

**Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission**

---

**OSHRC**

---

**Fiscal Year 2011**

**Performance Budget and Justification**



---

February 2010

## Table of Contents

### Fiscal Year 2011 Performance Budget and Justification

	<b>Page</b>
I. Introduction -- Mission, Vision, and Strategic Goal.....	1
II. Performance Budget Justification by Organizational Function.....	3
III. Budget by Object Classification Category.....	20
IV. Other Tables.....	25

# **I. INTRODUCTION -- MISSION, VISION, AND STRATEGIC GOALS**

# **Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission**

## **Our Mission**

The Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission (OSHRC) is an independent, adjudicatory agency created by the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the Act). Our sole statutory mandate is to serve as an administrative court providing fair and expeditious resolution of disputes involving the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), employers charged with violations of Federal safety and health standards, and employees and/or their representatives. The Review Commission was created by Congress as an agency completely independent of the Department of Labor to ensure that OSHA's enforcement actions are carried out in accordance with the law and that all parties are treated consistent with due process when disputes arise with OSHA.

## **Our Functions and Procedures**

Our Rules of Procedure (which mirror the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure) provide two levels of adjudication when an employer contests an OSHA citation for alleged violations of the Act or failure to abate such alleged violations. The first is a trial level, which affords an opportunity for a hearing before a Review Commission Administrative Law Judge. The Judge's decision becomes final unless the decision is directed for review to the Commission. The second level is a discretionary appellate review of the Judge's decision by Commission members who are appointed by the President. Both before its judges and the Commissioners, the Review Commission provides fair and impartial adjudication of cases concerning the safety and health of employees' working conditions in the United States.

Our principal (National) office is located in Washington, D.C. OSHRC also has two regional offices: one in Atlanta, GA, and one in Denver, CO. The regional offices are staffed with Administrative Law Judges who travel, as necessary, to adjudicate cases in locales where the alleged workplace violations took place.

## **Vision Statement**

The Review Commission strives to be:

- A judicial body that is -- and is recognized for being -- objective, fair, prompt, professional, and respected.
- An agency that creates a body of law through its decisions that define and explain the rights and responsibilities of employers and employees under the Act.

- A model Federal agency with highly effective processes, a highly motivated, qualified and diverse workforce, and modern information management, communications, and administrative systems.
- An agency that values teamwork, develops its employees, and strives to improve its performance, service, and value to the American people.

## **Strategic Goals**

OSHRC has three overarching strategic goals: 1) Respect for the rule of law by assuring fair, just, and expeditious adjudication of disputes brought before the Commission and its judges; 2) Expanding transparency and openness by providing for stakeholder engagement and ensuring that the Review Commission keeps interested parties and the public it serves informed of the agency's work at all levels, consistent with due process requirements; and 3) Responsible stewardship of the fiscal and human resources employed by the Review Commission in accordance with the agency's statutory mandate and other applicable law.

## **II. PERFORMANCE BUDGET JUSTIFICATION**

## **Budget Request Summary**

To continue our mission of adjudicating OSHA-issued workplace safety citations, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission requests an appropriation of \$12,051,000 to fund essential agency programs and support 67 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions in FY 2011.

The funding requested would allow us to fulfill our legislative mandate to serve as an administrative court providing fair and prompt resolution of disputes involving the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), employers charged with violations of Federal safety and health standards, and employees and/or their representatives. The request supports the goal in the strategic plan to improve service to the public.

Our FY 2011 budget request includes:

- \$9,444,000 to support direct payroll and related costs for 67 FTEs. These costs represent 78 percent of the Review Commission's appropriation.
- \$1,271,590 for office space rent.
- \$459,410 for services provided by other Federal agencies, such as support for financial and administrative services provided by the Bureau of the Public Debt (BPD) and personnel and payroll services provided by the National Finance Center (NFC).
- Funds to enable the Review Commission to complete its annual performance plan goals and targets and to implement government wide and Review Commission specific transparency initiatives.

## Justification by Organizational Unit

The Review Commission has three main offices which function in concert to achieve the agency's overarching mission:

1. The Administrative Law Judge function;
2. The Commission function;
3. The Office of Administration function.

Each office has staff and resources assigned exclusively to it, but all three work collaboratively to meet or exceed the Review Commission's strategic goals. This separation of staff between the Administrative Law Judges and Commissioners stems principally from the nature of their functions, which must be apart so that each of these review levels is, both in fact and appearance, independent of the other. The Office of Administration function supports both the Administrative Law Judge and Commission functions and the Agency's strategic planning efforts.

Funding and staffing by function is as follows:

<b><u>Funding (in millions) and FTE by Function</u></b>				
	<b>FY 2010 Estimate</b>		<b>FY 2011 Estimate</b>	
	<b>\$</b>	<b><u>FTE</u></b>	<b>\$</b>	<b><u>FTE</u></b>
Administrative Law Judge	4.7	24	4.9	24
Commission	5.2	31	5.3	31
Administration	<u>1.8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>12</u>
Total	11.7	67	12	67



## **Administrative Law Judge Function**

The front line of our agency's delivery of services to the American public rests with the Administrative Law Judges. Our judges travel around the country to conduct formal hearings and related proceedings in a fair, just and expeditious manner. The function is directly related to the public service goal of fair, just and expeditious adjudication of disputes brought before the Commission and its ALJs.

