Affairs** reported a 63 percent increase in incidents in CY 2019 compared to CY 2018, primarily due to an increase in (1) slips, trips, and falls and (2) amputations.

Table 8m. *VA Fatalities/Hospitalizations/Amputations for CY 2018 and CY 2019*

Cause	Fatalities CY18	Fatalities CY19	Hospitalizations CY18	Hospitalizations CY19	Amputations CY18	Amputations CY19	Percent Change
Assault	1	0	0	1	0	0	↔
Burn	0	0	0	1	0	0	*
Chemical	0	0	1	1	0	0	↔
Crushed by, caught in	0	0	0	0	1	5	↑ 400
Cut, pierce	0	0	0	0	1	0	↓ 100
Electrical	1	0	0	0	0	0	↓ 100
Illness	0	0	3	1	0	0	↓ 67
Slip, trip, fall	0	0	7	12	0	0	↑ 71
Strain, over-exertion	0	0	1	1	0	0	↔
stress	0	0	1	1	0	0	↔
Struck, struck by	0	0	1	2	0	0	↑ 100
Unclassified	0	0	0	3	0	0	*
Vehicular (land)	0	0	1	3	0	0	↑ 200
Total	**2**	**0**	**15**	**26**	**2**	**5**	**↑ 63**

The **National Aeronautics and Space Administration** reported a total of eight incidents in CY 2019, up from zero in CY 2018. The seven hospitalizations were due to electrical, strain, struck-by, and vehicular incidents. One incident was an amputation.

While an overall analysis across agencies and years is not possible because some agencies did not submit reports in both years, some patterns are apparent. Slips, trips, and falls continue to be the cause

of the majority of incidents. Vehicular and struck-by incidents also cause a large percentage of incidents. Of the agencies that submitted reports, 10 showed a decrease in overall incidents, while seven saw an increase.

Certified Safety and Health Committee

A CSHC is an agency OSH committee, approved by the Secretary, that meets the requirements of 29 CFR § 1960, Subpart F. A CSHC monitors and supports an agency's OSH program and improves safety awareness by providing the agency an open channel of communication between employees and management. A CSHC also allows an agency to facilitate employee input on OSH-related policies, conditions, and practices.

An agency that wants to form a CSHC must report its intent to the Secretary. Specifically, the agency must provide the Secretary with information regarding the location and coverage area (establishments and populations) of the committee. The agency must also provide the name and phone number of each committee chair and certify that the committee meets all the requirements of 29 CFR § 1960, Subpart F. As part of the required annual report to the Secretary, the agency must provide an update of its OSH program activity.

While agencies with a CSHC that meets all requirements are exempt from unannounced OSHA inspections, they may request an inspection. In CY 2019, three agencies had a CSHC. The Secretary recognized the following departments and independent agencies' CSHC:
- Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)
- Department of Labor (DOL)
- Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA)

CIA, DOL, and TVA submitted information certifying to the Secretary that their respective CSHCs met the requirements of the subpart during the CY 2019 reporting period. SEC, which did not report on the status of its CSHC in its CY 2018 report, indicated that it did not have a CSHC in CY 2019.

Other OSH Committees and Councils

Federal agencies were asked to provide information on their involvement in both internal and external OSH committees and councils, including their participation in FFSHCs. For internal activity, 47 agencies (57 percent) reported encouraging employee participation in OSH-related committees at the departmental, agency, and field operation levels, and in a variety of local OSH committees, including FFSHCs. Of the 47 agencies that were involved in OSH committees or councils, 6 agencies (12 percent) reported that they have an internal OSH committee. Internal OSH committee membership varied among agencies. Some agencies reported that membership included only management, while other agencies noted that committee participation was open to all level of employees, and was required for employees with OSH-related expertise, duties, or responsibilities. For example, DoD instituted the Defense Safety Oversight Council as the senior departmental governance body for operational safety and health. Defense Safety Oversight Council membership comprised the senior-most decision-making personnel and senior OSH personnel from DoD divisions. It met monthly in 2019 to provide governance on DoD-wide efforts to reduce incidents and occupational illnesses and injuries. USDA reported that it had a safety committee at each of its geographic locations and it provided numerous opportunities for employee participation. At some of its smaller locations, every employee was a member of the safety committee.

