

Prevention Through Design & Green Buildings

A U.S. Perspective on Collaboration

Current green design and construction practices are primarily aimed at minimizing environmental and resource impacts and improving the safety, health and productivity of a building's final occupants and the public. Rating systems, such as the U.S. Green Building Council's (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) put little, if any, focus on the safety and health of the initial occupants, the construction workers or those that maintain these buildings. Yet, such rating systems and their proponents represent a largely untapped opportunity for safety and health practitioners to enlist in efforts to promote designing for safer workplaces during the building's construction and maintenance.

In the U.S., the likelihood of governmental regulations that would broadly specify prevention through design (PtD) efforts in upstream construction activities is remote. Because PtD has seen international support in enhancing construction worker safety and health, innovative and creative ways to diffuse the concept in the U.S. must be developed. This article focuses on the congruencies between the green building effort as a sustainable holistic system and the safety and health of workers who build and maintain these buildings.

National Occupational Research Agenda (NORA) Construction Sector goals, whose formulation was facilitated by NIOSH in collaboration with external stakeholders, are described as they relate to green building elements and ideologies. Motivations and methods for design professionals to participate within NIOSH PtD and a new NIOSH program, Safe Green Jobs, are described.

The basic premise of the article is summed up by Gilding, et al. (2002) who say "no entity that presides over projects that experience avoidable workplace deaths, serious injuries, or illnesses can ever claim to be sustainable." For green buildings to be considered sustainable, construction safety and health concepts must be integrated into upstream considerations.

WHY SHOULD GREEN BUILDINGS BE CONSTRUCTED SAFER?

Green's Eventual Purpose Is to Benefit People

Green buildings are built by and occupied by people. As cited by Abbaszadeh, et al. (2006), USGBC defines green buildings as structures that have significantly reduced or eliminated negative impacts on the environment and the occupants. Construction workers are the earliest occupants in the initial lifecycle stage of a green building. Construction workers will also maintain, remodel and decommission a green building throughout its lifecycle. Green design and construction are founded on the concept of promoting environmental sustainability and consequently perceived as doing the right thing for the ultimate benefit of the health and well-being of people.

However, the construction industry is highly hazardous. In the U.S., over the past few years, the following statistics have remained fairly constant—the construction industry employs roughly 7.5% of the nation's workforce yet accounts for more than 20% of the nation's occupational-related deaths (Table 1). The safety record in the construction industry is improving. The fatality rate decreased from 14.7 per 100,000 workers

in 1995 (Toscano & Windau, 1996) to 10.5 per 100,000 workers in 2007 (BLS, 2008). However, each year more than 1,000 workers are killed in the construction industry, and a large disparity still exists between the percentage working in construction and the percentage of construction fatalities in relation to all industries.

Green buildings are constructed with green materials and specific ele-

Table 1

U.S. Construction Safety Statistics, 1995, 2005-07

Year	Construction Employment (thousands)	Total Employment (thousands)	% Construction Employment	Construction Fatalities	Total Fatalities	% Construction Fatalities	Fatality Rate
2007	11,416	147,215	7.8%	1,204	5,657	21.3%	10.5
2006	11,312	145,501	7.8%	1,239	5,840	21.2%	10.9
2005	10,739	142,894	7.5%	1,192	5,734	20.8%	11.1
1995	7,153	126,248	5.6%	1,048	6,210	16.8%	14.7

Fatality rate = $(N/W) \times 100,000$; N = the number of worker fatalities, age 16 and older; W = the annual average number of employed workers, age 16 and older.

Sources: Toscano & Windau (1996); BLS (2006-08)

ments that are designed to improve a building's sustainability and hopefully earn the green or sustainable design designation; yet, the processes used during construction have not incorporated elements to account for sustainability (i.e., safety and health) of the construction workforce. Construction literature and practice are filled with proven methods for constructors to work safely and remain healthy. The causes of injuries and illnesses in construction have long been recognized and their persistence continues to frustrate construction safety and health practitioners and researchers (Hill, 2003).

Research has identified best practices that improve the safety and health performance of construction workers (e.g., CII 2003; Jaselskis, et al., 2006). Individual companies have reached incredible milestones of zero injuries and no accidents throughout their projects. In other words, in general, it is known how to work safely and how to manage construction safety and health to eliminate and reduce recognizable risks and hazards. These established best practices ultimately have a positive effect on people—the construction workers and their families.

