

City of Seattle

SAFETY AND HEALTH

General duty standards (WAC 296-24-073)

An employer violated general safe workplace standards where workers were exposed to traffic hazards in reversible lane operation which required workers to maneuver cones from rear bumper of moving truck. To establish a violation of general duty standards, the Department must establish three elements: (1) employer failed to provide a workplace free from hazard; (2) the hazard is recognized; and (3) the hazard is likely to cause death or serious physical injury. ...*In re City of Seattle, BIIA Dec., 89 W136 (1991)*

Penalties

The Department's penalty worksheet is appropriate for calculating penalties, and a serious violation requires some monetary penalty which may be reduced by the employer's attempts to avoid inherent hazards. ...*In re City of Seattle, BIIA Dec., 89 W136 (1991)*

Scroll down for order.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS

STATE OF WASHINGTON

In re: CITY OF SEATTLE)	Docket No. 89 W136
)	
Citation and Notice No. 436346)	DECISION AND ORDER
)	
_____)	

APPEARANCES:

Employer, City of Seattle, by
R. James Pidduck, Jr. and Barry Fairfax

Employees of City of Seattle, by
Public Service and Industrial Employees Local 1239, by
John L. Masterjohn

Department of Labor and Industries, by
Office of the Attorney General, per
Shawn Ruth, Paralegal, Aaron Owada and Ron Lavigne, Assistants

This is an appeal filed by the employer, City of Seattle, on December 14, 1989, with the Safety Division, Department of Labor and Industries, and transmitted to the Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals on December 22, 1989, from a Corrective Notice of Redetermination No. 436346 issued on November 30, 1989. The Corrective Notice of Redetermination affirmed Citation and Notice No. 436346, which alleged serious violations of WAC 296-24-073(4)(a) and 296-24-073(2) and a general violation of WAC 296-155-120, but modified the penalty assessed for the two serious violations from \$600 for each violation to \$240 each. Affirmed as modified.

DECISION

Pursuant to RCW 51.52.104 and RCW 51.52.106, this matter is before the Board for review and decision on timely Petitions for Review filed by the employer and the Department to a Proposed Decision and Order issued on May 13, 1991 in which the Corrective Notice of

1 Redetermination was modified to find "nonserious" violations of WAC
2 296-24-073(4)(a) and 296-24-073(2) and to reduce the total penalty from
3 \$480 to -0-.

4 The Board has reviewed the evidentiary rulings in the record of
5 proceedings and finds that no prejudicial error was committed and said
6 rulings are hereby affirmed.

7 The employer appealed the Corrective Notice of Redetermination
8 arguing, in the alternative, that the City of Seattle complied with the
9 general safety standards set forth in WAC 296-24-073(2), and (4)(a), or
10 that the general standards did not provide the City with adequate
11 notice that it was, or may have been, committing safety violations in
12 its reverse lane crew operation on the First Avenue South bridge.

13 Citation and Notice No. 436346 included a charge that the City of
14 Seattle violated WAC 296-155-120(1)(b) because the senior person at the
15 worksite did not have proof of first aid training. Corrective Notice
16 of Redetermination No. 436346 did not address that violation. At the
17 hearing, the Department moved to vacate the violation of WAC 296-155-
18 120(1)(b), and our industrial appeals judge granted the motion.
19 Unfortunately, the Proposed Decision and Order failed to indicate that
20 that element of the Citation had been vacated.

21 There is no significant dispute between the parties regarding the
22 facts which led to the issuance of this Citation. The City of Seattle,
23 in conjunction with the Department of Transportation (then known as the
24 Highway Commission), developed a reversible lane system for peak
25 traffic hours on the First Avenue South bridge. The operation
26 establishes three lanes dedicated to southbound traffic and one lane to
27 northbound, through placement of fluorescent orange traffic cones and

1 vertical plastic pylons at designated points on the bridge each workday
2 evening.

3 Two workers stood or crouched on a platform coated with traction
4 enhancing covering on the back of a City truck. The platform is
5 approximately fourteen (14) inches above the roadway to allow placement
6 and recovery of the lane marking devices. One worker would hand a cone
7 to the other, who placed it on the roadway while the truck moves
8 forward at two or three miles per hour. In order to place the cone,
9 the worker on the platform leans out past the side of the truck. To
10 place or remove the vertical pylons, the truck stops and the worker
11 gets off. The removal process involves the same basic technique. One
12 worker reaches out and from a sitting or squatting position on the
13 platform while holding onto the back of the truck, picks up the cone
14 and hands it to the other worker for placement in the bed of the truck.

15 During the "coning" process, a motorcycle police officer follows the
16 truck. During removal, the officer moves to the front of the truck.

