Advisory Committee Minutes
Of the 4th Cal/OSHA Advisory Meeting on
Housekeeping in the Hotel and Hospitality Industry
May 13, 2015 – Oakland, California

Meeting Chairs: Amalia Neidhardt, Steve Smith,
Cal/OSHA introduction by: Juliann Sum, Chief and Eric Berg, Acting Deputy Chief
Notes: Valerie Royo, Mike Horowitz

Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Carisa Harris Adamson	Samuel Merritt University
Maria Aguilar	Unite Here
Mary Banks	Housekeeper
Yolanda Barron	Unite Here
Maria Beltran	Unite Here
Fabiola Benavidez	Unite Here
Teresa Cheng	Unite Here
Carmelita Cotton	Unite Here
Nathan Dobbs	Unite Here, Local 49
Baruch A. Fellner	Gibson-Dunn (Partner)
Marti Fisher	California Chamber of Commerce
Josefina Garcia	Unite Here, Local 483
Aida Mojica	Unite Here, Local 49
Anna Gutierrez	
Ricardo A Hermide	Unite Here, Local 483
Mirna E. Hidalgo	Unite Here, Local 483
Zenaida Jabines	Unite Here, Local 49
Sarah Julian	Unite Here, Local 49
Monica Kaitz	Unite Here, Local 49
David Kernazitskas	OSHSB
Ed Klinenberg	CIHC
Mary Kochie	DOSH
Chuck Lam	
Angela Luna	
Runyao Luo	
Silvia M.	
Nicole Marquez	Worksafe
Barbara Materna	CDPH-HESIS
Jennifer McNary	CDPH
Martha Mendoza	Unite Here, Local 49
Lynn Mohrfeld	CA Hotel and Lodging Association
Tessie Navarro	Housekeeper
Irma Perez	Unite Here
Annabel Ramirez	
Sergio Rangel	Unite Here, Local 483
Carmen Reyes	Unite Here, Local 483
Argelia Rico	Unite Here

Estela Rivera	Unite Here
John Robinson	CAPA
Sandra Rodriguez	Unite Here, Local 19
Adela Sandoval	Unite Here
Nathan Schmidt	OD Legal
Mitch Seaman	Cal Labor Federation/AFL-CIO
Brett Smith	CDPH-OHIB
Laura Stock	U.C. Berkeley
Steven Wiker	Ergonomic Design Institute
Mei Juem Yen	
Joyce Yip	
Tiffany Yu	

DOSH Chief Juliann Sum welcomed the attendees and opened the meeting. She noted that the Division has been moving at a fast pace on many regulations, and that this issue was also a high priority. She is confident that progress can be made to reduce ergonomic injuries.

Ms. Sum introduced the people sitting at the panel table: Steve Smith, Eric Berg, Barbara Materna from the Occupational Health Branch Chief, CA Department of Public Health, Amalia Neidhardt, Nathan Schmidt; with Mike Horowitz and Valerie Royo assisting with the minutes.

Steve Smith recapped the OSHSB's Petition 526 and noted that this is an informal process often used to obtain information on how to best address an issue such as this, where there is a high prevalence of injuries, to look at how to best reduce that injury rate. He mentioned that there are a number of methods to do that, such as outreach, doing different stakeholder groups, looking at amending existing regulations or promulgating new regulations.

In January 2012, a petition was sent to the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board (OSHSB) to consider adopting a regulation on hazards unique to hotel housekeeping. That petition was evaluated by Cal/OSHA and Standards Board staff to determine the necessity, and whether to grant or deny the petition. It was a unique situation where the Board initially granted one decision on the petition in May, and then reconsidered and granted a modified decision in June. That is where it was determined that there is a high prevalence of these injuries, and a need to look at those injuries and methods to control those injuries. The advisory committee meetings began in 2012.

Amalia Neidhardt gave a brief report on the advisory committee process to date. The Division convened an advisory committee to talk about the occupational hazards faced by housekeepers and held 3 advisory meetings one each in 2012, 2013, and 2014. At these meetings, the Division gathered information and input from stakeholders regarding the illnesses and injuries faced by hotel housekeepers in California. The Division, as well as the industry and labor advocates, gave presentation and housekeepers shared their experiences. All presentations, handouts, meeting minutes and written comments received were posted on the DOSH Hotel Housekeeping website.

