

Philip L. Graitcer, D.M.D., M.P.H.
926 Myrtle Street Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Tel: 404-872-7337 Fax: 404-872-1464
Email: pgraitc@sph.emory.edu

December 10, 2002

Greg Abel
Chairman, Advocates for Safe Glass
P.O. Box 24511
Eugene, OR 97402

Dear Mr. Abel:

In reference to my report to you dated December 5, 2002, there are two further points I would like to make:

Number of Wired Glass Injuries

Because the CPSC surveillance data were not specifically coded for wired glass injuries, it was not possible to state how many of the 2,554 glass door injuries in schools were caused by wired glass as opposed to other glass types such as annealed (plate), tempered, or laminated glass. I do think that we can safely assume, however, that a majority of these injuries were caused by wired glass for the following reasons:

- Since 1977, only wired glass and tempered or laminated glass (“safety glass”) have been permitted in hazardous locations such as school doors or door side panels. If there is any annealed or plate glass in these installations, they are part of an original door installation dating from before 1977, or they are part of an illegal replacement. In other words, annealed glass should not be in these installations.
- Tempered and laminated glasses are unlikely to produce the kinds of lacerations and cuts reported to the NEISS surveillance system.
- Based on my observational experience here in Atlanta, less than 10% of the glass installed in hazardous locations is annealed. Most of it is wired or tempered glass.

Since the kinds of injuries seen in the surveillance system had to be caused by wired or annealed glass, I would conservatively estimate that 90% of 2,500 glass door injuries seen each year in the CPSC system involved wired glass.

Wired Glass in Other Locations

In my report, I did not attempt to estimate the number of injuries caused by wired glass in hazardous installations in other facilities such as in factories, public buildings, and homes. This could be done using NEISS data and possibly worker compensation data, however, for a variety of reasons, worker injury data is frequently not accurate. If an analysis were possible, I am certain, however, we will see a similar pattern of inadvertent laceration injuries and that they

would be caused primarily by wired glass. As in schools, in hazardous locations in these locales, annealed or plate glass should no longer be there – it was outlawed in 1977; only wired glass or safety glass are now permitted. Since lacerations from safety glass rarely occur, I expect the majority of these injuries are from wired glass.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Philip L. Graitcer, DMD, MPH