Agencies were also asked to indicate whether they supported and recognized OSH-related certifications from outside organizations. Forty agencies (49 percent) reported employee participation in external OSH committees, including OSHA's Office of Federal Agency Program's Roundtable meetings. Most agencies, including GSA and USDA, reported encouraging employees to participate in OSH professional organizations, including as the American Industrial Hygiene Association and the National Safety Council. OSH personnel are encouraged to obtain and maintain professional certifications such as Certified Safety Professional and Certified Industrial Hygienist, and licenses such as Professional Engineer, to demonstrate competence in assigned duties. Several agencies, including the National Gallery of Art (NGA), indicated that while it is not currently involved in any external OSH committees, its Deputy Chief of Risk Management highly encouraged the OSH Manager's participation in local FFSHCs; and that encouragement was echoed throughout NGA's leadership. NGA's OSH Manager often communicated with OSHA and attended OSHA-sponsored training and council meetings held at DOL. Seven agencies (nine percent) reported encouraging employees to seek professional certification and participate in professional OSH organizations.

Analyzing and Controlling Hazards

OSHA asked agencies how they identify OSH-related trends, such as types and causes of injuries. Of the 77 agencies providing information on this topic, 43 agencies (55 percent) reported that the most frequent cause of employee injury was slips, trips, and falls. Other common causes of injuries included materials handling (sprains/strains, exertion) and ergonomics. Commerce, for example, reported that in CY 2019, slips, trips, and falls were the most frequent cause of incidents that resulted in bruises, contusions, and sprains. Incidents involving material handling followed slips, trips, and falls and caused injuries such as abrasions, scratches, and fractures.

Agencies took a variety of actions to prevent future recurrences of these incidents, such as publishing safety messages on their webpages, providing formal training, and participating in safety campaigns to raise safety awareness. Several agencies increased the use of warning signage, conducted mishap trend analysis, and focused workplace inspections on high hazard areas. Many agencies implemented new procedures for keeping working surfaces, walkways, and parking lots free of obstacles. The USAF implemented proactive housekeeping procedures, based on ambient conditions rather than a set schedule, which required the timely and thorough removal of snow and ice on walkways and working surfaces. In CY 2019, the USAF also produced and distributed 24 "Risk Management in 45 Seconds or Less" videos as incident prevention messages.

DOL initiatives on slip, trip, and fall prevention focused on hazard recognition, prevention, and prompt abatement. Specifically, DOL used training, outreach, and targeted inspections to raise awareness on the topic. In CY 2019, DOL conducted more workplace inspections to identify hazards and used warning signage, such as pop-up safety cones, to call attention to hazards and prevent slips, trips, and falls.

Several agencies, including TVA, reported participating in OSHA's National Safety Stand-Down for Fall Prevention in May 2019. The stand-down brought awareness to fall hazards, typical work tasks associated with fall risks, and fall protection strategies. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission highlighted its participation in the National Safety Stand-Down for Fall Prevention by emailing bulletins throughout the agency. The International Boundary and Water Commission reported that roughly 51 of its employees participated in the 2019 stand-down.

Agencies' efforts to identify and analyze workplace hazards included using a wide range of analytical methods to prevent future hazards. Some agencies manually catalogued incidents, while others used

electronic applications to track hazards. The Navy's OSH personnel, for example, used electronic and web-based information management systems to record all hazard identification and monitor the correction process until hazards are abated. These systems allowed for simultaneous centralized and decentralized real-time review of the hazard correction process. A few of its establishments used local electronic or paper media to manage the hazard identification and hazard abatement log. In addition to hazard tracking, the Navy regularly reviewed documentation to ensure timely hazard abatement.

Most agencies reported analyzing data to determine the prevalence of injury type and cause, and target investigations of jobs or tasks that resulted in injuries. These agencies employed root cause analysis to identify and mitigate or eliminate risk of injuries and prevent recurrence of incidents. At DHS, safety personnel assigned a root cause to each finding identified during OSH audits. Each facility completed its own internal inspections with root causes assessed and corrected per its program procedures.

