OSHA Interpretation Letter #1

OSHA requirements are set by statute, standards and regulations. Our interpretation letters explain these requirements and how they apply to particular circumstances, but they cannot create additional employer obligations. This letter constitutes OSHA's interpretation of the requirements discussed. Note that our enforcement guidance may be affected by changes to OSHA rules. Also, from time to time we update our guidance in response to new information. To keep apprised of such developments, you can consult OSHA's website at http://www.osha.gov.

February 1, 1999

Randall A. Tindell, ASP
Williams Power Company
7826 North State Hwy 95
Columbia, AL 36319

RE: The difference between maintenance and construction; scaffold inspection requirements; definition of periodic inspections

Dear Mr. Tindell:

This is in response to your letter dated March 6 to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) in which you asked for a written response to several questions you had discussed with OSHA. We apologize for the delay in responding.

We understand your questions to be as follows:

The difference between construction and maintenance

Question 1: There are two scaffold standards -- one for construction and one for general industry. What determines which standard applies -- the activity being performed, or the company's Standard Industrial Code (SIC)?

Answer: It is the activity to be performed while on the scaffold, not the company's standard industrial classification (SIC) code, that determines which standard applies.

Question 2: A valve is removed to install a test rig for maintenance and the valve is reinstalled when the work is completed. Is this a construction or maintenance activity?

Answer: "Maintenance" means keeping equipment or a structure in proper condition through routine, scheduled or anticipated measures without having to significantly alter the structure or equipment in the process. For equipment, this generally means keeping the equipment working properly by taking steps to prevent its failure or degradation.
In the activity you describe, a valve is removed so that a test rig can be temporarily installed to perform a maintenance activity. After the test, the rig is removed and the valve is either reinstalled or replaced with an identical valve. This would be considered a maintenance activity.

**Question 3:** If a valve is cut out and replaced, no matter what size it is, is this construction or maintenance?

**Answer:** The size of the valve is not necessarily a factor in determining whether the activity is construction or maintenance. It would be a factor if, because of its size, the process of removal and replacement involves significantly altering the equipment that the valve is in.

**Example No. 1: Maintenance**
A common household water shut-off valve in a home heating system is removed and replaced. Its replacement is part of the routine maintenance of the system and removing and replacing the valve is done without making major alterations to the heating system. The removal and replacement of the valve would be considered maintenance.

**Example No. 2: Construction**
A 36 inch valve that is one of three major components in a processing system is removed and replaced. To do the job, 50 percent of all parts in the system have to be cut, unbolted, moved, or otherwise altered or replaced. Removing and replacing this valve would be considered construction because the valve constitutes a major portion of the equipment it is in and much of the rest of the system's parts must be moved or altered in the process of doing the job.

[Note: Additional clarification on this issue is available in the November 18, 2003 letter to Mr. Raymond V. Knobbs (Added 6/14/2004)]

**Qualifications necessary to inspect scaffolds; how often is "periodic?"**

**Question 4:** While using a scaffold for maintenance activity, is the visual inspection performed by the user, prior to use, sufficient for the periodic inspection requirements of the general industry standards.

**Answer:** Your question involves two issues: the required qualifications of a person who is responsible for inspecting a scaffold, and whether inspecting a scaffold prior to use meets the requirement that scaffolds be inspected periodically.

**Qualifications**
There are periodic inspection requirements for a number of different types of scaffolds. For example, there are periodic inspection requirements for welded frame scaffolds (§1910.28(d)(14)), mason's adjustable multiple-point suspension scaffolds 9§1910.28(f)(11)), and two-point suspension scaffolds (§1910.28(g)(8)). These particular provisions do not specify qualifications that the person conducting the periodic inspection must have. However, the purpose of these inspection requirements is to ensure that the scaffold continues to be in a safe condition. For the employer to meet this obligation, the employee it assigns to do the inspections must have sufficient knowledge to recognize unsafe scaffold conditions and to determine if the scaffold continues to meet the applicable scaffold standard requirements. The employer may assign the periodic inspection task to one of its employees using the scaffold only if that employee has this level of knowledge. That employee must understand that a cursory look at the scaffold prior to use would not constitute an inspection -- an inspection requires a careful and critical examination.
For some types of scaffolds, a "competent person" must supervise the erection, installation or relocation of scaffolds. If an employee meets the requirements for a competent person for those purposes, that employee would also be qualified to periodically inspect those scaffolds.