In his text on a contractor's guide to green construction, Glavinich (2008) addresses construction safety in one page but does not make the link that worker safety and health should be connected to green building design. Another text on green project planning and estimating (Greene, 2006) does not mention worker safety or health.

One example of a green building where construction safety failures occurred is at the Las Vegas, NV, Mirage City Center, which was striving for USGBC LEED certification at the Silver level. During this construction project, scheduled to be completed near the end of 2009, six construction workers died on the job in an 18-month period (CPWR, 2008).

Regarding the safety and green link on this project, Ivanovich (2008a) posed the question, "how many construction site deaths should there be to make a building 'not green' regardless of the environmental benefits?" Ivanovich (2008b) also suggests awarding one credit if a project is completed without a serious injury or death. He also proposed that green certifications should be revocable where accidental injuries or deaths occurred during construction and were proved to be complicit with negligence after the certification was awarded.

While these comments are thought-provoking, proving such negligence or corruption is difficult. Rather, a more proactive suggestion would specify the incorporation of leading indicators of safety and health performance in obtaining LEED certification rather than revoking it for occupational fatalities.

Examples include fall protection anchor points (for both construction and maintenance activities); the inclusion of roof parapets where appropriate; recommendations for safe design of atria windows and skylights to facilitate building and maintenance; organization of the building site to facili-

tate the safe handling of building materials; and other design suggestions (Gambatese, et al., 1997).

GREEN CONCEPTS ARE EVOLVING INTO SUSTAINABLE CONCEPTS

The USGBC LEED Rating System measures how well a building or community performs across a spectrum of environmental and public health metrics: energy savings, water efficiency, CO₂ emissions reduction, improved indoor environmental quality and stewardship of resources and sensitivity to their impacts. Yet, these are predominantly environmental issues, and construction worker safety and health issues are not included among the metrics. With the LEED focus on the environment as an end goal, worker safety and health is only incidentally linked to the environment by the fact that many professionals in both fields have responsibilities in the other.

For example, professionals often have job titles that encompass both fields, such as SH&E manager. The term *green* is not synonymous with the term *sustainable*. However, these two terms have been used interchangeably in the construction industry (Kibert, 2008; Kopec, 2009). The main contention of this article is that construction worker safety and health and green construction development have linkages and opportunities for integration.

It is a misperception that including construction worker safety and health will dilute the green effort; on the contrary, sustainable design and green buildings must account for both environmental and human resources throughout their lifecycles. Sustainability is a broader concept, which, in addition to the environmental aspect, addresses the continuity of economic considerations, resource conservation and social aspects of human society. Sustainability raises the "green" discussion from materials and processes to include marketing, distribution, disposal and human labor (Evans, 2006).

For a green building to be sustainable, consideration must be given to more than just protecting the environment. Worker safety and health are key issues within the social dimension of sustainability (Holcim, 2009; Epstein & Roy, 2003; Gilding, et al., 2002). Montoya (2009) references Trevor Hancock, a public health physician and first leader of the Green Party of Canada, whom he calls a pioneer of the "healthy communities" movement, and credits him with a definition of socially sustainable development that includes, among other items, safe working conditions. USGBC (2009) is founded on a similar set of guiding principles, expressed in its mission

For a green building to be sustainable, consideration must be given to more than just protecting the environment. Worker safety and health are key issues within the social dimension of sustainability.

statement: “To transform the way buildings and communities are designed, built and operated, enabling an environmentally and socially responsible, healthy and prosperous environment that improves the quality of life.” Moreover, the USGBC Strategic Plan (2009) states that “the meaning of ‘green’ is evolving, to more fully include human and social relationships to the built environment.”

USGBC is deeply rooted within six guiding principles that are incorporated into all aspects of its organization, consistent with promoting the triple bottom line (i.e., economic, social and environmental responsibility). The six principles are: 1) promote the triple bottom line; 2) establish leadership; 3) reconcile humanity with nature; 4) maintain integrity; 5) ensure inclusiveness; and 6) exhibit transparency. However, no mention of construction worker safety and health, or construction workers at all for

that matter, is included in the USGBC strategic plan or other materials available on [USGBC’s website](#).