17 On September 20, 1989, Mike Vosika, a safety inspector for the
18 Department of Labor and Industries, observed the First Avenue South
19 bridge reverse lane crew operation around 5:30 - 6:00 p.m. He noted
20 there was no safety guard for workers on the rear platform of the
21 truck, that employees did not stay within the truck as it moved, and
22 later learned that the senior person did not have evidence of current
23 first aid training. He believed workers came within one or two feet of
24 oncoming traffic when they leaned from the back of the City truck to

1 place or retrieve cones. He felt this was a risk because the operation
2 was performed while the bridge was used for two-way traffic with a
3 posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour.

4 The City of Seattle contends it did not violate the general safety
5 standards set forth in WAC 296-24-073, which provide in pertinent part:

6 (2) Every employer shall furnish and use safety devices and
7 safeguards and shall adopt and use practices, and means,
8 methods, operations and processes which are reasonably
9 adequate to render such employment and place of employment
10 safe. Every employer shall do every other thing reasonably
11 necessary to protect the life and safety of employees.

12

13
14
15 (4) No employer shall fail or neglect:

16 (a) To provide and use safety devices and
17 safeguards.
18
19

20 To establish a violation of the "general duty" standards, the
21 Department must establish three basic elements: 1) the employer failed
22 to provide a workplace free from hazard; 2) the hazard is recognized;
23 and 3) the hazard is likely to cause death or serious physical injury.

24 See Kelly Springfield Tire Co. v. Donovan & OSHA, 11 OSHC 1889, 1891
25 (5th Cir. 1984).

26 In this particular instance, the Corrective Notice of
27 Redetermination focused upon the hazard of a worker's falling off the
28 rear platform of the truck while picking up the cones. The City
29 contends the general safety standards did not provide adequate notice
30 to it of the prohibited or required conduct. In the context of the
31 safe workplace or general duty provisions, recognition "refers to

1 knowledge of the hazard and not to recognition of abatement." M.
2 Rothstein, Occupational Safety and Health Law § 145 at 184 (3rd ed.,
3 1990) (footnote omitted).

4 A condition or activity is a recognized hazard if the employer knows
5 the dangerous potential or that potential is known generally within an
6 industry, irrespective of probability or foreseeability of hazardous
7 incidents. United Technologies Corp., Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Div., 9
8 OSHC 1554, 1557-1558 (2d Cir. 1981) (the dangerous potential of storing
9 certain chemicals next to each other was recognized in the industry).
10 Thus, an employer's admitted knowledge of dangerous potential is
11 sufficient to establish a recognized hazard. Continental Oil Co., 8
12 OSHC 1980, 1981 (6th Cir. 1980) (employer knew the dangerous potential
13 of spilled gasoline).

14 Barry Fairfax, of the City Engineering Department, described the
15 coning operation. He noted the truck's rear platform rails were
16 covered with an abrasive traction material. He described the platform
17 as 90 inches wide, 14 inches deep and 14 inches above the road surface.

18 The truck operators were advised to travel in the range of two to
19 three miles per hour, with a maximum speed of five miles per hour. The
20 restrictions on the speed of the vehicle, the provision of a police
21 motorcycle escort, and the provision of traction material on the
22 platform are all evidence that the City recognized that there were
23 potential hazards with its coning operation.

24 That the hazard inherent in the reverse lane crew operation is

1 liable to cause death or serious physical injury is also apparent. Mr.
2 Vosika expressed concerns regarding a worker being struck by oncoming
3 traffic as he leaned out to place or retrieve a cone. Similarly, a
4 worker is at risk of falling during the operation. If, in fact, a
5 worker fell onto the roadway and possibly into traffic, serious
6 physical injury is likely to result. Accordingly, a serious violation
7 of the general safe workplace standards has been established.

8 Under RCW 49.17.180(7), when determining the amount of penalty, the
9 Department is required to consider "the number of affected employees of
10 the employer . . . , the gravity of the violation, the size of the
11 employer's business, the good faith of the employer, and the history of
12 previous violations." The Department's penalty worksheet is an
13 appropriate tool for calculating WISHA penalties. Although the
14 Department's worksheet for calculating penalties for these violations
15 was not admitted into the record, Mr. Vosika described the basis for
16 the penalties assessed.

17 Because RCW 49.17.180(2) states that a civil penalty shall be
18 imposed for serious violations, the City of Seattle's violations
19 warrant a penalty in some monetary amount. We believe the penalty
20 imposed by the Citation and then the Corrective Notice of
21 Redetermination should be reduced, however.

22 Mr. Vosika testified that the base penalty amount was calculated by
23 using a "gravity score" for the violation. The gravity score is based
24 upon the severity factor multiplied by the probability factor, with

1 each being considered on a 1 to 5 scale. He characterized the severity
2 of each violation of the general duty standards as "4", with
3 probability as "3". Multiplication of the factors led to a
4 determination that the gravity of each violation was equal to 12,
5 resulting in a base amount of \$2,000.00. The worksheet used in
6 calculating the City of Seattle's penalties allowed the maximum
7 deductions for number of employed exposed, good faith, and history.
8 The resulting initial penalty imposed for each violation was \$600.00.

