

Survey of Contract Loggers with Non-Mechanized Logging Operations, Summer 2016

Technical Report Number 11-2-2016
February 2017

David K. Bonauto, MD, MPH

Safety and Health Assessment and Research for Prevention (SHARP) Program
Washington State Department of Labor & Industries
PO Box 44330
Olympia, WA 98504-4330

www.Lni.wa.gov/Safety/Research

List of Abbreviations:

DOSH	Division of Occupational Safety and Health
L&I	Washington Department of Labor and Industries
LSI	Logger Safety Initiative
WCLA	Washington Contract Logger Association

Acknowledgements:

The development of survey content and endorsement and collaboration of the Washington Contract Loggers was essential in completing this survey. This research was financially supported by the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Department. David Bonauto, MD, MPH developed the survey, summarized the data, and wrote the report. Assistance of Elyette Martin in formatting and mailing the survey and Hieu Pham's data entry are appreciated. Sara Wuellner, PhD, and Ms. Christina Rappin reviewed and provided edits to the report.

Executive Summary:

SHARP, with joint sponsorship of the Washington Contract Loggers Association, conducted a mail-based survey of Washington-based contract logging employers engaged in manual (non-mechanized) logging – which entails timber falling, yarding and processing work outside of the safety of the cab of a machine - to gain a better understanding of contract logger's perceptions of the Washington Division of Occupational Safety and Health visits, safety in the logging industry, and perceptions of the Washington State logger safety initiative (LSI) program.

The response rate for the survey was 21%, thus limiting the generalizability of the findings. Some observations from the 76 responses received:

- 43% had less than 1 FTE in manual logging, 45% had more than one FTE and 12% reported no manual logging activity in the last year.
- 33% hired temporary workers in the previous 12 months.
- 30% reported having workers with limited English proficiency.

With regard to the Washington State Division of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH), 45 respondents with manual logging hours had DOSH activity in the last year. Of these respondents:

- 89% agreed that they understood DOSH logging regulations.
- 89% agreed that information from DOSH information was communicated in an easy to understand fashion.
- 60% agreed that a DOSH visit led to improved safety.
- 60% intended to invite DOSH consultation to review their logging operations in the future.

Seventy-one contract loggers provided perspectives on landowners, of these:

- 70% agreed that the landowners they contract with were committed to logger safety.
- 76% felt their level of attention to safety did not vary based on the landowner they worked with.
- 19% agreed that contract conditions negatively impact safety.
- 42% agreed that landowners had contributed to their company's safety. Contract loggers involved in the Washington LSI were more likely to agree that the landowners contributed to their company's safety.

When loggers performing manual logging were asked about their perceptions of logging safety (n = 62), more than four out of five (80%) believed:

- Contract loggers could improve safety on the job.
- Workers and supervisors had the information they needed to work safely.
- Employees were involved in decisions affecting their health and safety.
- Employees who acted safely received positive recognition.

Contract loggers who were participating in the Washington logger safety initiative reported on their perceptions of the LSI program. Of the 36 LSI participating respondents, in response to LSI program:

- 78% reported their company was more committed to logging safety.
- 83% used LSI training materials to improve company safety.
- 64% started to investigate near misses.
- 61% reported landowners as more engaged in contract logger safety.
- 94% reported the LSI 3rd party auditor completely evaluated their logging operation to identify safety hazards.
- 75% reported that the LSI program was on the right track to improve logging safety and decrease injuries.

Introduction:

Logging is a vital part of Washington's economy. Logging and non-mechanized logging, in particular, where cutting, yarding, and processing timber are conducted outside the protective cab of a machine, have historically had high injury rates. The high injury rates coupled with the relative severity and poor outcome of injuries in logging compared to other industries has led to high workers' compensation premiums.

Recognition of the high injury rate and high workers' compensation costs led to the development of the Washington State Logger Safety Initiative (LSI). LSI is the joint commitment of public and private industrial timberland owners, government, and contract loggers to a long-term effort to change the 'safety culture' in the industry. The LSI stakeholders formulated an intervention consisting of three major components: a) improving workplace safety to reduce workplace injuries, b) improving compliance with payment of workers' compensation premium and reporting of worker hours, and c) creating a dedicated group of workers' compensation claim managers to minimize claim disability costs.