The Administrative Law Judges report through the Chief Judge to the Chairman. However, they act independently in arriving at case decisions. The Commission's rules are similar to the Federal rules. In the absence of specific Review Commission rules, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are followed. The Commission's Rules are constructed and administered to secure the just and timely determination of every action.

### **Proceedings before the Review Commission's Administrative Law Judges**

The events leading to the presentation of an OSHA case before a Review Commission Administrative Law Judge follow an established procedure and are designed to provide all parties with a fair hearing and swift adjudication of their case. To contest all or part of a citation, penalty, or abatement period, an employer must file a notice of contest with the Secretary of Labor within 15 working days from the receipt of the citation proposed by OSHA. The Secretary of Labor transmits the notice of contest and all relevant documents to the Review Commission's Executive Secretary for filing and docketing. After the case is docketed, it is forwarded to the Office of the Chief Judge for assignment to an Administrative Law Judge. The case is generally assigned to an Administrative Law Judge in the Review Commission office closest to where the alleged violation occurred. Thereafter, the Administrative Law Judge has full responsibility for all pre-hearing and pre-trial procedures, including settlement, and is charged with providing a fair and impartial hearing in an expeditious manner, and rendering a decision promptly.

### **Administrative Law Judge Operations**

Our agency strives to expedite the judicial process in a fair and impartial manner, and to strengthen its settlement procedures and case management responsibilities by constant monitoring of its Simplified Proceedings and Mandatory Settlement programs. The Administrative Law Judge function addresses a caseload that is becoming increasingly more complex, as reflected by the increasing complexity of OSHA citations.

OSHA conducted 40,549 inspections in FY 2009 (including 1,545 Recovery Act inspections), and estimates it will perform 41,700 inspections in FY 2010 (including 3,000 Recovery Act inspections), and 42,250 inspections in FY 2011. This represents an increase of 8% in the number of non-Recovery Act inspections to be conducted during this time frame, and a 4% increase in the total number of inspections. OSHA's emphasis in more recent years has been on serious workplace hazards, and the consequent increase in proposed penalties has translated into more complicated cases and more costly trials (cases involving lock-out/tag-out, confined

spaces, health care hazards, asbestos, lead poisoning, process safety, and construction industry hazards, etc.). These cases command a greater portion of the judges' time.

The complexity of these cases is the result of the existence of one or a combination of the following:

- Intricacies of the law (complex questions of law)
- Volume of documents, including transcripts
- Large number of witnesses (including expert witnesses in such fields as engineering, architecture, construction, soil, physics, epidemiology, pathology, neurology and infectious diseases)
- Number of alleged violations, items, and affirmative defenses (including distinct and separate items)
- Technical, novel, difficult or new issues raised
- Types of cases, such as those involving asbestos, lead poisoning, ergonomics, and process safety management and/or confined spaces

Case processing is expedited by moving a greater numbers of cases into the Mandatory Settlement and Simplified Proceedings programs, innovative methodologies to speed the settlement or adjudication of pending cases.

Under Commission Rule 2200.120, where the parties consent thereto, the Chief Administrative Law Judge may assign a Settlement Judge to a pending proceeding to aid the parties in disposing of cases. Where the aggregate amount of the penalty sought by the Secretary of Labor is \$100,000 or greater, the Mandatory Settlement procedure goes into effect. The Settlement Judge appointed by the Chief Administrative Law Judge has full control of the proceeding and may require that the parties' representatives be accompanied by officials having full settlement authority. This procedure has aided the Commission in disposing of some extremely complex cases, with the approval of all parties. (If settlement efforts are not successful, the case may be assigned to a different judge for trial.)

The Simplified Proceedings process includes cases where proposed penalties are not more than \$20,000, and up to \$30,000, when found eligible by the Chief Judge. The Simplified Proceedings process allows parties with relatively simple cases to have their "day in court" unencumbered by the formal Rules of Procedure and evidence, while ensuring that due process requirements will be maintained. Under this process, a business, with or without counsel, can present its case before a Review Commission judge and receive a prompt decision. Most paperwork, including legal filings, has been eliminated so that justice can be rendered swiftly and inexpensively. The process reduces the time and legal expenses to employers contesting relatively small penalty cases.

In FY 2009, approximately 50 percent of new cases were assigned to Simplified Proceedings. The Review Commission projects that we will continue to assign 50 percent of new cases to the Simplified Proceedings process in FY 2010 and FY 2011.

