

by Vernon Moensen

On March 1st, construction workers at a construction site on East 1st Street in Manhattan were attempting to add steel sections to extend a tower crane's reach. The attempt to support the crane failed and it crashed, storing to the ground six workers and a woman in a nearby apartment building. On May 1st, another tower crane collapsed on East 1st Street during an attempt to secure the tower to a building with a coar two workers were killed and two others were injured including a bystander. In both cases, New York City's Buildings Department immediately issued stop work orders and Mayor Michael Bloomberg held press conferences to inform the public about the hazards involved and discuss what could be done to improve crane safety.

New York City's rapid response gave the impression that crane collapses are strictly a matter of local jurisdiction. But what was the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), whose mission is to assure safe and healthful working conditions for workers and women, the probe of construction and crane safety is national in scope but OSHA has been so eviscerated and many of its functions so privatized that it is framed as a local issue in political discourse. Indeed, the reporters who covered the story said the fatalities were either to enter the city's Buildings Department or rely on the self-protection by contractors but there was no mention of OSHA. These recent crane collapses illustrate the conundrum confronting OSHA: its mission is broad in scope but the state's political and budgetary powers necessary to carry out its responsibilities. New York City's shut down the crane worksites under its authority to protect public safety but OSHA cannot shut down an unsafe workplace unless it can prove in court that there is an imminent threat to worker safety. Local governments have tried to fill the vacuum left by OSHA but the Occupational Safety and Health Act, OSHA Act, of 1970 prohibits the reenactment of worker safety standards. It does allow for state plans but many are not very effective. For example, we have construction workers have been killed in a short span in Las Vegas yet Nevada OSHA is unable to enforce and fines as failed to stem the tide.

Created in 1970, OSHA's mission includes production safety standards to protect recognized hazards, enforcement standards throughout workplace inspections and assessing fines for violations of standards sufficient to deter future infractions. The recent wave of construction and crane related deaths provides a stark reminder that construction workers' dangerous working conditions in the construction industry to determine to what extent the administration of President George W. Bush's permit OSHA's fulfillment of its mandate to protect workers' safety and health.

Profile of a Dangerous Industry

The construction industry employs more than 10 million workers and working conditions are among the most dangerous in the United States. It is no surprise when one considers that it is done under conditions that pose considerable risks to workers' safety and health. Much of the work is done outdoors under variable weather conditions where passing vehicles or construction equipment pose a potential threat. The workers are often at heights, on scaffolds that can collapse by falling objects from above, in trenches that can cave in or in confined spaces that can trap workers.

Falls are the most common cause of death among construction workers and the second leading cause of death for all workers after work-related accidents. There were 1,000 fatal falls in 2010. More than half of all fatal falls were from causes common to construction work: 30 percent involved falls from a roof, 15 percent from ladders, 15 percent from scaffolds and 15 percent from building orders or structural steel. Many of the remaining categories also involve construction work: 10 percent from non-overhead ceiling, 10 percent from falls on the same level, 10 percent from floor, dock or round edge, 10 percent down stairs or steps and 10 percent were unreported. A problem that often occurs in construction work. Construction laborers have one of the highest numbers of lost work days as a leading indicator of work hazards.

The construction sector had the highest number of fatal work injuries in 2010, with 1,000 percent of all fatalities, far ahead of transportation and warehousing with 1,000 work-related fatalities. The magnitude of the hazards of construction work is illustrated by the fact that its fatality rate of 10 per 100,000 employed workers is more than twice and one-fifth that of the fatality rate of 5 percent for all workers. The number of construction industry deaths went up to 1,000 from 1,000. According to self-reported statistics, 1,000 workers were injured in 2010 for a rate of 10 workers injured per 100,000 workers, more than the average of 5 workers for all workers.

Large construction companies have the highest reported injury rates with construction companies of 100 or more employees averaging a rate of 10 per 100,000 workers, virtually the same as construction companies with 20 or more workers. The highest fatality rates, with 10 or more workers, are the safest with a rate of only 1 percent. The lowest fatality rates, with 20 or more workers, are a close second at 1 percent, but since the veracity of this data is in doubt since they don't have to report it to BLS.

Construction laborers are most likely to die on the job with 10 percent of the total deaths followed by

Another problem is that OSHA does not require that construction firms keep records of injuries and illnesses incurred on site. They are required to keep internal statistics but the BLS doesn't use this data to compile its statistics. A recommendation that this be done has been ignored since 1990. Nor does anyone have to keep track of workers who are hired as independent contractors or workers for subcontractors, a practice common in the construction industry.

Construction accounts for 10 percent of workplace deaths and ten percent of reported occupational injuries and illnesses. It is difficult to cover up workplace deaths, the reliability of injury and illness

Key indicators of OSHA's strength or weakness are the number of staff inspectors, investments and penalties. On the first OSHA clearly doesn't have enough inspectors to cover all workplaces under its jurisdiction. In OSHA's budget, staff to cover non-workplaces at non-workplaces but in there were only OSHA staff for non-workplaces in businesses under the Bush administration. OSHA has put a big emphasis on voluntary compliance by businesses which gives employers an incentive to avoid inspections by reporting fewer or no worker injuries. Consequently the number of workers covered by OSHA inspections decreased by percent from the Clinton FY to Bush FY.

There are so few OSHA inspectors today, that it would take years to visit each workplace under its jurisdiction. OSHA has failed so far that the situation is better under state OSHA plans. Altogether the states have inspectors and it would only take years to inspect workplaces under their jurisdiction.

Fewer inspectors have meant fewer inspections and that has resulted in lower penalties. For example the average OSHA penalty for serious violations, situations were death or serious injury are yearly as dropped from FY during the Clinton administration to FY under Bush.

concern of effort to tighten safety standards. Note that it was a rule to weaken tier 1 assessment for heat that would help employers by making it more difficult for OSHA and the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) to establish and regulate safe thresholds of workers' exposure to toxins and chemicals. For example, it proposes to use assumptions favorable to employers to arbitrarily calculate tier 1 that a worker exposed to crystalline silica dust would become

the state standard strategy involves putting the post-bacc every time the deadline