The primary focus of the LSI is workplace safety improvements in the logging industry. The LSI taskforce developed safety requirements above current state OSHA standards, instituted systems for verifying improved safety performance of participating contract loggers through on-site safety consultations and non-governmental third party safety audits. LSI mandated additional education, and mandated additional training requirements for contract loggers. Through LSI, some industrial timberland owners committed to safety improvements among their workforce, engaged with their contract loggers to improve safety, encouraged contract loggers to join LSI, and informally committed to only hire contract loggers participating in LSI. LSI participation by contract loggers and industrial timberland owners was voluntary. The safety programs were designed in 2013 and implemented beginning in 2014.

The intent of this contract logger survey was to gain a better understanding of contract logger's perceptions of the Washington Division of Occupational Safety and Health visits, safety in the logging industry, and perceptions of the Washington State Logger Safety Initiative (LSI) program.

The survey was administered by the Safety and Health Assessment and Research for Prevention program at the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries with joint sponsorship by the Washington Contract Loggers Association. SHARP is separate from the industrial insurance system and DOSH and conducts research to prevent workplace injuries and illnesses.

Methods:

We used the Washington L&I employer account information to identify any workers' compensation account reporting at least on hour in the Washington State manual logging risk class (5001) during calendar year 2014 and 2015. There were 369 accounts meeting these criteria.

Each account was mailed a 4-page survey (see appendix 2) with questions regarding logging activities conducted, assessments of DOSH and landowners impact on logging safety, and for those participants in Washington's Logger Safety Initiative, their response to interactions with safety auditors, landowners, and perceptions of the other required components of the program.

The selected accounts received the survey twice, separated by a 5-week interval. The second mailing asked respondents to not submit a duplicate response. The respondents could decide to answer or not answer any question. The respondents were anonymous and thus results are not linked to any other administrative data system.

Analyses were conducted looking at several subgroups, including those participating in the Washington Logger Safety Initiative, those with hours in manual logging, and those with or without DOSH activity. Data were analyzed with SPSS v.18.

Results:

Of the 369 accounts reporting at least one hour in the manual logging risk class, 76 (21%) responded. Of the 76 respondents, 36 reported being participants in the Washington State Logger Safety Initiative (LSI). The LSI had 143 accounts with participation during the years 2014 and 2015, thus the response rate for LSI is 25%. The response rate for non-LSI members was 17.6%.

Respondents were categorized by volume (hours) of non-mechanized logging in the last year: 33 (43%) reported more than 2000 hours or greater than one FTE, 34 (45%) reported between 0 to 2000 hours or less than one FTE, and 9 (12%) did not report any non-mechanized logging in the past year.

Regarding employment patterns, 33% (25/75) reported hiring temporary workers in the last year and 30% (22/73) reported employment of workers with limited English proficiency. The employment of both temp workers and limited English proficiency workers were distributed across all volume of non-mechanized logging.

Survey respondents were asked who they would turn to if they were unable to solve or needed guidance on a safety and health problem – 46% (35/76) would use DOSH, 53% (40/76) reported Washington Contract Loggers Association, 16% (12/76) used private consultants and 21% (16/76) relied on landowners. Twelve of the 76 loggers reported never needing such guidance. There were three respondents reporting use of ‘Other’ resources, specifically ‘Weyerhaeuser,’ ‘another faller they have confidence in’, and ‘retro’.

1. DOSH Activity

Forty-eight respondents (63.2%) had some interaction with DOSH in the previous year. LSI participants, per program design, had more interaction with DOSH, 94% (34 of 36) in the last year, whereas only 35% (14 of 40) non-LSI participants interacted with DOSH. These interactions differed by LSI participation (Table DOSH).

Table DOSH: Types of DOSH Activity in Last Year by LSI Participation, n (%)

	Compliance Only	Consultation Only	Both Compliance and Consultation
LSI (-)	3 (21%)	9 (64%)	2 (14%)
LSI (+)	6 (18%)	5 (15%)	23 (68%)

Of the 48 respondents with DOSH activity, 45 had hours in manual logging. These respondents provided the following responses when queried about:

- *Understanding Logging Safety Regulations:* Of survey respondents who had a DOSH visit and reported hours in manual logging, 89% agreed or strongly agreed that they understood logging regulations.
- *DOSH Visit Led to Improved Safety:* Of survey respondents who had a DOSH visit and reported hours in manual logging, 60% agreed or strongly agreed that a DOSH visit led to improved safety, 31% neither disagreed or agreed, 9% disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- The contract loggers with more hours (2,000 or more hours in a year) in manual logging were more likely to report the DOSH visit improving safety of their logging operations than those with lesser hours (<2,000 hours) (70% vs. 38%; $p = 0.034$).
- *DOSH Communication:* Of survey respondents who had a DOSH visit and reported hours in manual logging, 89% agreed or strongly agreed that information from the DOSH visit was communicated in an easy to understand fashion.
- *Future DOSH Visits:* Of survey respondents who had a DOSH visit and reported hours in manual logging, 60% agreed or strongly agreed that they intended to invite DOSH consultants to review their logging operations in the future. Contract loggers with more hours (2,000 or more hours in a year) in manual logging appeared more willing to invite DOSH to return than smaller contract loggers.