**What constitutes "periodic?"**
These standards do not specify how often a scaffold must be inspected to meet the "periodic" requirement. The frequency will depend on factors such as the type of scaffold, site and weather conditions, intensity of use, age of the equipment, and how often sections or components are added, removed or changed. These kinds of factors will determine how quickly or slowly safety related faults, loose connections, degradation and other defects can be expected to develop.

"Periodic" means frequently enough so that, in light of these factors and the amount of time expected for their detrimental effects to occur, there is a good likelihood that problems will be found before they pose a hazard to employees.

**Whether the frequency of scaffold inspection may be lowered to lessen radiation exposure**

**Question 5:** While working in high radiation or highly contaminated areas in the nuclear industry, workers can be exposed to radiation doses while inspecting construction scaffolds before each work shift; (1) Can the inspection requirement be changed to periodic inspections? (2) Can the user-trained worker perform the inspection just prior to performing work?

**Answer:** When doing construction, 1926.451(f)(3) requires that a competent person inspect the scaffold and its components before each work shift and after any occurrence which could affect the structural integrity of the scaffold. If the worker will be exposed to a radiation hazard while performing the inspections required by the OSHA scaffold standard, the employer is required to protect the worker with personal protective equipment. The employer is not permitted to do fewer inspections than are required by the standard as a means of protecting the worker from the radiation hazard.

The employer may assign the task of inspecting the scaffold to a "user-trained worker" as long as that worker qualifies as a competent person under §1926.450(b). A competent person is defined as one who is "capable of identifying existing and predictable hazards in the surroundings or working conditions which are unsanitary, hazardous, or dangerous to employees, and who has authorization to take prompt corrective measures to eliminate them."

If you require further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us again by writing to: [U.S. Department of Labor, OSHA, Office of Construction Standards and Guidance, Room N3468, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210].

Sincerely,
Russell B. Swanson, Director
Directorate of Construction

[Corrected 6/14/2004. Question numbers were added for reference purposes.]
November 18, 2003

Mr. Raymond V. Knobbs
Minnotte Contracting Corporation
Minnotte Square
Pittsburgh, PA 15220

Re: Distinguishing construction from maintenance: whether classifying steel tanks and structural steel supports as plant equipment or plant structure alters categorizing their removal as maintenance or construction; how specific factors determine whether the removal and installation of steel tanks and structural steel supports will be considered in distinguishing construction from maintenance; what requirements apply to the removal and installation of steel tanks and supports.

Dear Mr. Knobbs:

This is in response to your letter dated May 5, 2003, to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Your letter covers multiple questions pertaining to the classification of steel tanks and structural steel supports, what work OSHA considers maintenance vs. what is considered construction under 29 CFR Part 1926, and what OSHA regulations might apply to the owner of the property and to the controlling contractor during the work.

We have paraphrased your questions as follows:

**Question (1):** Do the following factors bear on whether work will be considered maintenance or construction: (a) the physical condition of the equipment/structure being worked on (whether it may be reused or if deterioration would require its complete removal); (b) replacement was performed to supplant deteriorated sections rather than to prevent the current parts from reaching a state of failure; (c) the physical characteristics (height, width, weight, material) of the equipment/structure; (d) the work is performed by an outside contractor rather than by a steel mill's own employees; (e) the work was performed during an annually scheduled work outage; and (f) whether steel tanks used in a mill plating line and the structural steel used to support the plating line, equipment and floor decking, are categorized as either plant equipment or plant structure?
Answer:
In our August 11, 1994 memorandum for Regional Administrators, our February 1, 1999 letter to Mr. Tindell, and our May 11, 1999 letter to Mr. Ellis, we discussed and gave examples of the difference between maintenance and construction work. These can be viewed on the Internet at http://www.osha.gov (we have also enclosed a copy of each for your reference).