Another method that agencies used to prevent and control occupational injuries, illnesses, and fatalities was Prevention through Design (PtD). Several agencies reported implementing PtD and highlighted its importance in all safety and health assessments. In CY 2019, the USAF participated in the design phases of facilities and aerospace platforms for the newly created United States Space Force. USAF recommended the integration of occupational safety mishap prevention processes and procedures during these design phases. It also reviewed blueprints regarding fire protection, fall protection, advanced safety features, and safety codes.

Motor Vehicle Safety

In CY 2019, 62 federal agencies (64 percent) reported having a Motor Vehicle Safety Program (MVSP), with the majority noting compliance with Executive Orders 13043 and 13513.[9] The Orders require using seatbelts in motor vehicles and ban texting while driving, respectively. Most agencies reported that MVSPs are major elements of their safety programs and that compliance with the Orders is necessary to reduce the deaths, injuries, and property damage related to vehicular mishaps. Thirty-two agencies with MVSPs (52 percent) provided information on the roughly 12,293 motor vehicle accidents their employees experienced during CY 2019. These motor vehicle accidents resulted in approximately 1,238 employee injuries.

Most agencies reported offering motor vehicle safety awareness training developed by the DOT, GSA, USDA, or similar organizations. Covered training topics included distracted driving prevention, safe holiday/seasonal driving, accident reporting procedures, driver improvement training for personnel involved in vehicle mishaps, vehicle safety inspection procedures, driver education for personnel deployed overseas, use of travel planning tools, and defensive driving. Agencies like the USAF supported nationally recognized safe driving programs in CY 2019. USAF installations used national motor vehicle safety programs such as the American Automobile Association's Defensive Driving, National Safety Council's Alive at 25, and the Street Smart program to reinforce motor vehicle safety and mishap prevention.

Fourteen agencies did not have any MVSP for a variety of reasons, including a small workforce, or a mission not requiring a dedicated fleet of vehicles. A few agencies asserted that such a program was "not applicable" to their situations or failed to provide any report on the item. Some agencies deemed to have little to no training reported compliance with Executive Orders 13043 and 13513, but provided

---

[9] E.O. 13043, "Increasing Seat Belt Use in the United States," requires federal employees to use seat belts while on official business. E.O. 13513, "Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging while Driving," bans federal employees from engaging in text messaging when driving a vehicle on official business.

no further information on safety protocols or measures. OSHA will follow up with agencies to offer assistance in addressing motor vehicle safety.

Agencies without any MVSP include Access Board, African Development Foundation, Commission on Civil Rights, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Export-Import Bank, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, Inter-American Foundation, National Council on Disability, National Credit Union Administration, National Endowment for the Humanities, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Postal Regulatory Commission, and Social Security Advisory Board.

Table 9. *Summary of Motor Vehicle Accidents as Reported by Departments and Independent Agencies (CY 2017 through CY 2019)*

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2017	Number of Accidents CY 2018	Number of Accidents CY 2019
Department of Agriculture	⬇	2,339	2,142	2,060
Department of the Air Force	⬇	19	21	16
Department of the Army	⬇	NR	345	212
Department of Commerce	⬆	80	2	306
Department of Defense	⬇	543	945	943
Department of Energy	?	85	NR	74
Department of Health and Human Services	⬆	0	91	304
Department of Homeland Security	⬇	1,585	2,392	2,190
Department of Housing and Urban Development	?	0	NR	NR
Department of Justice	⬆	2,251	2,197	4,124
Department of Labor	⬇	546	512	452
Department of the Interior	⬇	841	960	501
Department of the Navy	⬇	246	136	10
Department of State	?	2,024	NR	NR
Department of Transportation	⬇	39	47	40
Department of the Treasury	⬇	124	231	176
Department of Veterans Affairs	⬇	367	301	144
Environmental Protection Agency	⬇	29	39	33
General Services Administration	⬇	68	64	59
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	⬇	69	177	103
Social Security Administration	⬇	18	39	24
Tennessee Valley Authority	⬆	227	193	245
Office of Personnel Management	⬇	252	246	212
AbilityOne	?	0	NR	0
Access Board	⬌	NR	0	0
African Development Foundation	⬌	0	0	0
Agency for Global Media	?	0	0	NR
Agency for Internal Development	⬌	NR	0	0