Ms. Neidhardt noted that as part of the process of determining whether a rulemaking action should be initiated, the Division needed to gather information on all possible alternatives and their effectiveness in addressing the health and safety hazards faced by hotel housekeepers. Conclusions reached from the data collected established that there is a high number of injuries faced by hotel housekeepers in

California. These include disabling injuries to the back, shoulder and upper extremities and injuries due to slips, trips and falls. US Department of Labor data demonstrated the high incidence rates faced by maids and housekeeping cleaners. DOSH presented data from the California Workers Comp Information System highlighted by the tasks where these injuries most frequently occurred. Data from OSHA logs and inspections conducted by Cal/OSHA, Fed OSHA and Hawaii OSHA identified injuries and risk factors.

The goal is to address these injuries and not on whether or not they should be categorized as repetitive motion injuries, musculoskeletal illnesses or injuries due to slips, trips and falls. As such, the Division needs to gather information on all available alternatives and their effectiveness in addressing the injuries faced by hotel housekeepers. Not only is this input necessary to determine whether a rulemaking action should be initiated, but to also identify all viable solutions.

Ms. Neidhardt enumerated the possible alternatives to addressing these Health and Safety Problems:

1. Adopting new regulations

2. Amending existing Repetitive Motion Injury and IIPP regulations

3. Preparing a model IIPP with HESIS and stakeholders

Regarding alternative 3, Ms. Neidhardt reintroduced Barbara Materna, OHB Chief from CDPH who gave an overview on the HESIS approach to developing effective educational tools.

Ms. Materna noted that the Occupational Health Branch is a part of CDPH, another state agency, which is non-regulatory. They have a long history working with Cal/OSHA to make recommendations on health standards be more protective and effective. One of their activities is to develop practical information for employers and workers on how to work safely. HESIS has a contract with the Division, and their activity is to develop information for employers and workers, and they're here today to hear what role educational materials can play to help address the high rate of injuries.

Ms. Materna stated that HESIS has health education staff and stressed that for materials to be effective, it needs to be very clear what the need is, who the audience is, and just as critical, that there be input from beginning to end from the impacted audience. If they were to develop a model IIPP, it would be something employers use to comply with IIPP requirements, and everyone would have to feel it's useful to comply with the regulations. They would convene a group of stakeholders to do the development project, so there would agreement from all parties involved on the need and what they are trying to achieve. They would also want to make them user friendly so that it would help in reducing injuries. Ms. Materna concluded that they were there to listen and understand the needs better.

Ms. Neidhardt continued listing possible alternatives:

4. Providing materials and guidance on best practices under existing statutes and regulations, and

5. Other alternatives.

Next, Ms. Neidhardt explained to attendees that the Division was seeking input on the pros and cons of each alternative. The goal is to hear the pros and cons, advantages and disadvantages on the

alternatives to see if they are viable solutions. She asked the audience to be respectful of everyone's input and asked commenters to please state their name, mention if they're a worker or industry representative, as the meeting was being recorded.

Pamela Vossenas from Unite Here asked the panel to please explain why there was a discussion of alternatives at this point in time when a discussion draft had already been released. She asked if the alternatives #1-5 for a new regulation or were alternatives to high rate of injuries.

Ms. Neidhardt explained that in the event the Division was to move forward with rulemaking, there would be a need to say that the Division looked, listened and heard all possible alternatives. The Division hasn't yet made a determination. There is also a need to look at solutions, so the input is extremely valuable in order to effectively address these hazards

Ms. Vossenas noted that the second advisory meeting was held to specifically talk about solutions and that the first meeting was to establish the hazards. She reiterated that there has been discussion.

Mitch Seaman from the California Labor Federation thanked the Division for organizing the meeting and added that putting something worth enforcing in regulations sends an important message. If the problem is identified, then this needs to be serious and it has to be enforced. They believe that the severity and frequency of these issues has been demonstrated and needs to be put in regulatory language for it to be enforced. Employers may not follow model IIPPs, and there should be consequences for that. These are injuries that have not gone away, and given the effect on the workers' ability to provide and lead lives, it is necessary to prevent these injuries as much as possible. He asked the Division to send a message to employers about the seriousness of the problem by using regulatory language. Workers need to be able to call Cal/OSHA for help. They urge the Division to move forward with the discussion draft, and believe that helpful comments have already been submitted.