2. Landowners and Contract Logger Safety

Landowners are vital partners in increasing contract logger safety. Landowners can influence the pace of work, timelines for completion, future contracts and income security for contract logging firms, and the physical attributes of the logging site, e.g. access to logging site, landing design. Perceptions of the landowner engagement in contract logger safety was solicited from the contract logger survey respondents.

Table Landowner: Perceptions of Contract Loggers of Landowners, n = 71

	Agree (%)*	Neutral (%)*	Disagree (%)*
7a. The landowners I contract with are committed to logger safety.	70	24	6
7b. My level of attention to safety varies based on the landowner I'm contracting with.	16	9	76
7c. Contract conditions negatively impact safety.	19	24	57
7d. Landowners have contributed to improving my company's safety.	42	38	21

*Respondents were provided five responses – strongly agree; agree; neither agree or disagree; disagree; strongly disagree. Responses were combined with strongly agree and agree recoded as 'agree'; strongly disagree and disagree as 'disagree' and neither agree or disagree was considered 'neutral'.

Contract loggers associated with LSI were more likely to agree that contract conditions negatively impacted safety (32% vs. 5%; $p = 0.008$) than those contract loggers who were not in LSI. However, contract loggers associated with LSI were more likely to agree that landowners had contributed to improving the company's safety (59% vs. 29%; $p = 0.016$) than those contract loggers who were not in the logger safety initiative. These observations did not occur when comparing high volume manual loggers (2000 or more hours per year) to those with lesser volume logging.

3. Contract Loggers Perceptions of Safety in the Industry

Assessing the perceptions and the commitment of the industry to safety likely gives insight into the challenges in transforming the safety culture of the industry towards improved safety. Eight questions solicited perceptions of manual loggers about safety in their own workplace and within the industry. The results (Table Contract Logger Perceptions of Safety) suggest that more than 80% of 62 manual logging firm respondents believe workers and supervisors have the information needed to improve safety, that there is employee engagement in safety decisions and there is positive recognition for those who act safely. More than 50% of the respondents reported that they had had to decrease productivity to log safely and less than half affirmed that they felt their competitors were committed to logging safely. Only two respondents to the survey stated that they felt 'helpless in improving safety on the job; it is up to my individual employees.'

Table Contract Logger Perceptions of Safety- Manual Loggers Only, n= 62

	Agree (%)*	Neutral (%)*	Disagree (%)*
8a. My competitors are committed to logging safely.	43	46	11
8b. Contract terms with landowners force contract loggers to make safety a low priority to be profitable.	13	39	48
8c. I have had to decrease productivity to log safely.	53	20	27
8d. Most of the injuries in logging are due to workers not following my safety rules.	47	37	16
8e. I am helpless in improving safety on the job; it is up to my individual employees.	3	11	86
8f. Workers and supervisors have the information they need to work safely.	87	11	2
8g. Employees are involved in decisions affecting their health and safety.	83	15	2
8h. Those who act safely receive positive recognition.	82	15	3

* Respondents were provided five responses - strongly agree; agree; neither agree or disagree; disagree; strongly disagree. Responses were combined with strongly agree and agree recoded as 'agree'; strongly disagree and disagree recoded as 'disagree' and Neither agree or disagree was considered 'neutral'.

We see little variation in these distributions when comparing LSI members to non-LSI members, with the exception that LSI members agreed that those who act safely receive positive recognition (91% vs 72%; $p = 0.012$).

Contract loggers with more hours felt their competitors were more committed to logging safety and also believed that those contract loggers who act safely receive positive recognition.

4. LSI Participants Perception of the LSI program.

Approximately 25% of LSI participants responded to the survey and their perceptions are summarized in Table LSI Participants.