The absence of construction worker safety and health under the context of sustainable construction is evident in other publications. Kibert’s (2008) text on sustainable construction mentions the health and safety plan, however, the focus of that one-page section is to ensure that the completed building’s final indoor air quality is not compromised by the construction process. Kopec’s (2009) text on health, sustainability and the built environment discusses safety and ergonomic considerations for a sustainable build-

ing’s occupants but does not mention construction workers at all.

The Holcim Foundation for sustainable construction is committed to the “triple bottom line” concept, which asserts that long-term and sustainable progress requires the balanced achievement of economic growth, ecological balance and social progress. Within their social equity framework, workers’ safety and health is not mentioned. Kibert (2008) further states that sustainable construction is defined most comprehensively by addressing the ecological, social and economic issues of a building in the context of its community, but construction worker safety and health is not mentioned as a social issue.

Moreover, Kibert (2008), Lützkendorf (2003) and Sarja (2002) agree that sustainable construction must encompass the entire lifecycle of the building. The entire lifecycle includes the construction process itself as well as the maintenance of the building and building systems.

Construction worker safety and health, as well as the safety and health of all workers, falls under the umbrella of the social dimension of sustainability, and that the construction safety process, by its current safety record,

is unsustainable. In other words, green and sustainable buildings are built by an unsustainable process. Gilding, et al. (2002), summed up this contention by stating that “no corporate regime that presides over avoidable deaths, injuries and illnesses in the workplace can ever claim to be sustainable or even to understand what the concept requires of their business.”

IS GREEN CONSTRUCTION SAFER OR LESS SAFE THAN CONVENTIONAL CONSTRUCTION?

Green buildings are not constructed with additional safety and health measures within the design and planning process. Construction firms selected to construct green buildings are not required to have special safety management systems or evidence of a particular safety performance. Therefore, a null hypothesis would state that the construction safety and health record used to construct a green building is no different than conventional construction. Those statistics have been discussed previously and are included in Table 1 (p. 28). As yet, there are no records or published studies that describe the safety record of green construction. Gambatese, et al. (2004), performed case study research to answer the following questions:

- Do LEED buildings (e.g., green design and construction) affect construction worker safety and health?
- What is the affect, positive or negative, of LEED on safety and health on construction sites?

They found that some features of green buildings designed and constructed to meet the LEED rating system, such as the construction material recycling programs, may negatively affect the safety of construction workers, while others, such as the use of low-VOC materials, may help to eliminate construction site health hazards.

This study prompted further study by the same authors, and they recently had an article accepted for publication in the *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management* (Rajendran, et al., 2009). The research surveyed construction companies on their safety records during green and conventional construction projects. The study found no statistical difference between green and non-green projects in terms of construction worker safety and health.

With both green and non-green buildings having the same safety and health performance, a question arises as to whether LEED buildings should be labeled as sustainable buildings. Because no difference in safety and health performance is experienced, LEED projects are perhaps sustainable environmentally but not sustainable in terms of worker safety and health.

PREVENTION THROUGH DESIGN CONGRUENCIES Overview of NIOSH PtD in Relation to Green

To organize efforts to explore and promote the role of design in the broad field of occupational safety and health, NIOSH and its partners convened the first PtD

Construction firms selected to construct green buildings are not required to have special safety management systems or evidence of a particular safety performance.

Workshop in Washington, DC, in July 2007. The intent was to launch a national initiative aimed at eliminating occupational hazards and controlling risks to workers “at the source” or as early as possible in the lifecycle of items or workplaces.

PtD includes the design of work premises, structures, tools, plants, equipment, machinery, substances, work methods and systems of work. The workshop attracted approximately 225 participants from diverse industry sectors and disciplines. Initial partners included the American Industrial Hygiene Association, ASSE, the Center to Protect Workers’ Rights, Kaiser Permanente, Liberty Mutual, the National Safety Council, OSHA, ORC Worldwide and the Regenstrief Center for Healthcare Engineering. Others have joined and continue to do so since.

The central tenet of this initiative is expressed as follows:

PtD addresses occupational safety and health needs by eliminating hazards and minimizing risks to workers throughout the lifecycle of work premises, tools, equipment, machinery, substances and work processes including their construction, manufacture, use, maintenance and ultimate disposal or reuse.