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2017	Number of Accidents CY 2018	Number of Accidents CY 2019
American Battle Monuments Commission	⬆	1	0	1
Armed Forces Retirement Home	⬌	0	0	0
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board	⬌	0	1	1
Commission of Fine Arts	?	NR	0	NR
Commission on Civil Rights	⬌	0	0	0
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	⬌	0	0	0
Consumer Product Safety Commission	⬌	2	0	0
Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency	⬇	7	7	5
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	⬌	0	0	0
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	⬆	6	0	3
Export-Import Bank of the United States	?	0	NR	0
Farm Credit Administration	⬆	2	0	1
Federal Communications Commission	⬌	7	3	3
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	?	6	3	NR
Federal Election Commission	⬌	0	0	0
Federal Housing Finance Agency	⬌	1	0	0
Federal Labor Relations Authority	?	NR	NR	0
Federal Maritime Commission	⬌	0	0	0
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	⬌	NR	0	0
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission	⬌	0	0	0
Federal Reserve Board	⬌	0	0	0
Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board	⬌	0	0	0
Federal Trade Commission	⬌	0	0	0
Harry S. Truman Foundation	?	NR	0	NR
Holocaust Memorial Museum	⬌	0	0	0
Institute of Museum and Library Services	⬌	0	0	0
Inter-American Foundation	⬌	NR	0	0
International Trade Commission	⬌	0	0	0
International Boundary and Water Commission	⬇	10	10	4
James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation	?	0	0	NR

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2017	Number of Accidents CY 2018	Number of Accidents CY 2019
John F. Kennedy Center	?	0	NR	0
Marine Mammal Commission	?	0	0	NR
Merit Systems Protection Board	⬌	0	0	0
Millennium Challenge Corporation	?	0	NR	NR
Morris K. Udall & Stewart L. Udall Foundation	⬌	0	0	0
National Archives and Records Administration	⬇	4	1	0
National Capital Planning Commission	⬌	0	0	0
National Council on Disability	⬌	NR	0	0
National Credit Union Administration	⬆	3	0	2
National Endowment for the Arts	⬌	0	0	0
National Endowment for the Humanities	⬌	NR	0	0
National Gallery of Art	⬆	0	3	5
National Labor Relations Board	⬇	0	4	1
National Mediation Board	?	0	0	NR
National Science Foundation	⬌	0	0	0
National Transportation Safety Board	⬌	0	0	0
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	⬌	1	0	0
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	⬌	0	0	0
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission	⬌	0	0	0
Office of Government Ethics	⬌	0	0	0
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	⬇	0	1	0
Office of Special Counsel	?	NR	0	NR
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	?	0	0	NR
Peace Corps	⬆	NR	0	39

Department/Agency	Status	Number of Accidents CY 2017	Number of Accidents CY 2018	Number of Accidents CY 2019
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	⬌	NR	0	0
Postal Regulatory Commission	⬌	NR	0	0
Presidio Trust	?	3	NR	NR
Railroad Retirement Board	⬌	0	0	0
Securities and Exchange Commission	⬇	0	1	0
Selective Service System	?	0	NR	NR
Small Business Administration	⬌	0	0	0
Smithsonian Institution	?	15	14	NR
Social Security Advisory Board	⬌	0	0	0
Trade and Development Agency	⬇	0	193	0
Legend				

⬌	No change from 2018 report	NR	Not reported
⬇	Decrease from 2018 report	?	Undetermined from reported data
⬆	Increase from 2018 report		

Management Response to Safety and Health Inspections

OSHA asked federal agencies to report on internal and external inspection activities for CY 2019. As in prior years, agencies described myriad inspection activities ranging from correcting hazards identified during a formal or informal safety inspection, to participating in GSA-led inspections and abatement processes in GSA-leased facilities, to consulting with OSHA on abatement methods.