**Simplified Proceedings Case Activity**

**FY 2006 through FY 2011**

	<b><u>FY 2006</u></b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2007</u></b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2008</u></b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2009</u></b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2010</u></b> <b><u>Estimate</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2011</u></b> <b><u>Estimate</u></b>
New Cases	2,002	1,998	1,962	2,058	2,350	2,450
Cases assigned to Simplified Proceedings	1,063	1,104	990	1,041	1,175	1,225

**Anticipated Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Workload for FY 2011**

Three major factors have an impact on the ALJs' workload: (1) the quantity, magnitude, and nature of the cases; (2) the success of the Simplified Proceedings and Mandatory Settlement processes; and (3) the number of trials held, and their length and complexity.

The number of OSHA inspections and their focus affects the Review Commission's caseload. In particular, inspections of high hazard workplaces – especially those with high injury and illness rates, fatalities, repeat offenders, and egregious violations generally result in larger contestable proposed penalties. These inspections tend to result in more complex and contentious cases, which consume extensive time. The discovery process is lengthy and time consuming, motion practice is expanded, legal research and decision-writing time is protracted and, of necessity, the trial process is elongated and complicated.

The following table provides actual Administrative Law Judge caseloads and accomplishments for fiscal years 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 and estimated caseloads and accomplishments for fiscal years 2010 and 2011.

	<b>FY 2006</b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b>FY 2007</b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b>FY 2008</b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b>FY2009</b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b>FY 2010</b> <b><u>Estimate</u></b>	<b>FY 2011</b> <b><u>Estimate</u></b>
<b>OSHA Inspections*:</b>	38,579	39,324	38,591	40,549	41,700	42,250
<b>Administrative Law Judge Workload:</b>						
a. Case Inventory, Start of Year	708	685	625	739	777	817
b. New Cases	2,002	1,998	1,962	2,058	2,350	2,450
c. Total Caseload	2,710	2,683	2,587	2,797	3,092	3,232
d. Disposals						
(1) With Hearing	62	60	69	67	85	90
(2) Without Hearing	1,963	1,998	1,779	1,953	2,225	2,325
e. Total Dispositions	2,025	2,058	1,848	2,020	2,310	2,415
Total Case Inventory, End of Year	685	625	739	777	817	852

\*Provided by Directorate of Evaluation and Analysis, OSHA.

## Staffing

The Office of the Administrative Law Judge requires 24 FTE in FY 2011. This staff level is consistent with FY 2009, and includes 12 Administrative Law Judges, staff attorneys and support staff. This staffing level will be needed to support the projected workload, based on OSHA's planned inspections in the coming years, and meet performance targets, given the number and complexity of the cases anticipated.

The Chief Administrative Law Judge manages the effort to meet the Agency's GPRA goals at the Administrative Law Judge level.

The Chief Administrative Law Judge:

- Reviews and screens all docketed cases, determines the level of complexity and assigns each to an Administrative Law Judge;
- Exercises strong management and monitors the progress of cases in order to ensure that performance goals are met;
- Supervises judicial and administrative staff, and ensures that they receive appropriate training to perform their responsibilities; and
- Examines judicial case management practices of other entities to ensure that OSHRC's procedures are as efficient as possible.

	<b><u>Funding (in millions) and FTE</u></b>			
	<b><u>FY 2010 Estimate</u></b>		<b><u>FY 2011 Estimate</u></b>	
	<b><u>\$</u></b>	<b><u>FTE</u></b>	<b><u>\$</u></b>	<b><u>FTE</u></b>
Administrative Law Judge	4.7	24	4.9	24

**Strategic Plan and Outcome Goals**

The Review Commission’s Strategic Plan for 2010 – 2015 includes the following goals and outcomes related to this function:

<b><u>Public Service Goal</u></b>	<b><u>Outcome Goals</u></b>
<i>Respect for the rule of law by assuring fair, just, and expeditious adjudication of disputes brought before the Review Commission and its Judges.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that a significant proportion of both complex and non-complex cases at the Administrative Law Judge level are resolved in less than one year.</li> </ul>

The Office of the Chief Administrative Law Judge will advance this strategic goal through the following strategies:

- Expeditious assignment of cases to judges;
- Use of objective criteria to determine complex cases, and track the processing of these cases;
- Monitoring case performance, and improving case management information systems and reports;
- Providing training to all judges on a variety of subjects, including technical and legal issues, legal writing, case management and alternative dispute resolution (ADR), to help develop services and processes equal to the very best in judicial practice;
- Implementing appropriate changes in the agency’s Rules of Procedure to improve case processing (e.g., Mandatory Settlement Part and Simplified Proceedings), and seeking new ADR methods; and
- Continuing to use a team of judges to handle, on a rotational basis, extremely complex cases and assigning appropriate staff to timely process and monitor such cases, including settlement discussions.

To best serve the American people the Review Commission revised its strategic plan for the period FY 2010 through FY 2015. OSHRC’s Strategic Plan includes the following goals for the Office of the Administrative Law Judges for fiscal years 2010 through 2015.

