

From: [Berg, Eric@DIR](mailto:Berg.Eric@DIR)
To: [Neidhardt, Amalia@DIR](mailto:Neidhardt.Amalia@DIR); [Smith, Steve C.@DIR](mailto:Smith.Steve.C.@DIR); [Delizo, Grace@DIR](mailto:Delizo.Grace@DIR); [Friedman, Corey@DIR](mailto:Friedman.Corey@DIR)
Subject: FW: Indoor Heat Illness
Date: Thursday, April 06, 2017 5:41:12 PM

Comments from Marley Hart of the standards board about our initial draft.

From: Hart, Marley@DIR
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2017 2:18 PM
To: Berg, Eric@DIR
Cc: Sum, Juliann@DIR
Subject: Indoor Heat Illness

Eric, the Standards Board was not able to attend the advisory meeting for Indoor Heat Illness. We did, however, review the draft language. Here are a few quick observations:

- The draft regulatory text discussed at the February 28, 2017, advisory meeting proposes an approach that appears to be more complicated and burdensome than necessary, especially taking into consideration that Labor Code Section 6720 allows for the standard to be limited to certain industry sectors. As written, the standard could apply to many tens of thousands of California employers.
- Scope and Exception confusion: The scope says 90F and above, unless workers perform moderate, heavy, or very heavy work, and then 80F is the trigger. Exception 1.1 is for light and moderate work under 85F, which is below the 90F trigger. “Light work” shouldn’t be mentioned since it is already excluded. “Moderate work” is mentioned in relation to 80F (in the scope), 85F (Exception 1.1 if AC functions—does it need to be on, or just functional?), and 90F (Exception 1.2 if AC is undergoing “emergency” repairs). Listing moderate work in so many situations could be confusing to employers.
- The acclimatization definition is more strict than 3395 (outdoor heat illness). This one says employees who do not work at least 10 days in the previous 14 are considered unacclimatized. Assuming a 5-day work week, any employee that takes a vacation day or gets Labor Day off (or similar) is now unacclimatized. Any employees on a 4/10 or 9/80 work schedule could also be affected.
- The definitions of heavy, moderate, light work, etc. should be moved to one heading in the definitions so that stakeholders can more easily compare the different meanings, instead of having to find each one in the list. “Heavy work” equates manual sawing to walking quickly. “Moderate work” is defined as walking normally.
- “Moderate work” is the only work type that vaguely mentions a time factor—“sustained”. The others only mention intensity and activities, which could be confusing if an employee performs tasks that fall into multiple categories (i.e. walks quickly for a few steps, and then returns to normal walking). The definitions may be problematic.

We are hopeful that we will be able to attend future meetings.

Marley