Approximately 80% of LSI participants believed that in response to LSI their company was more committed to logging safety, had modified their company's Accident Prevention Program, found the LSI training materials useful and had used the LSI training materials to train their workers. Only two-thirds of the participants reported using the LSI training material to eliminate a safety hazard, and approximately 6 out of 10 reported starting to investigate near misses.

In a broad set of measures regarding landowner engagement in the LSI program as perceived by LSI participants (Questions 11 h – 11 l), approximately 6 of 10 LSI participants believed landowners were more engaged in contract logger safety, that harvest managers were discussing logging safety with contract loggers and had a greater understanding of contract logger safety. For the two measures assessing whether the third party auditor was knowledgeable about contract logger safety and was complete in evaluating the contract loggers' safety operation, all but one or two of the thirty-six contract loggers agreed with these statements.

Two questions assessed whether contract loggers believed the program was meaningful regarding improving safety – approximately 21 of the 36 (58%) LSI participants responding reported that they disagreed with the statement that it was 'easy to pass LSI program requirements without truly changing safety' and 27 of 36 (75%) reported that the LSI program was on the right track to improve logging safety and decrease injuries. These responses contrast with the report that 18 of 33 (54%) reported that they were operating as usual in terms of safety.

Table LSI Participants: Perceptions of LSI Program Activities, n = 36

In response to the Logger Safety Initiative (LSI)	Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree (%)
11a. My company is more committed to logging safely.	78	17	5
11b. I modified/improved my accident prevention program.	86	6	8
11c. The LSI safety training materials are useful.	86	14	0
11d. I used the LSI training materials to improve safety performance. (n = 35)	83	17	0
11e. I used the LSI training materials to eliminate a safety hazard. (n = 35)	63	34	3
11f. I used the LSI training materials to educate my workers about logging safety hazards.	92	6	3
11g. I started to investigate near misses.	64	28	8
11h. Landowners are more engaged in monitoring contract logger safety.	61	28	11
11i. Landowners reviewed my Accident Prevention program	64	22	14
11j. Landowners now participate in reviewing my injuries and near-misses.	58	25	17
11k. Harvest managers now discuss workplace safety with me.	64	25	11
11l. Harvest managers are now more knowledgeable about workplace safety.	64	19	17
11m. The LSI third party safety auditor was knowledgeable about logging operations.	94	6	0
11n. The LSI third party safety audit evaluated my entire operation to identify safety hazards.	94	3	3
11o. It is easy to pass the LSI requirements without truly changing safety.	25	17	58
11p. I've been operating as usual in terms of safety. (n = 33)	54	24	12
11q. The LSI program is on the right track to improve logging safety and decrease injuries.	75	22	3
11s. I believe that my competitors do not pay workers compensation premiums accurately.	33	56	11

Finally, appendix 1 contains the text responses to a series of open-ended questions about respondent's perceptions of and recommendations for improving contract logger safety through DOSH services, the LSI program, and landowner engagement, as well as suggestions for improvements of L&I services.

Conclusion:

This survey provides insight into the perspectives of contract loggers regarding DOSH, the LSI program and safety within the logging industry. Generally, the results suggest a positive impression of the LSI program with regard to DOSH and contract logger's efforts to improve safety. The results of this survey should be interpreted with caution given the low survey response rate and the possibility that a select group of respondents may have replied to the survey. Whether this selection bias resulted in a more favorable or less favorable view of DOSH, LSI, the Department of Labor and Industries and safety in the logging industry is unclear. The narrative text responses as provided in Appendix 1, provide insight into the perspectives of contract loggers and deserve further consideration by the LSI Taskforce and the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries.

Appendix 1: Logging Survey Responses to Open-ended Questions– As Written

LSI (+) = LSI participant; LSI (-) = not LSI participant

Question #6 – Do you have any recommendations about how L&I DOSH can improve safety in the Logging Industry?

15. LSI (+). As timber fallers, it's small esoteric things like having road builders not pile slash against trees. More of a land owner issue I guess. Thus far we've had nothing but positive experiences with L&I staff.
20. LSI (+). Target loggers operating under radar by using family members and not reporting. Monitor DNR FPA's to target those companies and conduct audits. Some companies are licensed as landscapers and fuel distributors but are logging.
27. LSI (-). They need to be able to understand what it takes to run a business. Focus more on what can seriously hurt or kill loggers.
32. LSI (+). Higher quality personnel that understand logging.
33. LSI (+). They need to all bring the same message – info. One officer said something that opposed another officer about shackles.
35. LSI (+). Get out more.
36. LSI (+). By listening to people who have actual logging experience.
48. LSI (+). Not at this time.
57. LSI (+). Provide handbook of current regulations
58. LSI (+). Don't let machines create man made dangers for hand fallers (the biggest threat). Also "No one cares or listens to the safety concerns of hand fallers."
62. LSI (+). If not signed up, audit them. Safety for workers is at stake.
73. LSI (+). We need more skilled workers; the workforce is getting slim.
76. LSI (+). Listen to the professionals.