The PtD national initiative is framed by industry sector and within four functional areas: research, education, practice and policy. Goals for each of these areas, and an additional focus area of small businesses, were established at a subsequent meeting of the NORA PtD Council in September 2008. More information on the initiative is available at <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/programs/PtDesign/>. Because the role of design is so closely linked to safety and health in so many applications identified through this initiative, the incorporation or adaptation of PtD into green building projects warrants consideration to ensure that such projects are consistent with the concepts of sustainability proposed here.

The following PtD policy intermediate goal was established to move the PtD concept forward through sustainable construction practices: IG4.4: Worker health and safety principles are included in sustainable design and construction practices. Additionally, a comprehensive description of the PtD initiative is documented in the *Journal of Safety Research* (Vol. 39, No. 2, 2008) dedicated to the proceedings of the 2007 PtD National Workshop. As a further step to recognize the potential linkages between environmental sustainability and worker safety and health, NIOSH launched an effort in June 2009 focusing on Going Green: Safe and Healthy Jobs.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION: PtD & GREEN

Incorporating worker safety and health in to a system, such as LEED, would move safety into the design effort (Silins, 2009) and thus presents collaborative opportunities for the NIOSH PtD initiative and the green building



movement. While the use of low-VOC materials will enhance construction worker health (Gambatese, et al., 2004; Montoya, 2009), certain green features have documented risks associated with their construction and maintenance.

Atria and skylights are often specified to increase the amount of natural light and heating, thereby reducing electricity usage. The construction and maintenance of atria present fall hazards, that can be overcome with proper design and planning. A significant number of injuries and fatalities result from workers falling through skylights (NIOSH, 2004). In 2008, the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) assembled a committee to evaluate skylight specifications and testing (eGlass Weekly, 2008). The standard will increase the required force from the 1984 OSHA standard, which specified that skylights be designed to withstand a load of at least 200 pounds. Dr. Nigel Ellis, lead for the ASTM skylight test committee, calls the 200-lb requirement woefully inadequate (eGlass Weekly, 2008). Alternatively, a specification could be included that the skylight be surrounded by a permanent protective guardrail.

The literature associated with construction PtD has established more than 400 additional specific methods where design professionals could positively affect construction and maintenance worker safety and health without interfering with constructor’s choice of means and methods (Gambatese, et al., 1997). The relationship between designer and constructor can be complicated by construction contracts, and the relationship between design decisions and construction safety and health is complex and multifaceted (Behm, 2005).

Some features of green buildings designed and constructed to meet the LEED rating system, such as the construction material recycling programs, may negatively affect the safety of construction workers, while others, such as the use of low-VOC materials, may help to eliminate construction site health hazards.

No corporate regime that presides over avoidable deaths, injuries and illnesses in the workplace can ever claim to be sustainable or even to understand what the concept requires of their business.

Therefore, sustainable PtD efforts are more about considering the safety and health of workers in relation to design, and providing an opportunity for construction workers to work safely than about dictating means and methods. Success in PtD hinges on the relationship and communication between designer and constructor with both parties knowing their roles and responsibilities. The texts by Montoya (2009), Kopec (2009) and Glavinich (2008) go into detail on the specifications, environmental benefits and construction aspects of specific green elements.

It is recommended that revisions of these or future textbooks also include the safe design, planning and construction of green elements. A suggested future research endeavor would be to find congruencies with these textbooks and construction PtD suggestions and establish specific design measures within the context of green and sustainable construction.

NORA CONSTRUCTION SECTOR GOALS

The NORA Construction Sector Council was formed in 2006 facilitated by NIOSH in collaboration with external stakeholders. The council is comprised of invited stakeholders and subject matter experts from government, academia, industry groups, organized labor and private consulting. During initial face-to-face meetings, the Construction Sector Council identified priority topic areas through a series of discussions and multivoting processes. Among the resulting topic areas identified, safety by design, later renamed Construction Hazards Prevention through Design (CHPtD) for harmonization and consistency with the broader PtD initiative, was determined to be a priority area for assessing research needs as well as the translation and dissemination of best practices for preventing hazards in construction through design and engineering solutions. A core CHPtD workgroup was formed from volunteers on the Sector Council with interest and experience in this topic area. Additional corresponding members were recruited through the Sector Council in February 2008.