<b><u>Outcome Goals</u></b>	<b><u>Performance Measures</u></b>	<b>FY 2006 Actual (Target)</b>	<b>FY 2007 Actual (Target)</b>	<b>FY 2008 Actual (Target)</b>	<b>FY 2009 Actual (Target)</b>	<b>FY 2010 Target</b>	<b>FY 2011 Target</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that a significant proportion of non-complex cases at the ALJ level are resolved in less than one year.</li> </ul>	Percent within one year.	99% Target Exceeded (94%)	99% Target Exceeded (97%)	99% Target Met (99%)	98% Target Met (98%)	98%	98%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that a significant proportion of complex cases at the ALJ level are resolved in less than one year.</li> </ul>	Percent within one year.*	99% Target Exceeded (94%)	97% Target not met (98%)	99% Target Met (99%)	98% Target Exceeded (95%)	95%	95%

Note: For FY 2006 – 2009, the target case resolution period for complex cases at the ALJ level was 18 months (540 days). In accordance with the Review Commission’s revised Strategic Plan (FY 2010- 2015), the target period has been reduced to one year commencing in FY 2010.

## **Commission Function**

OSHRC Commissioners are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and serve as an appellate level of review. The Commissioners review and decide cases contested under the Occupational Safety and Health Act, following an initial decision by an Administrative Law Judge. This appellate level of review must be prompt, fair, and protective of the parties' rights. .

### **Proceedings before the Commission**

Our Commissioners adjudicate contested cases independently from the enforcement and rule-making functions vested in OSHA. Disputed enforcement proceedings are tried initially before the Review Commission's Administrative Law Judges. The Commission members may then review decisions by the Review Commission's Administrative Law Judges.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 provides for Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of three Commissioners, each with a six-year term. The Commissioners sit as an appellate review body to review any case decided by the Review Commission's Administrative Law Judges. Each Commission member has the authority to direct for review by the full Commission any case decided by any Judge. Absent such a direction for review, the decisions of the Administrative Law Judges become final by operation of law. Once a case is directed for review, the Commission members have authority to review all aspects of a case, including the Judge's findings of fact, conclusions of law, penalty assessments and abatement orders.

Each Commissioner has a counsel who is responsible for providing assistance and advice on all pending matters, including the proper disposition of cases and motions, and whether cases are appropriate for Commission review. Each counsel also aids the Commissioner in researching and editing draft opinions submitted by the General Counsel after the Commission decides a case.

The Office of the General Counsel (OGC) provides legal advice and assists the Commission in complying with the various laws, regulations and executive orders governing its operations. OGC has primary responsibility for preparing and presenting factual and legal analyses to assist Commission members in adjudicating appeals, and may also provide legal advice on ethics, FOIA, EEO, procurement, appropriations, Privacy Act and other areas.

### **Commission Operations**

Our Commissioners strive to minimize the time for deciding cases. Aided by improved case management technology, the Commission seeks to strengthen the internal processes by which a case is prepared for decision. Three external factors that have a major impact on the operations of the Commission are: the presence of a quorum, the size and complexity of cases, and the novelty of the issues presented for review.



The Commission consists of three Members appointed by the President. The Occupational Safety and Health Act requires a quorum of two Commissioners to take official action. Further, by statute, decisions require the affirmative vote of two Commissioners. During periods when the Commission lacks a quorum, no cases can be decided. If there are only two Commissioners, it may be more difficult to reach agreement sufficient to dispose of some cases. In cases where such agreement cannot be reached, deadlocks result. As a result, action on important issues and issuance of some pending cases may be delayed.

The Commission operated during FY 2009 with two Commissioners and one vacancy. Nevertheless, the two Commissioners resolved 20 cases during the fiscal year.

Historically, the number of safety and health inspections carried out by OSHA each year, the nature of those inspections, and the rate at which employers choose to contest the citations issued and penalties proposed by OSHA all have an impact on the number of cases before the Review Commission. In addition, OSHA's emphasis during recent years on more serious workplace hazards and the consequent increase in proposed penalties has translated into more complicated cases, and longer, more costly trials. Consequently, the complexity and size of the cases both at the Administrative Law Judge and at the Commission levels has increased significantly in recent years.

#### **Anticipated Commission Workload for FY 2011**

The Review Commission focuses on solid case production, including deciding and issuing decisions in older cases in an effort to reduce case inventory. However, the cases that are going to hearings before the Commission's ALJs are becoming more complex (e.g., imposition of higher penalties and/or more complex technical issues), which may result in a higher percentage of cases being petitioned for review.

In FY 2009, the Commission had 20 cases pending at the beginning of the year. We received 22 new cases and issued 20 decisions by the end of the fiscal year. Thus, the Commission entered FY 2010 with 22 cases pending review. For FY 2010, the Commission anticipates receiving 26 new cases and disposing of 22 cases, ending that year with an inventory of 26 cases. Actual dispositions, of course, may be affected if a full Commission is not in place.