OSHA's regulations define construction work as "construction, alteration, and/or repair, including painting and decorating." 1 Section 1910.12(a) further provides that OSHA's construction industry standards apply "to every employment and place of employment of every employee engaged in construction work." 2

Unlike construction work, there is no regulatory definition for "maintenance," nor a specified distinction between terms such as "maintenance," "repair," or "refurbishment." "Maintenance activities" have commonly been defined in dictionaries as making or keeping a structure, fixture or foundation (substrates) in proper condition in a routine, scheduled, or anticipated fashion. In OSHA's directive on the general industry confined space standard, the Agency stated that maintenance involves "keeping equipment working in its existing state, i.e., preventing its failure or decline" 3 [emphasis added]. In applying this concept to the broad range of circumstances encountered in the construction industry, the factors discussed in the Tindell and Ellis letters and those discussed below must also be considered.

Construction work is not limited to new construction, but can include the repair of existing facilities or the replacement of structures and their components. For example, the replacement of one utility pole with a new, identical pole would be maintenance; however, if it were replaced with an improved pole or equipment, it would be considered construction.

In addition to the concept of one-for-one replacement versus improvement, the scale and complexity of the project are relevant. This takes into consideration concepts such as the amount of time and material required to complete the job. For example, if a steel beam in a building had deteriorated and was to be replaced by a new, but identical beam, the project would be considered a construction repair rather than maintenance because of the replacement project's scale and complexity. Also, if a bridge was to be stripped and re-painted, that would be considered construction work even if the repainting were done on a scheduled basis. Replacement of a section of limestone cladding on a building, though not necessarily a large project in terms of scale, would typically be considered construction because it is a complex task in view of the steps involved and tools and equipment needed to do the work.

As discussed in the Tindell letter, the physical size of an object that is being worked on can be a factor if, because of its size, the process of removal and replacement involves significantly altering the structure or equipment that the component is within. This is another example of how the project scale and complexity is relevant - if the process of removal and replacement is a large-scale project, then it is likely to be construction. It is not the classification of what you are working on as "equipment" or "structure" that is significant, but rather the project's scale and complexity.

Characteristics such as the material of the component are sometimes relevant in determining what specific standards apply, although by themselves such characteristics are unlikely to be an important factor in deciding whether an activity is considered maintenance or construction.
Whether the work is performed in-house or by an outside contractor is not a factor; it is not the personnel which will determine whether work will be considered maintenance or construction, but the work itself.

Work that is anticipated, routine and done on a regularly scheduled/periodic basis to help maintain the original condition of the component, will be suggestive of "maintenance," although this must be considered in light of the scale of the project. For example, whether a tank in your steel mill is repaired and reused versus replaced is not determinative. If the work consists of repair as opposed to replacement, a key factor is whether those repairs are extensive. If the work consists of removal and replacement of equipment, an important factor is whether the new equipment is of an improved type. For both the cases of repair and replacement, a key factor is the scale of the project, including the extent to which other equipment or structures must be moved, altered, etc. as discussed above.

Note that, though the work may itself occur during a scheduled "maintenance outage," this alone is not enough to qualify it as maintenance. For example, it is possible that the work may be construction, but scheduled during a maintenance outage to minimize lost productivity.4

**Question (2):** Based on the characteristics described in Question (1), would the removal and replacement of steel tanks and the removal and replacement of the structural steel components be considered maintenance or construction under 29 CFR Part 1926?

**Answer:**
Based on the information you have provided, the complete replacement of entire tanks and sections of structural support are large-scale projects, both with respect to time and material. In addition, you specifically state that the work being performed on both the steel tanks and the structural steel supports was undertaken because both had already reached a state of failure. The act of completely replacing the deteriorated tanks and support structures is an activity that goes beyond mere "refurbishment" and requires constructing replacements for structures (tanks) and plant components (structural supports). Also, unlike the scenario of replacing a single utility pole in a system of hundreds of poles, the tank replacements you describe form a significant portion of the system involved -- a system that will be significantly disrupted due to the work. Taking these factors together, the act of replacing the tanks and supports would be considered construction work under 29 CFR 1926.32(g) and 1910.12(b).5

**Question (3):** Is the removal of the old structural steel components and the installation of new steel components (steel flooring/decking, structural steel beams) governed by Subpart R of 29 CFR Part 1926; what OSHA standards would pertain to the removal and replacement of the steel tanks?

**Answer**
Activities listed in §1926.750(b)(1) fall within the scope of Subpart R. Activities listed in §1926.750(b)(2) are covered by Subpart R "when they occur during and are a part of steel erection activities [listed in (b)(1)]."  