To apply the concept of designing for safety to the construction industry the NORA Construction CHPtD workgroup was given the task of providing leadership to develop goals and priorities. The main idea was to use engineering strategies in the design phase of projects to reduce accident-producing situations. This is to be accomplished by the formation of partnerships, coordination of efforts and facilitating networking between the construction industry and associated groups of design organizations. These activities were performed through a series of

facilitated discussions, face-to-face meetings and multiple teleconferences throughout a 3-year period (2006-08).

The following strategic goal (Goal 13) was established for the CHPtD topic:

Strategic Goal 13: Increase the use of “prevention through design” approaches to prevent or reduce safety and health hazards in construction.

Performance Measure: Increase the use of CHPtD by 33% over the next 10 years.

The intermediate goals (IGs) and associated performance measures were established to support the strategic goal and describe specific research or research-to-practice (r2p) activities identified as priority activities for this topic area. The draft goals, first disseminated in February 2008, were later revised in July 2008 as they appear here.

IG 13.1: Characterize the current use of CHPtD and coordinate efforts to promote its use (5 subgoals).

Performance Measures: Provide a baseline report within two years describing key measures of current national use of CHPtD within construction, along with a repository of currently available materials, current construction organization activities and contacts and current training. Use findings to inform and begin at least three promotion activities. Collect data from at least eight design/construction firms and other organizations actively involved in this process. Compile cost comparison assessments and business case models to characterize costs of CHPtD approaches.

Develop a repository for large and medium size AE firms that deal with electrical, mechanical, civil and commercial projects. For target audiences (i.e., engineers, architects, construction managers, and safety and health professionals), develop the following training programs to disseminate the principles and benefits of CHPtD:

- full semester undergraduate course;
- 1-week modules that can be incorporated into existing college courses’ 8-hour continuing education course.

IG 13.2: Confirm the most prevalent obstacles to acceptance and implementation of CHPtD (3 subgoals):

- fear of liability;
- lack of expertise in safety and in designing for safety;
- increased costs associated with CHPtD.

Performance Measures: Conduct a survey or other quantitative research method of owners, AEs and professional liability insurance carriers to empirically confirm the factors hindering their adoption of PtD processes.

IG 13.3: Develop tangible products and methods to address identified CHPtD obstacles and challenges (11 subgoals).

Performance Measures: Develop tools, policies, sources of information, training courses and other formal mechanisms as described in the following goals to circumvent barriers to the acceptance and implementation of CHPtD.

IG 13.4: Expand the use and evaluation of CHPtD practices (5 subgoals).

IG 13.5: Develop incentives for architects and engineers to include the following in facility design plans and specifications:

- methods for safer project erection;
- methods for safe operation;
- methods for safe service and maintenance;
- methods for safety of the public.

Each intermediate goal has multiple research and r2p subgoals providing further detail activities for meeting the broader objectives. CHPtD goals are found within the [NORA Construction Sector Agenda](#). As NIOSH and the construction industry work on meeting these performance measures and goals, the incentives for designers to participate in construction PtD have the opportunity to evolve absent formal governmental regulation. Just as the design community has embraced green building design and the environmental pillar of sustainable construction, NIOSH provides the opportunity for architects and design engineers to embrace the PtD concept, construction worker safety and health and that part of the social pillar of sustainability.

MOTIVATIONS FOR DESIGNERS TO PARTICIPATE IN PtD

As a new focus is revealed on the safety-sustainability link by NIOSH, safety researchers and reporters, such as Ivanovich, and design professionals on the leading edge of new innovations as early adopters would likely choose to participate. As any new idea grows, it is the early adopters who will shape that idea. These early adopters would desire to influence the amount and type of safety through design modifications in such a safety-sustainability expansion, rather than having the other aforementioned groups dictate that amount upon them through such means as public outcry or regulation.

As green and sustainable construction evolves, eventually the construction safety and health link will become obvious to all. Moreover, owners will start to see the link between safety and sustainability and, therefore, will be interested in sustainable construction models that include safety and health.

CONCLUSION

The crux of this article is summed up by Gilding, et al. (2002), who states, “no corporate regime that presides over avoidable deaths, injuries and illnesses in the workplace can ever claim to be sustainable or even to understand what the concept requires of their business.” Through this article, this notion is applied to construction workers, the initial occupant of a green building, by contending that no entity (including design professionals and project owners) that presides over construction projects or green buildings which experience avoidable workplace deaths, injuries or illnesses can ever claim to be sustainable. Green and sustainable construction should have a better safety record than conventional construction. Rajendran, et al. (2009), have shown that it currently does not.