Overall, 78 agencies (95 percent) indicated performing at least one internal OSH program inspection during CY 2019. Inspection frequency varied by organization and workplace. Sixty-three agencies (77 percent) completed an inspection at each of their workplaces. Most agencies reported that safety and health staff or supervisors and employees trained in hazard recognition performed the inspections. Other agencies, like USDA, reported chemists, biologists, engineers and other professionals knowledgeable in workplace hazards performed inspections and hazard surveys. Several agencies, including the Department of Transportation, sought assistance from external OSH consultants such as Federal Occupational Health. Other agencies received assistance from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and/or GSA. For example, EPA reported that its safety and health staff conducted a majority of its internal inspections. At locations where EPA staff are unable to perform inspections, building management and GSA are responsible for conducting inspections. When performing inspections, 82 percent of EPA locations include supervisors and employees who are trained in recognizing hazards, 88 percent involve safety and health committee members in the process, and 35 percent ask senior managers to participate. Some EPA locations also include facilities managers, contractors, union representatives, contracting officer representatives, and non-managerial EPA employees.

Seventy-eight agencies (95 percent) reported analyzing inspection results over time to find any patterns of recurring hazards or noncompliance. Most agencies reported requiring their facilities to use

checklists when conducting self-inspections, so the safety and health staff at the agencies' headquarters can evaluate program strengths and weaknesses at each facility and identify potential hazards and compliance issues. USDA reported all facilities not scheduled for a formal annual evaluation conducted self-audits of their safety and occupational health programs using various safety program audits or evaluation checklists. In CY 2019, DHS completed an exhaustive validation of the OSH checklists used in audits, inspections, and assessments to eliminate redundancies, ensure accuracy, and identify the appropriate level of assessor for each item on the checklists. DHS verified all policy and regulatory references, and improved language to ensure all checklist items are measurable and understandable. The updated checklists ensure uniformity of hazard identification and hazard data integrity.

OSHA asked agencies to provide information on their hazardous materials management program. To minimize risk to employees, visitors, and the environment, most agencies reported identifying, labeling, inventorying, handling, managing, and disposing of hazardous materials in compliance with applicable regulations. Most agencies reported maintaining an inventory of Safety Data Sheets (SDSs) for all of the workplace hazardous materials that they handle and store. Information in SDSs help to detect hazards and determine appropriate PPE use. Agencies used various tools to track, manage, and report on hazardous chemical data. Several agencies, including NASA, use the Government-Industry Data Exchange Program (GIDEP) to ensure the most up-to-date information is available for procured products. Commerce reported it established a new program for the review and management of change controls related to new procurements to prevent the introduction of hazards associated with purchasing new products, tools, services, and equipment.

Federal Employees Overseas

The Act, E.O. 12196, and 29 CFR § 1960 have no geographical limits. Agencies are required to provide safe and healthful workplaces to all federal civilian employees, including those who work outside U.S. borders. OSHA asked agencies to provide information on the number of federal employees stationed overseas during CY 2019 and how those employees were provided safe and healthful workplaces.

According to agency reports, at least 63,985 employees from 23 federal agencies worked outside the borders of the United States during CY 2019. DoD (including the armed services) had 55,762 employees overseas, the greatest number of any reporting agency. DoD (including the armed services) indicated that it extended its OSH programs and coverage to include overseas federal civilian employees. It noted that it follows OSHA standards in all operations worldwide, where feasible. When compliance with OSHA standards is impracticable, infeasible, or inappropriate, the DoD applies risk management procedures. Leaders and supervisors communicate the results of risk management decisions to all affected personnel. Other agencies, such as Commerce, indicated that they relied upon State's Safety, Health, and Environmental Management program to address safety and health issues for their overseas employees.

Table 10. *Number of Federal Civilian Employees in Overseas Locations by Agency (FY 2017 through CY 2019)*