**Steel Decking**
Section 1926.750(b)(1) contains a list of activities covered by Subpart R, including "installing metal decking * * *." Therefore, installing steel decking falls under Subpart R.
Subpart R is not limited to new construction; it also applies to steel erection activities in alteration and repair work. Under your scenario, the removal of the old decking is "repair." You are removing some but not all of the decking and replacing it with the same types of steel decking used in the original construction. Since §1926.750(a) states that steel erection activities done during repair are covered by Subpart R, the reverse of the decking installation process - removal - is also covered under §1926.750(b)(1).

**Structural steel beams**
Under §1926.750(b)(1) "steel erection activities include * * * placing, connecting * * * and rigging structural steel." The definition of "structural steel" includes steel beams. Therefore Subpart R applies to the installation of structural steel beams. Subpart R also applies to the removal of the steel beams for the same reasons as above. The removal of these beams is steel erection work done during "repair."

**Steel Tanks** - Section 1926.750(a) states:
* * * This subpart does not cover electrical transmission towers, communication and broadcast towers, or tanks. Therefore, the removal and replacement of the tanks is not covered by Subpart R. Fall protection for that work is governed by §1926.105.

**Components/structures supporting steel tanks**
In Question 5 of the Steel Erection Directive (which can be viewed at [www.osha.gov](http://www.osha.gov)), we implicitly indicated that the exclusion of tank construction from Subpart R does not also exclude work on the steel structure on which the tank rests:

**Question 5: When a tank is to be supported by a structure that falls under the scope of Subpart R, does construction of the tank also fall within the scope of Subpart R?**

**Answer:** No. 1926.750(a) excludes tank construction from the scope of Subpart R. It is excluded because it is considered to be a specialized industry based upon its unique use of cylindrical construction techniques. **The construction of the tank itself would not be steel erection even though the structure supporting the tank is covered by subpart R.** [Emphasis added.]

Based on the information you submitted, work on the structural steel components that support the tank would be covered under Subpart R.

In sum, given your scenario the removal of the old structural steel components and the installation of the new steel components (steel decking, structural steel beams) are governed by Subpart R of 29 CFR Part 1926 while the removal and reinstallation of the steel tanks are not.

If you need additional information, please contact us by fax (202-693-1689) at: U.S. Department of Labor, OSHA, Office of Construction Standards and Guidance. You can also contact us by mail at U.S. Department of Labor, OSHA, Office of Construction Standards and Guidance, Room N3468, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210, although there will be a delay in our receiving correspondence by mail.

Sincerely,
Russell B. Swanson, Director
Directorate of Construction
OSHA Interpretation Letter #3

OSHA requirements are set by statute, standards and regulations. Our interpretation letters explain these requirements and how they apply to particular circumstances, but they cannot create additional employer obligations. This letter constitutes OSHA's interpretation of the requirements discussed. Note that our enforcement guidance may be affected by changes to OSHA rules. Also, from time to time we update our guidance in response to new information. To keep apprised of such developments, you can consult OSHA's website at http://www.osha.gov.

August 11, 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR: REGIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

FROM: JAMES W. STANLEY
Deputy Assistant Secretary

SUBJECT: Construction vs. Maintenance

OSHA's regulations define "construction work" as "construction, alteration, and/or repair, including painting and decorating." at 29 CFR 1926.32(g) and 29 CFR 1910.12(b). They further provide that OSHA's construction industry standards apply "to every employment and place of employment of every employee engaged in construction work." id. at 1910.12(a). In interpreting definitional provisions in these regulations, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission and the courts have looked to similar definitional provisions in other federal laws and regulations. For example, OSHA's regulations make specific reference to definitions in the Davis-Bacon Act and regulations promulgated under that Act. The Davis-Bacon Act regulations issued by the Department of Labor broadly define construction work or activity as follows:

(i) The terms "building" and "work" generally include construction activity as distinguished from manufacturing, furnishing of materials, or servicing and maintenance work. The terms include, without limitation, buildings, structures, and improvements of all types, such as bridges, dams, plants, highways, parkways, streets, subways, tunnels, sewers, mains, power lines, pumping stations, heavy generators, railways, **excavating**, **.