The following future research activities are recommended:

•Determine the effect of specific green building elements on construction worker safety and health.

•Sustainable and green construction textbooks should consider construction worker safety and health as an element of importance and should consider including previous research that has highlighted construction PtD efforts. NIOSH and its collaborators are ready to provide assistance.

Green and sustainable construction is predicted to evolve and grow over the next few decades (Yudelson, 2008). Perhaps what is labeled green construction today will simply be conventional construction in the future. The innovation and creativity that has and will positively affect the environment will be substantial.

If construction worker safety and health is not part of this arrangement, any additional improvements in construction safety and health may lag behind environmental improvements. Green and sustainable buildings will continue to be built by a process that employs 8% of the nation’s workforce yet experiences more than 20% of its deaths. Green and sustainable construction should incorporate recognized construction safety best practices, including PtD, to truly have a positive impact on the dismal safety record and to ensure a sustainable building lifecycle. ☺

REFERENCES

- Abbaszadeh, S., Zagreus, L., Lehrer, D. & Huizenga, C. (2006). Occupant satisfaction with indoor environmental quality in green buildings. *Proceedings of Healthy Buildings 2006*, Lisbon, Vol. III, 365-370.
- Behm, M. (2005). Linking construction fatalities to the design for construction safety concept. *Safety Science*, 43(8), 589-611.
- Construction Industry Institute. (2003). *Safety plus: Making zero accidents a reality, RS160-1*. Austin, TX: Author.
- Center for Construction Research and Training. (2008, Nov.). Worksite assessment team site visit report for city center and cosmopolitan construction projects, Las Vegas, NV. Retrieved from <http://www.cpwr.com/eseach-sitereport.html>.
- eGlass Weekly (2008, Feb. 8). News to know: ASTM to develop skylight standard to prevent falls and fatalities. Retrieved from <http://news.glassmagazine.net/nga/issues/2008-02-05/index.html>.
- Epstein, M. & Roy, M. (2003, Spring). Making the business case for sustainability: Linking social and environmen-

Green and sustainable buildings will continue to be built by a process that employs 8% of the nation’s workforce yet experiences more than 20% of its deaths. Green and sustainable construction should incorporate recognized construction safety best practices, including PtD, to truly have a positive impact on the dismal safety record and to ensure a sustainable building lifecycle.

tal action to financial performance. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 79-96.

Evans, L. (2006, Feb. 1). Goodbye to green, hello to sustainability. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://www.usgbc.org/News/USGBCInTheNewsDetails.aspx?ID=2182>.

Gambatese, J., Rajendran, S. & Behm, M. (2007, May). Green design and construction: Understanding the effects on construction worker safety and health. *Professional Safety*, 52(5), 28-35.

Gambatese, J., Hinze, J. & Haas, C. (1997). Tool to design for construction worker safety. *Journal of Architectural Engineering*, 3(1), 32-41.

Glavinich, T. (2008). *Contractor's guide to green building construction: Management, project delivery, documentation and risk reduction*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Gilding, P., Humphries, R. & Hogarth, M. (2002, Mar.). Safe companies: A practical path for "operationalizing" sustainability. Retrieved from http://www.ecoscorporation.com/think/safety/safe_companies.pdf.

Hill, D. (2003). *Construction safety management and engineering*. Des Plaines, IL: ASSE.

Holcim Foundation for Sustainable Construction. (2009). Target issues for sustainable construction. Retrieved May 27, 2009, from http://www.holcimfoundation.org/T439/Target_issues_for_sustainable_construction.htm.

Ivanovich, M. (2008a). Bloody buildings. CSE Live. Retrieved from http://www.csemag.com/blog/Give_and_Take/11206-Bloody_Buildings.php.

Ivanovich, M. (2008b). LEEDing construction safety: A natural step. CSE Live. Retrieved from http://www.csemag.com/article/177222-LEEDing_construction_safety_a_Natural_Step.php.

Jaselskis, E.J., Anderson, S.D. & Russell, J.S. (1996). Strategies for achieving excellence in construction safety performance. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 122(1), 61-70.