### Commissioner Case Activity

	<b><u>FY 2006</u></b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2007</u></b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2008</u></b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>FY2009</u></b> <b><u>Actual</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2010</u></b> <b><u>Estimate</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2011</u></b> <b><u>Estimate</u></b>
New Cases:						
Cases Directed for Review:	12	21	11	16	24	26
Other New Cases:						
Interlocutory						
Appeals	0	0	0	0	0	0
Remands	1	4	2	6	2	4
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Other New Cases:	1	4	2	6	2	4
Total New Cases:	13	25	13	22	26	30
Case Inventory from Prior Year:	40	27	25	20	22	26
Total Caseload:	53	52	38	42	48	56
Dispositions:	26	27	18	20	22	28
Case Inventory, End of Year:	27	25	20	22	26	28

### Staffing

Our FY 2011 budget requests 31 FTE for the Commission function, including 10 FTEs for the three Commissioners and their immediate staff, 16 FTEs for the Office of General Counsel, and 5 FTEs for the Office of the Executive Secretary.

### **Funding (in millions) and FTE**

	<b><u>FY 2010 Estimate</u></b>		<b><u>FY 2011 Estimate</u></b>	
	<b><u>\$</u></b>	<b><u>FTE</u></b>	<b><u>\$</u></b>	<b><u>FTE</u></b>
Commission	5.2	31	5.3	31

**Strategic Plan and Outcome Goals**

The Review Commission’s Strategic Plan includes the following goals and outcomes related to this function:

<b><u>Public Service Goal</u></b>	<b><u>Outcome Goal</u></b>
<i>Respect for the rule of law by assuring fair, just, and expeditious adjudication of disputes brought before the Review Commission and its Judges.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolve the oldest cases on the Review Commission’s docket.</li> <li>• Reduce the average age of open cases at the Commission-level.</li> <li>• Resolve all priority cases in a timely manner.</li> </ul>

The Commission will advance its strategic goal through the following strategies:

- Focusing on the disposition of older cases, with the aim of reducing the existing backlog and achieving an average age of two years or less;
- Expediting the disposition of priority cases that require immediate action (in general, court remands, interlocutory reviews, Federal Rule 60(b) cases, and Commission Rule 101(a) defaults);
- Implementing internal markers to assist in the preparation of cases and issuance of Commission decisions;
- Accelerating processing of cases through a variety of efforts, including early intervention of the Commissioners’ counsels, computerization of changes to draft decisions and development of strategies to resolve cases when there are only two Commission members;
- Expanding the use of teams in the Office of the General Counsel to reduce the time needed to write decisional memoranda and draft decisions;
- Developing new methods to shorten case preparation time;
- Developing procedures for case processing and decision quality;
- Implementing changes to the Agency’s Rules of Procedure to improve case processing;
- Making greater use of oral arguments and requests for amicus briefs for complex cases and cases that present significant questions of law; and
- Developing case processing measures for employees assigned to cases to ensure individual performance plans support priorities in the Review Commission’s strategic and annual performance plans.

The following new performance goals have been developed for fiscal year 2010 and 2011 to support the FY 2010 – 2015 Strategic Plan:

<b><u>Outcome Goals</u></b>	<b><u>Performance Measures</u></b>	<b>FY 2010 (Target)</b>	<b>FY 2011 (Target)</b>
Resolve the oldest cases on the Review Commission's docket.	All cases docketed at the Commission level prior to 2008 resolved.	(30% of oldest cases)	(70% of oldest cases)
Reduce the average age of open cases at the Commission-level. *	Average age of open cases.	41 months or less	36 months or less
Resolve all priority cases in a timely manner.	Percent of priority cases disposed of within 6 months.	(100%)	(100%)

\* As of September 30, 2009, the average (mean) period of time for a case on the Review Commission's docket was 46 months. The Review Commission's revised Strategic Plan (FY 2010- 2015) anticipates reducing this average to 24 months by the end of FY 2015. However, resolving the oldest cases on the Review Commission's docket, e.g., those cases docketed prior to 2008, which is reflected under the first outcome goal in this chart, is the highest priority. It is possible that, in the short term, the average age of open cases may increase. While this is not anticipated to occur, the presence of a full Commission will be an important factor in achieving our goal.

## **Office of Administration Function**

The Office of Administration provides administrative support services for the entire Review Commission to assure success in fulfilling our mission.

### **Administrative Operations**

The Office of Administration provides operational management for the agency, including procurement, information technology management, human resources management, budget and financial management, and administrative services. The day-to-day tasks of this office are led by the Director of Administration and include:

- Supporting the development and implementation of the Agency's strategic goal;
- Maintaining and enhancing a website to provide the public with greater access to Review Commission information;
- Providing agency-wide support in the areas of finance, budget, procurement, human resources, equal opportunity and general administrative services;
- Providing personnel, payroll, benefits, reproduction, and mail services, and travel assistance to agency employees;
- Procuring goods and services, maintenance and needed repairs of equipment, training, reference materials, supplies and office space;
- Implementing case management and administrative systems through IT hardware and software;
- Developing and maintaining computer systems and information security enhancements; and
- Enhancing telecommunications and improving technology efficiency and effectiveness.