Agency	Status	Number of Employees		
		2017	2018	2019
Department of Agriculture	⬇	900	1,133	999
Department of Commerce	⬇	278	1,253	252
Department of Defense	⬇	46,792	56,785	55,762
Department of Energy	⬌	?	50	50
Department of Health and Human Services	⬇	89	464	438
Department of Homeland Security	⬌	2,000	1,500	1,500
Department of the Interior	⬇	1,006	883	881
Department of Justice	⬇	1,312	1,226	1,062
Department of Labor	⬌	53	6	6
Department of State	?	59,666	NR	NR
Department of Transportation	⬇	332	24	20
Department of Veterans Affairs	⬆	?	0	94
Department of the Treasury	⬌	33	41	41
Environmental Protection Agency	⬆	360	985	1,150
General Services Administration	⬆	12	22	24
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	⬇	12	7,536	8
African Development Foundation	⬆	12	0	12
Agency for Global Media*	?	32	42	NR
Agency for International Development	⬆	0	0	1,399
American Battle Monuments Commission	⬇	59	393	38
Consumer Product Safety Commission	⬌	1	1	1
Export-Import Bank	⬌	1	0	0
Millennium Challenge Corporation	?	33	NR	NR
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	⬌	2	2	2
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	?	5	5	NR
Peace Corps	⬆	189	187	245
Smithsonian Institution	?	620	6	NR
Trade and Development Agency	⬆	1	0	1
Total	⬇	113,800	72,544	63,985

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4" align="center">**Legend**</td></tr>
<tr><td>⟷</td><td>No change from CY 2018 report</td><td>NR</td><td>Not reported</td></tr>
<tr><td>⬇</td><td>Decrease from CY 2018 report</td><td>?</td><td>Undetermined from reported data</td></tr>
<tr><td>⬆</td><td>Increase from CY 2018 report</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

OSH Training and Resources

E.O. 12196 requires agencies to provide OSH training for all employees. Additionally, 29 CFR § 1960, Subpart H, prescribes the necessary OSH training for employees with respect to applicable standards. Most agencies reported that that they provided OSH training to employees using conventional methods, such as online (43 agencies; 52 percent) and/or classroom training (53 agencies; 65 percent). Nineteen agencies (23 percent) reported that they required employees to demonstrate their skills, capabilities, and knowledge using practical exams. The Navy, for example, reported that it provided more than 40 environmental, safety, and occupational health courses to OSH professionals using various training methods. Navy provided in-house OSH training to collateral duty personnel with assigned safety and health responsibilities. It also funded these employees' attendance at external training to ensure that they were able to meet the requirements of 29 CFR § 1960, as well as additional training needed to help them execute their assigned responsibilities. In all, 20 agencies (24 percent) reported offering a safety and health training course to collateral duty OSH personnel in CY 2019. A few agencies, like the American Battle Monuments Commission, stated that they were working to implement a Collateral Duty Safety Officer Course in 2020. In CY 2019, 18 agencies (22 percent) did not conduct OSH training. The Office of Government Ethics noted that, although it did not have formal OSH training, the OSH manager used online research to stay current on OSH requirements.

Thirty agencies (37 percent) reported providing employees with the opportunity to participate in FEDWEEK 2019. In addition, 34 agencies (41 percent) reported that employees received training from OTI, while employees from 24 agencies (29 percent) received training from OSHA Training Institute Education Centers. Forty-three agencies (52 percent) indicated that they provided support by encouraging OSH employees to participate in FFSHC activities.

As in prior years, OSHA asked agencies to report on their OSH training efforts for newly hired employees as well as for supervisors. Most agencies reported that their new-hire orientation included information on agency-specific safety and health policies, general safety and health rules, agency-specific hazards and protections, and emergency procedures. Supervisory training included a review of the topics covered in new-hire orientation, along with information on the requirements of 29 CFR § 1960 and E.O. 12196. Commerce reported that during new-hire and supervisory training, employees received information on their safety rights and responsibilities, the agency's expectations for employees with respect to safety, methods for managing work-related risks, and safety-related resources for employees.

Most agencies provided OSHA with details regarding funds dedicated to OSH training efforts. Sixty-six agencies (80 percent) reported that supervisors had the authority to requisition training, although funds for training varied dramatically by agency.

Whistleblower Protection Programs

As required by 29 CFR § 1960, Subpart G, agencies must have procedures in place to assure that no employee is subject to restraint, interference, coercion, discrimination, or reprisal for filing a report of an unsafe or unhealthful working condition. To assess agencies' whistleblower protection programs, agencies were asked to provide information on any federal employee allegations of reprisal in CY 2019. Agencies were also asked to address how allegations were investigated and the impact of investigation findings on the agencies' OSH programs. In all, 77 agencies (94 percent) reported that having functional whistleblower protection programs. A few agencies, like CFTC, reported having written whistleblower protections, but no written anti-retaliation policy. These agencies noted they would continue to assess the need for an anti-retaliation policy each year.