Kibert, C. (2008). *Sustainable construction: Green building design and delivery* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Kopec, D. (2009). *Health, sustainability and the built environment*. New York: Fairchild Books.

Lützkendorf, T. (2003). The future of sustainable construction: Situation and trends in Germany. International eJournal of Construction. Special issue article in *The Future of Sustainable Construction*.

Montoya, M. (2009). *Green building fundamentals: A practical guide to understanding and applying fundamental sustainable construction practices and the LEED green building rating system*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

NIOSH. (2004). Preventing falls of workers through skylights and roof and floor openings (NIOSH Publication No. 2004-156). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, CDC, Author.

Rajendran, S., Gambatese, J. & Behm, M. (2009). Impact of green building design and construction on worker safety and health. Accepted for publication in the *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*.

Sarja, A. (2002). *Integrated life cycle design of structures*. London: Spon Press.

Silins, N. (2009, March). LEED and the safety profession: Green has come of age. *Professional Safety*, 54(3), 46-49.

Toscano, G. & Windau, J. (1996, Sept.). National census of fatal occupational Injuries, 1995. *Compensation and working conditions*, 34-45. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/cfar0015.pdf>.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2008). Fatal occupational injuries, employment and rates of fatal occupational injuries by selected worker characteristics, occupations and industries, 2007. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Author. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/cfoi/cfoi_rates_2007.pdf.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2007). Fatal occupational injuries, employment and rates of fatal occupational injuries by selected worker characteristics, occupations and industries, 2006. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Author. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/cfoi/CFOI_Rates_2006.pdf.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2006). Fatal occupational injuries, employment and rates of fatal occupational injuries by selected worker characteristics, occupations and industries, 2005. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Author. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/cfoi/CFOI_Rates_2005.pdf.

U.S. Green Building Council (2009). About USGBC. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from <http://www.usgbc.org/DisplayPage.aspx?CMSPageID=97&>

Yudelson, J. (2008). *The green building revolution*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Michael Behm works in the occupational safety program at East Carolina University.

Thomas Lentz and Donna Heidel are with NIOSH.

John Gambatese works in the School of Civil and Construction Engineering at Oregon State University.

This article was originally published as a peer-reviewed conference proceeding by the International Council for Research and Innovation in Building and Construction through Working Commission 099, Safety and Health in Construction, at its 2009 conference in Melbourne, Australia. For details, visit <http://www.cibworld.nl/site/home/index.html>.

Blueprints

VOLUME 10 • NUMBER 3



Fall Protection PPE Saves Lives

BY TIMOTHY LOVLEY

On March 4, 2011, two lives were saved in Yonkers, NY. The lives saved were those of two men working from a scaffold at 289 Nepperhan Ave. The agent of their near-death experience was a faulty scaffold that collapsed from under their feet without warning for a yet-to-be-determined reason. They were about 12 stories (approximately 120 ft) above the ground when the scaffold failed.

Proper fall protection means that they had individual, independent lifelines which were tied off to anchor points that were able to hold 5,000 lb of force per worker.

A fall from that height to the concrete below would surely have killed them both.

They were saved because they were properly wearing fall protection, as required by OSHA's fall protection safety standards. Proper fall protection means that they had individual, independent lifelines which were tied off to anchor points that were able to hold 5,000 lb of force per worker. They were wearing fall

continued on page 16

PAGE 5
COMPLIANCE
Residential Construction

PAGE 20
INTERVIEW
Tony O'Dea
on Large-Scale Public Projects

PAGE 26
INFLUENCE
An Avenue to Success

PAGE 28
GREEN DESIGN
Prevention Through Design

For a complete Table of Contents, see page 3

How Are We Doing?

Have you heard? ASSE turns 100 this year! How cool is that? But are we where we need to be as a practice specialty? First, I wish to sincerely thank those staff, members and partners who have either helped, mentored, guided or supported us along the way. Second, I urge that together we can (and will) do better.

To me, the Construction Practice Specialty (CPS) is nothing without our core set of officers, Neil, Eric, Ron, Carl and Barry, and, of course, the competent administration of ASSE. I wish to publically thank them all for what they do behind the scenes. Next, and most importantly, I wish to thank you, the nearly 4,000 construction safety and health professionals who loyally send in your \$20 a year in support of CPS, the Society and our profession.