(j) The terms construction, completion, or repair mean the following:
(1) all types of work done on a particular building or work at the site thereof **29 CFR 5.2(i) and (j). In order for work to be construction work, the employer need not itself be a construction company. See e.g., New England Telephone & Telegraph Co., 4 OSHC 1838, 1939 (1976), vacated on other grounds sub nom. and New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. vs. Secretary of Labor 589 F.2d 81 (1st Cir. 1978).

Further, construction work is not limited to new construction. It includes the repair of existing facilities. The replacement of structures and their components is also considered construction work. For example,
in Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 2 OSHC 1962 (1975), the Review Commission held that the replacement of a wooden utility pole is covered by the construction industry standards. The utility had argued that the replacement of the pole was "maintenance work," rather than "construction work." The Review Commission, however, concluded that pole replacement is "improvement" and, therefore, construction work. Similarly, construction work is typically performed outdoors, rather than at a manufacturing plant. This factor too is another hallmark of construction work. See e.g., Cleveland Electric Co. vs. OSHRC 910 F2d 1333 (6th Cir. 1990).

There is no specified definition for "maintenance", nor a clear distinction between terms such as "maintenance", "repair", or "refurbishment." "Maintenance activities" can be defined as making or keeping a structure, fixture or foundation (substrates) in proper condition in a routine, scheduled, or anticipated fashion. This definition implies "keeping equipment working in its existing state, i.e., preventing its failure or decline." However, this definition, (taken from the directive on confined spaces) is not dispositive; and, consequently, determinations of whether a contractor is engaged in maintenance operations rather than construction activities must be made on a case-by-case basis, taking into account all information available at a particular site.

Examples of activity that have been determined to be construction:

- OSHA has recognized that repair of highways is construction work. See e.g., Yonkers Contracting Co., 11 OSHC 1994 (1984) (highway contractor cited under construction industry standards in connection with highway rehabilitation project); Karl Koch Erecting Co., 3 OSHC 1223 (1975) (employer cited for violation of construction industry standards in connection with freeway repair project).

- OSHA has consistently taken the position that the repair of railroad track and related structures are construction work. Thus, in Secretary of Labor vs. Consolidated Rail Corp., OSHRC Docket No. 91-3134 (filed Jan. 22, 1992), OSHA cited Conrail for violation of its construction industry standards, alleging that maintenance-of-way activities "involve at least in part, construction, alteration and/or repair * * *." In Consolidated Rail Corp., 1979 OSAHRC LEXIS 640, 1979 OSHC (CCH) p. 23,392 (1979), OSHA cited a railroad for violation of construction industry standards in connection with replacement of damaged railroad ties on a bridge. See also Burlington Northern Railroad Co., 14 OSHC 1402 (1989) (citation for failing to shore trench). More recently, in a 1993 case settled with the Norfolk Southern Railroad, it was determined that the replacement of thousands of aged and damaged ties and tons of ballast is "improvement and/or repair of track," and consequently such work is construction work. The case also determined that the repair and rehabilitation of railroad tracks, on site, using heavy equipment and workers spread over a large geographical area is also construction work.

In other instances, where an activity cannot be easily classified as construction or maintenance even when measured against all of the above factors, the activity should be classified so as to allow application of the more protective 1910 or 1926 standard, depending on the hazard. In such cases the citation should be issued in the alternative with the emphasis on the more protective standard.

Questions on the above policy should be forwarded to the [U.S. Department of Labor, OSHA, Office of Construction Standards and Guidance, Room N3468, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.}
OSHA Interpretation Letter #3A

March 13, 2012

Ms. Kira Henschel
Secretary, Power Crane and Shovel Association
Crane Technical Committee
6737 West Washington Street, Suite 2400
Milwaukee, WI 53214-5647

Dear Ms. Henschel:

Thank you for your September 19, 2011 letter to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Directorate of Construction, as well as prior correspondence with Michael Buchet of my staff. You have asked specific questions concerning the scope of the Cranes and Derricks in Construction standard, and the certification and qualification requirements for mechanics, inspectors, and testers under this standard. This letter constitutes OSHA's interpretation of only the requirements discussed and may not be applicable to any question not delineated in your original correspondence. For clarity, we have paraphrased your questions as follows:

**Question #1:** Are assembly/disassembly, inspection and testing of cranes/derricks considered construction activities? What if these activities are performed in a general industry setting?