Question #7 – Do you have any recommendations about how the landowners you contract with could improve logger safety at your firm?

1. LSI (+). Evac plans for all jobs!
7. LSI (+). Tell road builders and processors not to make such a mess on low side of roads.
13. LSI (-). Landowners want a safe crew working for them, but it is not their responsibility. Contractors with poor safety records have to charge more for services as their costs are higher. Contractors will either under-report (if poor safety record) or charge more – therefore not getting jobs.
25. LSI (+). DNR needs to lay out sales with logger safety and logging plans that are more logger friendly. Logger safety should be a priority over everything when laying out timber sales.
27. LSI (+). Wear PPE and follow safety rules themselves.

29. LSI (-). It is easy to say “pay more” but in my opinion longer term contracts would help contractors invest in better equipment and keep better crews around. This would help give the contractors more stability and allow them to focus on safety and productivity.
36. LSI (+). By paying a reasonable price instead of the cheapest price they can get.
38. LSI (-). I have worked as a timber faller for over 25 years and have seen an L&I inspector two or three times. It would be nice to get some input or recommendations from them.
48. LSI (+). Not at this time.
57. LSI (+). Discussing potential safety hazards prior to final logging layout.
58. LSI (+). They know they just refuse to do anything because it will cost them money.
76. LSI (+). <<Landowner>> has helped out quite a bit with safety but the bottom line is production vs. safety sometimes paying more to slow down will still save lives.

Question #8 – Do you have any comments on what impacts safety at your company?

1. LSI (+). We need to have enough time to have settings cut out, not just thrown to the wolves.
4. LSI (-). Employer leadership
5. LSI (-). Understanding what causes most accidents – machinery malfunction, recklessness, and ignorance. Having the foresight to convey my experience to my crew.
6. LSI (-). Carelessness, not thinking things through, skilled employees being complacent, persons with an agenda to being on disability, government pressure on business in our state.
8. LSI (+). Me and my attitude.
9. LSI (-). Landowners who might pressure me to their time schedule.
13. LSI (-). Safety pays – lower rates.
20. LSI (+). Owner working alongside employees, so is aware of any safety issues immediately, keeping long term employees with no turn over.
22. LSI (+). Planning ahead. Landings.
27. LSI (-). Leading by example, talking about safety, accountability, and speaking up.
32. LSI (+). Good attitude and being aware of things.
35. LSI (+). As a leader you have to show a positive attitude and lead by example. Don’t give up!
36. LSI (+). We have an unsustainable workforce because of our history of paying the least amount possible. Our competition is the construction industry which pays sometimes double what our employees can make, which leaves us with the lowest level of employees.
37. LSI (+). Quarterly bonus given for no accidents on the job.
38. LSI (-). State of mind with employees.

- 53. LSI (+). Just makes a better workplace.
- 57. LSI (+). More investment in safer road landings and cable layouts.
- 58. LSI (+). Work conditions created by other contractors before we even start a job as hand fallers.
- 62. LSI (+). Push for higher pricing means corners are sometimes cut. We don't, but others do.
- 76. LSI (+). Pressure/ not starting ahead of loggers, pressure to cut enough for the contract price.

Question #12 – How can the LSI program be improved?