During CY 2019, three agencies reported investigating allegations of reprisal—GSA, NASA, and the FEC. NASA and FEC investigations were found unsubstantiated and GSA was awaiting any findings from its investigation.

Product Safety Programs

In CY 2019, agencies were asked how they ensure that the products and services they procure comply with the product safety requirements of 29 CFR § 1960.34, including the use of SDSs. Of the responding agencies, 60 agencies (73 percent) reported compliance with the standard, 13 agencies (16 percent) reported lacking product safety programs, and 15 agencies (18 percent) did not respond to OSHA's request for information.

In addition to describing their compliance with the provisions of the standard, OSHA asked agencies to provide details on their policies for addressing chemicals in fragrances, such as those in perfumes and air fresheners. In total, 43 agencies (52 percent) indicated no policy existed and 36 agencies (44 percent) indicated recent development of policies to address issues of employees with chemical and/or fragrance sensitivities.

Most agencies indicated that their product safety programs were designed, operated, and maintained in accordance with safety and health requirements established under 29 CFR § 1960, Subpart E. The Navy managed hazardous materials through hazardous material minimization centers as part of the overall Consolidated Hazardous Material Reutilization and Inventory Management Program. These centers were responsible to inventory, label, issue, and return of all the hazardous materials. They also verified that a SDS was present and the material complied with regulatory requirements. Personnel received initial hazard communication briefs during check-in and received follow-on hazardous material awareness training throughout their employment. Detailed procedures advised employees of hazards and included materials such as the PPE required to protect them from each hazard. The Navy checked the use and availability of SDS on a regular basis to identify appropriate protections for exposed employees and recommend precautions for incorporation into local work processes.

Specific Agency Reporting Programs

Under 29 CFR § 1960, Subpart E, GSA and NIOSH must assist federal agencies with specific activities affecting safety and health conditions of federal employees. Each year, GSA and NIOSH provide OSHA with details on these activities in their annual reports. In its annual report, GSA provided information on its programs for ensuring that federal facilities are designed, operated, and maintained in accordance with OSH requirements and best practices. GSA also detailed how it ensured that the products and services offered to federal agencies comply with product safety

requirements, how safety recalls were implemented, and how federal purchasers were made aware of the safe use of such products. The NIOSH annual report provided details on the agency's Request for Technical Assistance program and included information on the assistance provided to federal agencies during CY 2019.

General Services Administration

GSA continued updating the safety and health requirements for all federally owned and commercially leased facilities in CY 2019. The GSA process for addressing safety and health in products and services offered is a mature program; it did not change in CY 2019. GSA noted that if it receives information concerning a product recall in the commodity line it manages, it initiates a review of the product line to determine if the item under recall was supplied to agencies. GSA immediately notifies suppliers to cease shipments of products associated with a recall. It also identifies customers that have ordered the item under recall and provides instructions on how and whom to contact concerning the item.

National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health

NIOSH received 40 federal ATARs for health hazard evaluations (HHEs) in CY 2019.[10] It completed 25 (63 percent) of those requests. It also completed 15 HHE requests from prior years. In total, NIOSH performed 6 field investigations and 34 record reviews/consultations in CY 2019. Federal agency requests varied by both exposure groups and health problems. Each completed technical assistance request addressed multiple exposure groups and/or health issues. For the reporting period, the exposure group categories of indoor environmental quality, biological hazards, and chemical hazards accounted for a majority of assistance requests. Many agencies also requested assistance with health problems such as respiratory, nervous system, and viral and bacterial issues. Appendix 2 provides a breakdown of HHEs for the last three years.

