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How it works

✓ Good standing with Wyoming Workers’ Compensation
✓ Public, private, any size
✓ Up to $10,000 - 1 year, 10% match

http://wyomingworkforce.org/businesses/workerscomp/sif/
How it works

• Reporting 185 & 365 days post contract

• Equipment
• Engineering Controls
• Training
Why is this important for Wyoming?

• Historically high worker fatality rates

• High percentages of workers in high-risk jobs

• One of only four monopolistic workers’ compensation systems
Dec 2012 - May 2015

• **92 employers**
  o About **3,600 employees**

• Top industries
  o Construction 35%
  o Manufacturing 14%
  o Healthcare 9%
  o Local Gov’t 8%
  o Mining (O&G) 5%
## Summary of Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Size</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (≤ 25)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (26-75)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (75 +)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety Equipment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory protection/Gas monitoring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergonomic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Safety Equipment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s trending?
Example # 1 - Construction

- Trailer & equipment
- Established a traveling training program
- Reaching employees at state-wide work sites
Example # 2 - Manufacturing

- QR code Lockout/ Tag out program
- Prevents systems from accidentally becoming energized while maintenance is being performed.
Evaluating Impact by Funded Employer

- Contract effective date (CED) delineates the pre/post period
- Used first CED available for each of 92 employers

Pre period = 2 years prior to CED  Post period = From CED to 5/15/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Comp ID</th>
<th>Pre Period</th>
<th>Post Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Claims</td>
<td># Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Average crude claims rate per 100 employed, Funded employers (n=92)

Limitations:
- Pre/post periods are different lengths of time
- Very small sample size
- Numerator & denominator includes employees possibly not affected by intervention

Est. background claims rate decrease -6.2%  -38.3
Evaluating Impact by Industry

- Matched funded and not-funded employers by industry (6-digit NAICS)
- Series split = July 1, 2013
  - 33% of all contracts had been funded by then
  - Provided similar pre/post periods

Pre Period =
July 1 2011 to Jun 30 2013 (2 yr)

Post Period =
July 1 2013 to May 15 2015 (~2 yr)
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Average crude claims rate per 100 employed, Funded & Non Funded, Matched industries, (n=59 NAICS groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-period 7/11/11 – 6/30/13</th>
<th>Post-period 7/1/13 – 5/15/15</th>
<th>% Change Pre/Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>-3.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Funded</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-4.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Data by specific industry varied drastically from above – Sample sizes too small to draw conclusions.
- So many limitations
Anecdotes

Mobile training unit:
“We have been able to take our training to the job site and do more specific training...We have also used this unit to raise hazard awareness through onsite team building exercises...We have a stronger, closer knitted team with positive ownership of safety!”

Forklift:
“It was extremely valuable to us in replacing our older (unsafe) all terrain forklift with a newer unit...We were able to secure a bid to manufacturer 20 camper cabins for Flagg Ranch in Grand Teton National Park. Thanks again...for helping Wyoming businesses thrive!”

Audiometric testing equipment & certification for onsite hearing tests:
 “[This] is helping to educate employees on the health hazards associated with exposure to hazardous levels of noise. It will help them become proactive in understanding, valuing and protecting their sense of hearing.”
Evaluation

• Are we reaching the right industries?
  
• Are employers utilizing the program appropriately?
  
• Does this fund raise awareness about safety?
  
• Does this fund reduce injuries?
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If dreams come true

1. Continue the grant program.
2. Revisions to model the Ohio BWC program
3. Improve data collection to improve evaluation.
Special thanks:
  o Laurie Knowlton, DWS Risk Manager
  o NIOSH CWCS (Wurzelbacher et al., AJIM, 2014)
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