- 1. LSI (+). Comparable rates like private insurance.
- 8. LSI (+). All parties quit trying to use it for their benefit and quit just giving the program lip service and ¼ effort. Too many in all 3 parties talk big and don't follow through.
- 10. LSI (+). They need to target more companies not voluntarily in LSI. The volunteer companies generally are good.
- 20. LSI (+).
 - 1. Continue to reach out to companies who are not involved.
 - 2. Conduct yearly compliance audits, every two years if no deficiencies are found.
 - 3. Offer yearly training sessions through L&I sometime other than summer months.
- 33. LSI (+). I log my own timber sales, so I don't have a harvest manager.
- 35. LSI (+). Keep on companies that are not fully involved with the system. They are only doing it because it lowers their premium and landowners require them to do it.
- 57. LSI (+). Discussing new technologies and testing that might impact logging safety, I.E. (splice eye tests)
- 62. LSI (+). Since everyone is buying into the program, it would be nice to have all audits at the same time. L&I landowners. Or at least spaced out to hit every six months instead of all in the first four months. Bombarded with missed time.
- 70. LSI (+). We need to have an incentive program (lower rates, etc.) to hire and educate safety to new hires in the hand falling/cutting.
- 73. LSI (+). We need more people interested in forestry operations. There needs to be a school or training classes or certificates for the worker to go to, don't leave it up to the employers to train extensively. No one pays employers to do that in logging, we need qualified people.
- 74. LSI (+). The on-site field visits are great. I would like to see them more often.
- 76. LSI (+). Listen to the guys doing the job. Some of the cutting rules are too old to apply to the timber we cut.

Question #13 – What works well in the LSI program?

- 1. LSI (+). Voluntary Audits.
- 8. LSI (+). We think we can scare people into being safe and that doesn't work.
- 10. LSI (+). Annual reviews and quarterly training docs that are provided.

- 15. LSI (+). First, it weeds out L&I dodgers thereby leveling the field. It brings safety to the forefront in new ways at every level of the company and the rate discounts provide owners excellent incentive.
- 20. LSI (+). Eventually will increase overall safety so all will save on premiums in the future.
- 23. LSI (+). Performance based rates.
- 33. LSI (+). Being held accountable for doing the safety program correctly.
- 35. LSI (+). Training materials.
- 36. LSI (+). Lower rates and resources for fraudulent claims.
- 43. LSI (+). Getting topics for safety meetings.
- 48. LSI (+). What we think is working in the LSI program is that it is giving every landowner and contractor a chance to be on the same page. There is a lot that these jobs entail and a lot to be on top of. All extra info we can obtain is very useful.
- 57. LSI (+). The Auditors do a good job.
- 58. LSI (+). Communication with DOSH consultants.
- 62. LSI (+). Getting companies to pay for all 5001 hours. Inspection sheets help train operators. All workers convinced LSI is a good program.
- 73. LSI (+). Consultations.
- 74. LSI (+). It brings a higher level of awareness to all the employees.
- 75. LSI (+). Having more contact with consultants and looking over operations.
- 76. LSI (+). The consistency helps for safety.

Question #14 – If you have suggestions for L&I about improving services to employers or injured workers in the logging industry, please comment below.

- 2. LSI (-). It takes too long for injured workers to receive treatment after injury accident.
- 6. LSI (-). Be more business friendly. Everyone needs “skin in the game” to be safe on the job. The state L&I is a retirement strategy for many, employees need more accountability. Business must be profitable to continue operating.
- 9. LSI (-). I am basically a farmer with some forest land, an orchard, a 37’ boom lift, and a couple chainsaws that occasionally helps a neighbor, so I seldom do work pertaining to this survey. I have a strong background in safety and no reportable accidents to my firm....ever!
- 12. LSI (-). Lower rates/costs being high result in higher production which causes increased demand and risk to stay profitable. Loggers also need to stop working too cheap 5001 should not apply to setting chokers on a backyard skidder job, risk way lower than a yarder. Little profit margin.
- 13. LSI (-). This program doesn’t apply to us as we have too few folks working logging – BUT – lots working in related industries – transportation of forest products and wood mfg. Need to expand program.