---

[10] NIOSH's response to a federal agency's Request for Technical Assistance usually involves a HHE: a workplace study to learn whether workers are exposed to hazardous materials or harmful conditions. Based on the information provided, NIOSH answers an HHE/technical assistance request in one of the following ways: in writing with pertinent information or a referral to a more appropriate agency, by telephone to discuss the problems and how they might be solved, or with a visit to the workplace. During a visit, NIOSH will meet with the employer and employee representatives to discuss the issues and tour the workplace. During one or more visits, NIOSH may review records about exposure and health, interview or survey employees, measure exposures, and perform medical testing. At the end of an evaluation, NIOSH will provide a written report to the employer and employee representatives. Depending on the type of evaluation, the final report may require a development time of a few months to a few years.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Field Federal Safety and Health Councils

Active FFSHCs in CY 2019 – Received Annual Reports by OSHA Region

Region I (CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT)	Region VI (AR, LA, NM, OK, TX)
Greater Boston	Dallas/Fort Worth
	Oklahoma
Region II (NJ, NY, PR, VI)	South Texas
Greater New York	
Puerto Rico	**Region VII (IA, KS, NE, MO)**
Southern New Jersey	Greater Des Moines
Western New York	Greater Kansas City
Hudson Valley	Greater Omaha
	Greater St. Louis
Region III (DC, DE, MD, PA, VA, WV)	
Metropolitan Washington, DC	**Region VIII (CO, MT, ND, SD, UT, WY)**
	Denver
Region IV (AL, GA, FL, KY, MS, NC, SC, TN)	
Atlanta	**Region IX (AS, AZ, CA, GU, HI, MP, NV)**
Central Florida	Phoenix
Louisville Area	San Francisco Bay Area
Middle Tennessee	
Mississippi Gulf Coast	**Region X (AK, ID, OR, WA)**
North Carolina	Mt. Rainier
South Florida	
Region V (IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI)	
Chicago	
Detroit	
Duluth/Superior	
Minneapolis	

Appendix 2: Agency Requests to NIOSH for Technical Assistance

Technical Assistance Requests
CY 2017 through CY 2019

Department/ Agency	Technical Assistance Requests		
	2017	2018	2019
Agriculture	2	3	0
Commerce	0	0	1
Defense	9	7	10
Energy	1	1	0
General Services	0	0	1
Health and Human Services	0	1	0
Homeland Security	7	3	6
Interior	0	0	2
Justice	2	2	4
U.S. Postal Service	1	6	9
Social Security Administration	2	2	0
Transportation	1	1	1
State	0	0	0
Treasury	1	0	1
Veterans Affairs	9	6	5
Other	3	0	0
Total	38	32	40

Investigations, by Type, Completed During the Reporting Period CY 2017 through CY 2019

Department/Agency	Completed Investigation by Type					
	Desktop			Field		
	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019
Agriculture	0	0	2	2	0	1
Commerce	0	0	1	0	0	0
Defense	3	10	9	1	0	1
Energy	1	0	0	0	0	0
General Services	0	0	1	0	0	0
Health and Human Services	0	0	1	0	1	0
Homeland Security	3	4	1	0	0	2
Interior	0	0	1	3	0	1
Justice	2	0	3	0	0	1
U.S. Postal Service	2	2	9	0	0	0
Social Security Administration	0	4	0	0	0	0
Transportation	1	0	2	0	0	0
State	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasury	0	0	1	0	0	0
Veterans Affairs	5	9	3	0	1	0
Other	3	7	0	0	0	0
Total	20	36	34	6	2	6

2019 Assistance Requests by Department/Agency and Exposure Group

Department/Agency	Exposure Group*							
	Chemical	Biologic	Indoor Environmental Quality	Noise	Heat	Stress	Radiation	Ergonomics
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0
Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
General Services	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Health and Human Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0
Interior	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Justice	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
U.S. Postal Service	1	1	5	0	1	0	0	1
Social Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasury	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans Affairs	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	15	9	22	0	1	1	0	1

* A Request for Technical Assistance, also known as a Health Hazard Evaluation request, may involve an investigation under more than one exposure group category. This is illustrated by DoD's single request to investigate three exposure groupings: "Chemical," "Biologic," and "Indoor Environmental Quality."

2019 Assistance Requests by Department/Agency and Health Problem

Department/Agency	Health Problem							
	Respiratory	Viral/Bacterial	Cancer	Musculoskeletal	Mental/Behavioral	Sensory	Skin Disorder	Nervous System
Agriculture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Energy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
General Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health and Human Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security	1	3	1	0	0	0	2	2
Interior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Justice	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
U.S. Postal Service	5	2	0	1	0	0	1	2
Social Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Treasury	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans Affairs	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	7	4	1	0	0	4	9