9 At the reassumption conference conducted by Mr. James, the
10 Department reduced the penalty by modifying the probability to "2".
11 Mr. James acknowledged the probability of a fall from the platform was
12 very small in light of the "firm grip bumper" and the City's 23-year
13 history of safe operation. The record amply demonstrates the City's
14 efforts to avoid the hazard inherent in its reverse lane coning
15 procedure. Those efforts justify a finding that the probability of an
16 incident was even lower than that found by the Department. In
17 addition, although the operation could result in serious physical
18 injury, we believe the severity of the violation does not warrant the
19 "4" rating. Instead, the penalty should be based upon a severity
20 rating of "3".

21 After consideration of the Proposed Decision and Order, the
22 Petitions for Review filed thereto by the City of Seattle and the
23 Department of Labor and Industries, and a careful review of the entire
24 record before us, we are persuaded that the Corrective Notice of

1 Redetermination is correct to the extent it found a serious violation
2 of WAC 296-24-073(4)(a) and a serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(2).
3 It is incorrect in its penalty assessment, however. We therefore
4 modify the penalty to reflect a gravity factor of "3" [3 (severity) x 1
5 (probability)]. In addition, we vacate the violation of WAC 296-155-
6 120(1)(b), based on the Department's own motion to vacate.

7

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
1. On October 10, 1989, the Department of Labor and Industries issued Citation and Notice No. 436346, pursuant to the Washington Industrial Safety and Health Act, alleging the City of Seattle committed a serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(4)(a), for which a penalty of \$600.00 was assessed, a serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(2), for which a penalty of \$600.00 was assessed, and a general violation of WAC 296-155-120.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

On October 12, 1989, the employer, City of Seattle, filed a Notice of Appeal with the Department of Labor and Industries. The Department thereafter on November 30, 1989, issued Corrective Notice of Redetermination No. 436346, affirming the serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(4)(a) and reducing the penalty from \$600.00 to \$240.00, affirming the serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(2) and reducing the penalty from \$600.00 to \$240.00, for a total penalty assessment of \$480.00.

22
23
24
25
26
27

On December 14, 1989, the employer filed a Notice of Appeal with the Industrial Safety Division of the Department of Labor and Industries. The Department transmitted its file to the Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals on December 22, 1989.

- 28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
2. The Department moved to vacate the general violation of WAC 296-155-120. The employer did not contest the motion.
 3. The City of Seattle, in conjunction with the Department of Transportation, developed a reversible lane system for peak traffic hours on the First Avenue South bridge. The operation involves two workers who stand or crouch on a traction-material-coated platform on the back of a City truck. One worker hands a cone to the other, who places it on the roadway while the truck moves forward at two or three miles per hour. In order to place or remove a cone, the worker leans out over the edge of the truck. To place or remove vertical pylons, the truck stops and the worker gets off.
 4. The operation places a worker at risk of falling off the rear platform of the truck. The City recognized the potential hazard and made good faith efforts to avoid it and reduced the probability of an incident by

1 providing safety devices and safeguards for workers
2 riding on the rear platform.
3

4 5. Based upon the penalty factors already considered by
5 the Department, the appropriate penalty for the
6 serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(4)(a) should be
7 calculated upon a gravity rating of "3" with the
8 maximum adjustments for good faith, history, and
9 number of employees exposed.

10
11 6. Based upon the penalty factors already considered by
12 the Department, the appropriate penalty for the
13 serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(2) should be
14 calculated upon a gravity rating of "3" with the
15 maximum adjustments for good faith, history, and
16 number of employees exposed.
17

18 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

19
20 1. The Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals has
21 jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter to
22 this appeal.
23

24 2. Corrective Notice of Redetermination No. 436346, which
25 alleged one serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(4)(a)
26 and one serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(2) is
27 correct and is affirmed with respect to the violations
28 cited. To the extent the Corrective Notice of
29 Redetermination No. 436346 did not address the general
30 violation of WAC 296-155-120, it is incorrect and that
31 violation is vacated.
32

33 The penalty assessment in Corrective Notice of
34 Redetermination No. 436346, totalling \$480.00, is
35 excessive, and this matter is remanded to assess the
36 penalty for a serious violation of WAC 296-24-
37 073(4)(a) upon a gravity rating of "3" with the
38 maximum adjustments for good faith, history, and
39 number of employees exposed, and to assess the penalty
40 for a serious violation of WAC 296-24-073(2) upon a
41 gravity rating of "3" with the maximum adjustments for
42 good faith, history, and number of employees exposed.

43 As herein modified, the Corrective Notice of
44 Redetermination is affirmed.
45

1
2 It is so ORDERED.
3

4 Dated this 22nd day of November, 1991.
5

6 BOARD OF INDUSTRIAL INSURANCE APPEALS
7

8
9 /s/ _____
10 S. FREDERICK FELLER Chairperson
11

12
13 /s/ _____
14 PHILLIP T. BORK Member
15