### **Anticipated Office of Administration Workload for FY 2011**

During FY 2011, Office of Administration staff will:

- Implement the Administration's government-wide performance initiatives;
- Improve financial and administrative services and enhance integrity and efficiency of the Agency's financial management and human resources programs;

- Provide greater online access to information generated by OSHRC to citizens and other interested parties as a part of the Review Commission’s transparency initiatives;
- Provide faster and better public access to and dissemination of Review Commission information and decisions through the use of modern automated technology and techniques, including the Agency’s website;
- Improve computer information security based on an evaluation of the Review Commission’s computer security, compliance with the various security acts and the implementation of corrections or improvements in any weaknesses found as a result of evaluations;
- Execute the Continuity Of Operations Plan (COOP) including maintenance, testing, and (if needed) implementation of the COOP for Washington, DC and the regional offices in Denver and Atlanta; and
- Make use of best knowledge management practices to ensure that employees are better prepared to perform their work, and to provide for continuity and succession planning.

In FY 2011, we plan to enhance our web-based transparency initiatives, including enhancing the OSHRC website to make more information available to internal and external customers, revising our Continuity of Operations (COOP) plan, and undertaking other activities in support of the Review Commission’s mission.

**Staffing**

Our FY 2011 budget requests funding for 12 FTE for the Office of Administration function to perform the duties and responsibilities outlined above. The Office of Administration staff has responsibility for implementing the Administration’s performance improvement efforts, including implementing and monitoring strategic and performance plans and reports, budget and performance integration, human capital development and E-government.

<b><u>Funding (in millions) and FTE</u></b>				
	<b><u>FY 2010 Estimate</u></b>		<b><u>FY 2011 Estimate</u></b>	
	<b><u>\$</u></b>	<b><u>FTE</u></b>	<b><u>\$</u></b>	<b><u>FTE</u></b>
Administration	1.8	12	1.8	12

**Strategic Plan and Outcome Goals**

The Office of Administration’s responsibilities include implementation of and/or providing Strategic Plan guidance for the following goals and outcomes:

<b><u>Public Service Goal</u></b>	<b><u>Outcome Goals</u></b>
<p><i>Expanding transparency and openness by providing for stakeholder engagement and ensuring that the Review Commission keeps interested parties and the public it serves informed of the agency’s work at all levels, consistent with due process requirements.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that the Review Commission’s website is accurate, current and complete, and serves as a useful repository for information about the agency and its adjudicatory activities.</li> <li>• Produce timely and accurate reports on the Review Commission’s activities, including all reports required by law.</li> <li>• Update agency’s FOIA regulations and FOIA reference guide.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Responsible stewardship of the fiscal and human resources employed by the Review Commission in accordance with the agency’s statutory mandate and other applicable law.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve the Review Commission’s outreach activities with affected public and with other Federal agencies.</li> <li>• Recruit and maintain a diverse and highly motivated staff with the skills to support the mission of the agency.</li> <li>• Invest in human capital by increasing staff development and training opportunities and increasing employees’ capabilities and potential.</li> <li>• Ensure that the agency’s performance management system enhances individual and organizational effectiveness.</li> <li>• Improve case tracking through implementation of a new IT case management system.</li> <li>• Develop metrics to measure ALJ effort devoted to non-hearing case resolution.</li> <li>• Make use of best knowledge management (KM) practices to ensure that employees are better prepared to perform their work, and to provide for continuity and succession planning.</li> <li>• Improve the quality of employee work life through enhanced use of IT, telework, wellness programs, etc.</li> <li>• Examine opportunities for insourcing of work that has been outsourced to contractors.</li> </ul>

# **III. BUDGET BY OBJECT CLASSIFICATION CATEGORY**



## Budget by Object Classification Category

The Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission requests an appropriation of \$12,051,000 and 67 FTE for FY 2011. The funding and staffing requested will enable the Review Commission to carry out its mission, as required by the Occupational Safety and Health Act. The growth in the FY 2011 budget request is required to pay salary rates approved by Congress, to provide for full staffing of all 67 approved FTE, as well as to pay other costs imposed upon us. The proposed budget for FY 2011 by object classification category is shown in the table below, along with the FY 2010 request. A narrative explanation of the amount requested for each object classification follows the table.