**Response #1:** Once a crane/derrick or its components are used in construction activities, this use—including assembly/disassembly, inspection and testing of the crane/derrick—is regulated by the Cranes and Derricks in Construction standard. Section 1926.1400 establishes the scope of the standard as follows: "This standard applies to power-operated equipment, when used in construction, that can hoist, lower and horizontally move a suspended load..." [emphasis added]. Employers using cranes or derricks to perform non-construction activities are not covered by the Cranes and Derricks in Construction standard.

In general, when an employee performs activities covered by the Cranes and Derricks in Construction standard at a construction worksite, such as assembly/disassembly, inspection, hoisting loads, or traveling from place to place on the worksite, the performance of these activities is considered construction. As a result, the employer must comply with the requirements of this standard, as well as any other applicable construction standards, because the activity in question occurs on a construction site and is expediting work that is integral to the construction process.

OSHA has provided general guidance for distinguishing between construction and general industry work in our November 18, 2003 letter to Mr. Raymond V. Knobbs, our May 11, 1999 letter to Mr. J. Nigel Ellis, our February 1, 1999 letter to Mr. Randall Tindell, and our August 11, 1994 memorandum for Regional Administrators. The OSHA website, [http://www.osha.gov/](http://www.osha.gov/), provides access to these and other materials that aid in determining when Agency construction standards under 29 CFR 1926 apply and when they do not.

**Question #2:** Do the operator qualification and certification requirements under §1926.1427 apply to
mechanics, inspectors or testers during assembly and disassembly under §1926.1404 and during
inspection under §1926.1412?

Response #2: Not generally. When the operator certification requirement of 29 CFR 1926.1427 becomes effective on November 10, 2014, an employee who operates a crane on a construction site must meet the requirements of §1926.1427 when the employee performs activities covered by the Cranes and Derricks in Construction standard, such as assembly/disassembly, hoisting loads, or traveling from place to place on the worksite. However, the §1926.1427 operator qualification and certification requirements do not apply to maintenance, inspection or verification of crane/derrick performance by maintenance, inspection and repair personnel. Operation of a crane/derrick for maintenance, inspection or performance verification purposes must meet the requirements of §1926.1429, Qualifications of maintenance and repair employees. Personnel who have satisfied the requirements for qualification/certification under §1926.1427 may perform maintenance, inspection and verification of crane/derrick performance, provided that they also meet the requirements of §1926.1429.

Section 1926.1429 provides:

(a) Maintenance, inspection and repair personnel are permitted to operate the equipment only where all of the following requirements are met:

(1) The operation is limited to those functions necessary to perform maintenance, inspect the equipment, or verify its performance.

(2) The personnel either:

(i) Operate the equipment under the direct supervision of an operator who meets the requirements of §1926.1427 ... ; or

(ii) Are familiar with the operation, limitations, characteristics and hazards associated with the type of equipment.

(b) Maintenance and repair personnel must meet the definition of a qualified person\(^1\) with respect to the equipment and maintenance/repair tasks performed.

Question #3: May an employer rely on ASME B 30.5-2004 or -2007 requirements under 5-3.1.1 in determining what qualification requirements must be met by testers, inspectors and mechanics in order to comply with OSHA's construction crane/derrick standards?

Response #3: No. OSHA has not incorporated by reference ASME Standard B 30.6-2004 or 2007 at 5-3.1.1 in 29 CFR 1926. Although requirements under the ASME standard, including the requirement that maintenance and inspection personnel limit operation of equipment to necessary functions, may be similar to those under §1926.1429, OSHA is required to enforce §1926.1429.

Thank you for your interest in occupational safety and health. We hope you find this information helpful. OSHA requirements are set by statute, standards, and regulations. Our interpretation letters explain these requirements and how they apply to particular circumstances, but they cannot create additional employer obligations. This letter constitutes OSHA's interpretation of the requirements discussed. Note that our enforcement guidance may be affected by changes to OSHA rules. Also, from time to time we update our guidance in response to new information. To keep apprised of such developments, you can consult OSHA's website at http://www.osha.gov/. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact the Directorate of Construction at (202) 693-2020.
Sincerely,
James G. Maddux, Director
Directorate of Construction