What do you think? Are we where we need to be as a group? We (I) would like to hear from you. I often wonder how many of our members even find time to read our newsletter and my administrator's comments. If you do, we would like to hear from you, even if it is to simply say, "Yes, I am out here." So send me a note, and copy all officers and ASSE staff (contact information located at right).



We are nothing without our members and your solid support, so are you okay with your CPS relationship as we collectively mature into a 100-year-old society? We would like to know.

Some might say that if members do not interact with their officers, it is a sign all is good because if things were bad, people would speak up (in that case, we must be a very happy and content group). On the other hand, I do not blindly accept this notion as a truth, which is the basis of my comments this quarter.

I often tell my 6-year-old daughter that my job is to be responsible to people rather than for them. In return, she just shyly stares back at me because she does not really understand what that means (oh, well). But, I know you understand the distinction—are we being responsible to you? Are we serving your needs? Supporting what you do? Promoting the profession? Or at least staying out of your way and doing no harm?

Perhaps we are (great). Perhaps you do not know (and that is fine) or perhaps you do not care (not so fine), but we still wish to know what you think. To this effect, we (mainly Carl) have created a membership satisfaction survey. Please [click here](#) to complete the survey. In return for your time and input, you will be entered into a drawing for a \$50 American Express card. If you are not interested in taking the survey, please still send us your feedback.

We also look forward to your input at our annual face-to-face meeting at Safety 2011 in Chicago. Until then, take care. ☺

MICHAEL W. HAYSLIP

OFFICERS

Administrator

MICHAEL W. HAYSLIP
(937) 434-8951
hayslip@aol.com

Assistant Administrator

NEIL WEBSTER
(978) 664-9500
nwebster@columbiacc.com

Publication Editor

ERIC VOIGHT
(856) 552-4756
evoight@connerstrong.com

COMMITTEES

Awards & Honors

OPEN

Body of Knowledge

OPEN

Conferences & Seminars

OPEN

Membership Development

CARL HEINLEIN
cwheinlein@acig.com

Nominations

RON SOKOL
rsokol@csctc.org

Website Development

OPEN

ASSE STAFF

Staff Liaison

KRISTA SONNENSON
(847) 768-3436
ksonneson@asse.org

Publication Design

SUSAN CARLSON
scarlson@asse.org

Blueprints is a publication of ASSE's Construction Practice Specialty, 1800 East Oakton St., Des Plaines, IL 60018, and is distributed free of charge to members of the Construction Practice Specialty. The opinions expressed in articles herein are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily those of ASSE. Technical accuracy is the responsibility of the author(s). Send address changes to the address above; fax to (847) 768-3434; or send via e-mail to customerservice@asse.org.

PAGE 5 COMPLIANCE GUIDANCE FOR RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION

This instruction cancels OSHA Instruction STD 03-00-001, the agency's interim enforcement policy on fall protection for specified residential construction activities, and replaces it with new compliance guidance.



PAGE 15 DAY OF MOURNING FROM ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE

Stephanie Benay

In honor of the Day of Mourning on April 28, 2011, the author shares her experience of how a serious incident or fatality affects those who are responsible for educating, mentoring and advising in safety and health practices.

PAGE 18 A DAY IN THE LIFE OF A CONTRACTOR

By J. Wherry

Contractors across the country are facing a new level of enforcement activity not previously encountered.

PAGE 20 SAFETY & HEALTH: PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Tony O'Dea, vice president and director of corporate safety for Gilbane Building Co., provides an overview of construction safety and health with respect to large-scale public projects and outlines the hazards such projects can present to both workers and the general public.

D PAGE 26

INFLUENCE: AN AVENUE TO SUCCESS

By Peter Furst

Mastering the art of influence is a powerful tool in ensuring one's success within an organization.



D PAGE 28

PREVENTION THROUGH DESIGN & GREEN BUILDINGS: A U.S. PERSPECTIVE ON COLLABORATION

By Michael Behm, Thomas Lentz, Donna Heidel & John Gambatese

For green buildings to be considered sustainable, construction safety and health concepts must be integrated into upstream considerations.

CONNECTION KEY

Click on these icons for immediate access or bonus information



Video



Website



PDF



Hot Link



Ad Link



Direct Link