### Object Classification Table

Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011  
(Dollars in Thousands)

Budget Object Class	FY 2010	FY 2011	Change FY 2010-2011	
			\$	%
11.0 Personnel Compensation	\$7,231	\$7,601	+370	+5.1
12.0 Personnel Benefits	1,717	1,843	+126	+7.3
Subtotal Personal Services	8,948	9,444	+496	+5.5
21.0 Travel	185	185	0	0
22.0 Transportation of Things	7	7	0	0
23.1 Space Rental Payments (GSA)	1,466	1,272	-194	-13.2
23.3 Communications, Utilities and Misc.	95	97	+2	+2.1
24.0 Printing and Reproduction	17	17	0	0
25.0 Other Services	821	855	+34	+4.1
26.0 Supplies and Materials	45	45	0	0
31.0 Equipment	128	129	+1	+.78
<b>Total</b>	11,712	12,051	+339	+2.89

## Object Classification Detail

### 11.0 Personnel Compensation

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$7,231,000	\$7,601,000	+\$370,000	+5.1

The budget request for FY 2011 includes \$7,491,000 to fund the direct payroll costs of 67 FTE. This includes funding for comparability pay increases that were effective in January 2010, as well as proposed comparability pay increases in January 2011.

In the past, the Review Commission’s funding levels have not been sufficient to provide for full staffing at all times. In addition, the Review Commission has hired a number of new attorneys and other personnel whose positions are in formal “career ladders”. As these personnel gain additional experience, it is expected that they will be promoted accordingly. Thus, the need to provide for full funding of all 67 authorized positions, plus normal career ladder promotions, accounts for the increase in this budget object class.

This object class also supports awards to recognize those employees whose performance is superior, and who perform special acts or services. Cash awards are a necessary incentive under the Review Commission’s performance appraisal system, and form an important component of the continuing effort to improve the quality and timeliness of work products that contribute to overall agency efforts to accomplish its Strategic Plan objectives. The Review Commission has implemented a results-oriented performance management system for both senior executive and GS level employees. As part of this effort, the Review Commission also revamped its system for employee recognition to link awards to the accomplishment of critical elements and performance goals. Under this system, employee performance awards are directly linked to performance appraisals, which are based on individual performance agreements, established in advance, by employees and their supervisors.

### 12.0 Personnel Benefits

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$1,717,000	\$1,843,000	+\$126,000	+7.3

This budget includes \$1,843,000 to fund the payroll-related costs of employee benefits in FY 2011. These benefits principally consist of the government’s contributions to the CSRS and FERS retirement programs, life and health insurance programs, the Transit Subsidy Program, and the Thrift Savings Plan.

21.0 Travel

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$185,000	\$185,000	-0-	-0-

The Review Commission requests \$185,000 for travel in FY 2011. Travel of Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) to conduct hearings accounts for the majority of this request. It should be noted that approximately 90 percent of the Review Commission's travel budget pays for ALJ travel in order to conduct hearings. By law, these hearings must be conducted as close as possible to the site of the alleged violation. The remainder of these funds is for travel associated with training, necessary travel to the regional offices and other requirements

22.0 Transportation of Things

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$7,000	\$7,000	-0-	-0-

An amount of \$7,000 is requested to fund the cost of shipping materials between Review Commission offices and other locations, and the shipping costs associated with the purchase of supplies and equipment.

23.1 Rental Payments to GSA

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$1,466,000	\$1,272,000	-194	-13.2

The request includes \$1,272,000 for office space rental for the National and Regional Offices. These projected rent costs are based on FY 2011 estimates provided by the General Services Administration (GSA) to the Review Commission.

### 23.3 Communications, Utilities and Miscellaneous Charges

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$95,000	\$97,000	+2,000	+2.1

Telephone and postage costs are projected to require a total of \$97,000 in FY 2011. Local phone service and telecommunications are projected to cost \$69,000; long distance service is estimated at \$8,000. Postage for the required mailing of letters, case files, and other materials related to cases is expected to be \$20,000.

### 24.0 Printing and Reproduction

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$17,000	\$17,000	-0-	-0-

Printing costs consist mainly of the charges for publishing rules, proposed rules and other announcements in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) and/or the Federal Register, and for purchasing copies of the CFR and other GPO publications. Together, these printing/publishing costs are expected to approximate \$10,000 in fiscal year 2011. The balance of the budget -- \$7,000 -- is needed for printing of Rules of Procedure and Guide to the Review Commission pamphlets, which are provided to parties to Review Commission proceedings.

### 25.0 Other Services

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$821,000	\$855,000	+34,000	+4.1

A total of \$855,000 is requested for Other Services in FY 2011. Requirements in this area fall into two basic categories: interagency agreements for services provided by other Federal agencies; and contractual services provided by non-Federal vendors. Additional information on each of these is provided in the following paragraphs.

**Services Provided by Other Federal Agencies.** A total of \$459,410 is requested for services provided by other Federal agencies. This area includes \$7,980 for personnel and payroll services provided by the National Finance Center, \$336,918 for financial and administrative services provided by the Bureau of the Public Debt (including funds to BPD to support infrastructure upgrades), and \$57,000 for building security (estimated) provided by the Department of

Homeland Security. This category also includes funds needed for continuing maintenance of the Review Commission’s Internet website (\$16,000), which is housed at and maintained by the Government Printing Office. The remaining amount will be used to fund other Interagency Agreements such as FOH, GSA (HVAC), and OPM.