17. LSI (+). Quicker claims, Doctors to get worker back to work – being off 3 years makes a guy not want to return to work – just process faster!
24. LSI (-). We do not log, if we do we sub it out.
27. LSI (-). Current compliance officer in Region 4 is great, but previous ones had poor social skills.
28. LSI (-). L&I need to work more on closing claims and assessing injuries instead of having retraining programs to workers that should be directed for disability – L&I keeps workers on L&I for longer than necessary.
33. LSI (+). Have the information that is needed to correct an infraction, I.E. talkie tooter registration contact info.
38. LSI (-). I would like to see safety inspectors in the field more often and not to just dole out citations and fines. As an employer I don't get to see everything and a second set of eyes who knows the regulations would be nice every once in a while. Mandatory drug tests.
42. LSI (-). We are road construction, only occasionally cut row with hand fallers.
43. LSI (+). Have not had any big time loss claims lately but in past move investigation into bogus injuries needs to take place I.E. "I cannot work, but I can sure hunt, fish, and do yard work etc."
46. LSI (-). Stop trying to manipulate the logging company's choice of logging style by having such a high rate for 5001-03. I am forced to work alone much of the time because I cannot afford to pay such an unrealistic cost. It is like having an invisible employee!
53. LSI (+). What good does it do to try our best to improve safety and you turn around and continue to raise rates which we can barely afford now! Insurance should be privatized.
58. LSI (+). Try not to treat injured workers like no matter what it is their fault. No one likes or wants to get hurt.
60. LSI (-). L&I takes too long to respond to worker's injuries and get workers back on the job. L&I rates are out of control.
70. LSI (+). We need to get back to where an employer would previously hire an injured worker. At today's L&I rates no one wants to touch a guy that has been injured. These men are being forced out of the industry and L&I rates are too high to hire young guys. Preferred worker program that was around in the 90's made it attractive to hire guys to return to work.
75. LSI (+). Claims managers need to push more on the doctors of injured workers for light duty and getting back to work.

Question #15 – Any additional comments?

3. LSI (-). We aren't loggers. We use chainsaws sometimes, only reason we have logging falling bucking.
5. LSI (-). High L&I rates equal fewer jobs. I am very reluctant to hire help due to high Washington L&I rates and administrative burden. WCLA safety conferences are great! I appreciate WCLA efforts to reduce accidents and L&I rates via safety conferences and the LSI. Washington logging companies are extremely lean and efficient to survive. This should be a model for government departments. Does WA L&I look for ways to reduce departmental costs and increase efficiency? If so, it would increase my respect and trust in government. L&I safety duds are good. Thank You.

7. LSI (-). Road builders and processors make life miserable on new roads. Most are pigs but not all. Seems most just plain don't give a shit. A few have been threatened with bodily harm, then they get it for a while.
11. LSI (-). There are too many layers of people to go through to get any answers at L&I. Communication is also way too slow by L&I. There is no sense of urgency to get us answers.
15. LSI (+). A lot of paperwork.
22. LSI (+). Any word on a Tier 4 for the near future?
23. LSI (+). Quarterly reporting for LSI would be helpful instead of monthly.
29. LSI (-). I think this is a good program. Because I mainly am ground based it has not been necessary for me to join up. I will when the time arises.
36. LSI (+). Until wages increase substantially we will continue to have the bottom of the barrel for a workforce to choose from. Wages have come up just enough to keep loggers around, and mainly to get people from other loggers. Very few young people want to do work on the ground. That would change if they could make 35 dollars an hour, which is still 25% below prevailing wage jobs which is where people have gone.
46. LSI (-). Unreasonable rules for subcontractors, fallers, etc.
49. LSI (+). Overall the LSI program has had a positive effect on our operations and the landowners' interaction.
58. LSI (+). Don't go around telling people that you are an insurance company with fangs rather than making safer workplaces. (Contract Logger Meeting.)
61. LSI (-). We perform very little logging projects as we are primarily a construction company. 90% of our contracts are federal.
62. LSI (+). Should be mandatory for employee's safety that all cable loggers are part of this program. Should be like master loggers, can't sell/log without that certification.
73. LSI (+). The LSI program has saved the loggers and the timber industry with regard to premiums. Otherwise they couldn't afford to work.

Appendix 2: Survey

Please have the person most knowledgeable about workplace safety complete the survey.
Please do not include your name or your company's name. The survey is voluntary.

A. Information about your company:

1. For the last year, **estimate the percentage** of work time used for the following tasks.

Cable logging operations _____%

Hand falling/hand cutting _____%

Mechanized logging, log truck driving, log road construction, etc. _____%

Non-logging activities (e.g. human resources, company management, machine shop, construction) _____%

2. Estimate the total amount of time your company performs cable logging operations or are involved in hand falling and cutting? (Choose the best estimate for the last year)

Less than 2,000 hours per year (about one full-time logger).

More than 2,000 hours per year but less than 10,000 hours (from 1 to 5 full-time loggers).

More than 10,000 hours per year (about 5 full-time loggers).

3. In the last year,

Did you hire any temporary workers? Yes No

Did you have workers whose second language was English? Yes No

B. Safety assistance

4. If you have a safety concern you are unable to solve or you need guidance on a health and safety issue, who do you usually turn to? (Check all that apply)

L&I DOSH, or federal OSHA

Business Associations (e.g. Washington Contract Loggers Association)

Private consultants (i.e., private logging safety consultant.)

Landowner

Other, please list: _____

Never had a need

C. Experience with DOSH Consultation or Enforcement

5. In the last year has your company had a (voluntary) consultation or (mandatory) compliance visit from L&I's Division of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSHS) – some may refer to DOSHS as Washington State OSHA?

Yes No **If no, please skip to Q 7.**

5a. Did you have the following? – (select only one response)

- Only DOSH Compliance (mandatory) Only DOSH Consultation (voluntary)
- Both Consultation and Compliance

6. For the following questions rate your level of agreement using the scale provided – Mark an **X** under the appropriate number. **Refer to your most recent DOSH encounter.**

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree or disagree	4 Agree		5 Strongly Agree		
			1	2	3	4	5
6a. The DOSH visit led to improved safety of my logging operations.							
6b. I intend to invite DOSH consultants to review my logging operations in the future.							
6c. Information from the DOSH visit was communicated in an easy to understand fashion.							
6d. I understand logging safety regulations.							

Do you have any recommendations about how L&I DOSH can improve safety in the logging industry?

D. Landowners and contract logger safety; Industry safety perspective

7. For the following questions rate your level of agreement using the scale provided – mark an **X** under the appropriate number.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree or disagree	4 Agree		5 Strongly Agree		
			1	2	3	4	5
7a. The landowners I contract with are committed to logger safety.							
7b. My level of attention to safety varies based on the landowner I'm contracting with.							
7c. Contract conditions negatively impact safety.							
7d. Landowners have contributed to improving my company's safety.							

Do you have any recommendations about how the landowners you contract with could improve logger safety at your firm?

8. Rate your agreement to the following -

For the following questions rate your level of agreement using the scale provided – choose the appropriate number by marking it with an X.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree or disagree	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree			
			1	2	3	4	5
8a. My competitors are committed to logging safely.							
8b. Contract terms with landowners force contract loggers to make safety a low priority to be profitable.							
8c. I have had to decrease productivity to log safely.							
8d. Most of the injuries in logging are due to workers not following my safety rules.							
8e. I am helpless in improving safety on the job; it is up to my individual employees.							
8f. Workers and supervisors have the information they need to work safely.							
8g. Employees are involved in decisions affecting their health and safety.							
8h. Those who act safely receive positive recognition.							

Do you have any comments on what impacts safety at your company?

E. The Logger Safety Initiative

9. Has your company joined the Washington State Logger Safety Initiative? Yes No **If no, please skip to question 14.**

10. Select **the most important reason** you chose to join the Washington logger safety initiative.

- Landowner required my participation.
- Workers compensation premium discount.
- Met or already exceeded the safety requirements for participation.
- To improve safety.
- Other. please describe: _____

11. In response to the Logger Safety Initiative, rate your agreement to the following statements. Mark an **X** under the appropriate number.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree or disagree	4 Agree		5 Strongly Agree		
In response to the Logger Safety Initiative (LSI)-			1	2	3	4	5
11a. My company is more committed to logging safely.							
11b. I modified/improved my accident prevention program.							
11c. The LSI safety training materials are useful.							
11d. I used the LSI training materials to improve safety performance.							
11e. I used the LSI training materials to eliminate a safety hazard.							
11f. I used the LSI training materials to educate my workers about logging safety hazards.							
11g. I started to investigate near misses.							
11h. Landowners are more engaged in monitoring contract logger safety.							
11i. Landowners reviewed my Accident Prevention program							
11j. Landowners now participate in reviewing my injuries and near-misses.							
11k. Harvest managers now discuss workplace safety with me.							
11l. Harvest managers are now more knowledgeable about workplace safety.							
11m. The LSI third party safety auditor was knowledgeable about logging operations.							
11n. The LSI third party safety audit evaluated my entire operation to identify safety hazards.							
11o. It is easy to pass the LSI requirements without truly changing safety.							
11p. I've been operating as usual in terms of safety.							
11q. The LSI program is on the right track to improve logging safety and decrease injuries							
11s. I believe that my competitors do not pay workers compensation premiums accurately.							

12. How can the LSI program be improved?

13. What works well in the LSI program?

14. If you have suggestions for L&I about improving services to employers or injured workers in the logging industry, please comment below.

15. Any additional comments?

Thank you for assisting us with this survey. Please enclose in the return envelope.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Dr. David Bonauto at (360) 902-5664; or davidbonauto@Lni.wa.gov