**Other Contractual Services.** OSHRC procures a variety of services to support us in carrying out our mission. These include: court reporting (\$92,000); maintenance of the Review Commission’s information technology system (\$52,000); evaluation and support for information technology security (\$29,000); and on-line legal research (\$35,000). This category also includes funding for other contractual services such as the annual audit of our financial statements (\$36,000), library operations (\$50,000), training (\$27,000), and other requirements to support the agency’s mission (\$74,590).

26.0 Supplies and Materials

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$45,000	\$45,000	0	0

The amount of \$45,000 is requested for supplies and materials in FY 2011, including general office supplies (\$23,000) and information technology supplies and software (\$22,000).

31.0 Equipment

		<u>Change FY 2010-FY 2011</u>	
<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>FY 2011</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>%</u>
\$128,000	\$129,000	+1,000	+ .78

The amount of \$129,000 is required for equipment in FY 2011. Subscriptions and other publications necessary to maintain our legal libraries make up the bulk of the costs in this object class. The remainder is required for new and/or replacement computer and other information technology requirements, and to enable us to comply with Government-wide mandates such as the Federal Information Security Management Act. Our information technology equipment includes personal computers, printers, a local area network, and associated peripherals. Finally, a small portion of this funding will be used to purchase any office furniture that may be needed.

## **IV. OTHER TABLES**

**Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission  
Appropriation History**

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Request to Congress</u>	<u>House Allowance</u>	<u>Senate Allowance</u>	<u>Appropriation</u>
1995	\$7,655,000	\$7,595,000	\$7,595,000	\$7,595,000
1996	\$8,127,000	\$8,200,000	\$8,100,000	\$8,081,000 <sup>1</sup>
1997	\$7,753,000	\$7,753,000	\$7,753,000	\$7,738,000 <sup>2</sup>
1998	\$7,800,000	\$7,900,000	\$7,800,000	\$7,900,000
1999	\$8,050,000	\$8,100,000	\$8,100,000	\$8,092,000 <sup>3</sup>
2000	\$8,500,000	\$8,100,000	\$8,500,000	\$8,470,000 <sup>4</sup>
2001	\$8,720,000	\$8,600,000	\$8,720,000	\$8,720,000
2002	\$8,964,000	\$8,964,000	\$8,964,000	\$8,958,000 <sup>5</sup>
2003	\$9,577,000	\$9,577,000	\$9,577,000	\$9,673,000 <sup>6</sup>
2004	\$10,115,000	\$10,115,000	\$9,610,000	\$9,863,000 <sup>7</sup>
2005	\$10,516,000	\$10,595,000	\$10,595,000	\$10,510,240 <sup>8</sup>
2006	\$10,510,000	\$10,510,000	\$10,510,000	\$10,404,900 <sup>9</sup>
2007	\$10,346,000	\$10,510,000	\$10,346,000	\$10,470,779
2008	\$10,696,000	\$10,696,000	\$10,696,000	\$10,696,000 <sup>10</sup>
2009	\$11,186,000	\$11,186,000	\$11,186,000	\$11,186,000
2010	\$11,712,000	\$11,712,000	\$11,712,000	\$11,712,000

<sup>1</sup> Reduced to \$8,081,000 by P.L. 104-134

<sup>2</sup> Reduced to \$7,738,000 by P.L. 104-208

<sup>3</sup> Reduced to \$8,092,000 by H.R. 1664

<sup>4</sup> Reduced to \$8,470,000 by P.L. 106-113

<sup>5</sup> Reduced to \$8,958,000 by P.L. 107-206

<sup>6</sup> Reduced to \$9,610,125 by P.L. 108-7

<sup>7</sup> Reduced to \$9,863,000 by P.L. 108-199

<sup>8</sup> Reduced to \$10,510,240 by P.L. 108-447

<sup>9</sup> Reduced to \$10,404,900 by P.L. 109-149

<sup>10</sup> Reduced to \$10,509,141 by P.L. 110-161

**Authorized Full Time Positions  
by Function**

	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY2010</u>	<u>FY2011</u>
<b>Administrative Law Judge:</b>			
AL-1	1	1	1
AL-III	11	11	11
GS-14	3	3	3
GS-12	1	1	1
GS-11	2	2	2
GS-9	1	1	1
GS-8	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
Sub-total	24	24	24
 <b>Commission:</b>			
Executive Level III	1	1	1
Executive Level IV	2	2	2
ES-00	2	2	2
GS-15	8	8	8
GS-14	3	4	4
GS-13	6	7	7
GS-12	3	1	1
GS-11	3	4	4
GS-9	2	1	2
GS-8	0	1	0
GS-7	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Sub-total	31	31	31
 <b>Administration:</b>			
ES-00	1	1	1
GS-15	1	1	1
GS-14	2	2	2
GS-13	1	1	1
GS-12	0	1	2
GS-11	4	4	3
GS-9	1	0	0
GS-7	1	1	1
GS-6	0	0	0
GS-5	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Sub-total	12	12	12
 <b>Total full-time positions:</b>	 <b>67</b>	 <b>67</b>	 <b>67</b>