Ms. Neidhardt asked to clarify if he was asking the Division to adopt a new regulation. Mr. Seaman replied yes.

Ms. Vossenas noted that they clearly support a new regulation, and also understand the legal and administrative requirements to explore alternatives. She added that the next steps should be to revise the discussion draft in response to comments that were submitted. There has been sufficient time to establish hazards with urgency, and a revised discussion draft should head towards a new regulation. They are encouraged to see that the majority of comments are in support of Cal/OSHA's discussion draft so they think that those in support have similar comments. It would be a fairly feasible process to work towards finalizing a draft regulation. Their petition included much more of a prescriptive standard where they talked of fitted sheets and defining safe working practices, and still think that is the most protective standard one could have. They also submitted comments and felt they would be of value to the Cal/OSHA draft, which is more of a performance draft or a job hazard assessment program. They propose a release date of July 1st for the updated discussion draft. They understand how busy the Division has been, and they have seen the amendments to the heat stress regulation, as well as to the workplace violence petition. They understand that there are competing priorities, but noted that they submitted their petition in 2012.

Baruch Fellner, California Hotel & Lodging Association stated that they submitted a study with a letter from Lynn Mohrfeld. He noted that housekeepers are the face of the Hotel and Lodging association, that they interface with their customers, the people who enjoy their stays at their hotels and B&Bs. If

housekeepers are suffering, their problems and pains will come through to the public, and that will affect the Hotel and Lodging Association and its members. Mr. Fellner noted that this is not a question of us vs them, but a question of them working together. They want a common solution to these difficulties and it makes good sense to find appropriate solutions together. He added that their preferred alternative is the model IIPP which they attached to their submission and which can be tailored to the individual hotel. No two hotels are the same. They will be responsive and should be responsive to the issues that have been raised. They have opposed the UNITE HERE effort to impose a one-size fits all regulatory mandate on the hotel industry. Their prescriptions require specific numbers, exact equipment, fitted sheets, etc. There is some movement on UNITE HERE to a less prescriptive standard. Their effort is to find a regulatory solution. They think both directions are mistakes. There is no scientific correlation between number, type, and sequence of housekeeping tasks to injuries. California is the only state in the union that has an ergonomics regulation that requires two diagnosed repetitive motion and musculoskeletal injuries. This doesn't include falls and slips, but there is an IIPP.

Mr. Fellner said that California already has two unique enforcement prongs which can be used in order to appropriately protect housekeepers. DOSH has used 5110 and 3203 in issuing citations for housekeeping. If there is a standalone housekeeper standard, it would be an extraordinarily unfortunate precedence and every other industry will take a look at housekeeping and say that their injuries are even worse than what housekeepers have. A regulatory route will invite every other industry to legitimately come before the Board and say "me, too". This morning Barbara Materna indicated that one of the reasons she is here is to learn, and that may be an alternative as far as HESIS guidance and educational materials goes. If that is an alternative, they would welcome that. They look forward to being an active stakeholder to come up with guidance that would be very helpful to individual hotels to respond to the legitimate concerns that are articulated by the housekeepers. Mr. Fellner noted that the NIOSH study attached to Pamela's letter dated May 11th was not science. What these showed on a quick read is that "they (housekeepers) report working in negative and adversarial climates. The reason he quoted that is that this study established what the Boeing study established in the 80s: none of these concerns are physical but psychosocial.

Nicole Marquez, WORKSAFE noted that there has been a lot of work before this, and that they are very much in support of adopting a new regulation. They understand the Division's burden to reflect alternatives and believe there is overwhelming support to demonstrate the need for a standard required to address health and safety concerns for hotel housekeepers. The alternatives being reflected upon today give concern. The repetitive motion injury standard is a very onerous standard for people to meet. Hotel housekeeping is specific to that industry. Language to prevent these injuries should be in its own standard. 5110b is really just to minimize injuries. The new regulation would prevent injuries for hotel housekeepers. Looking to amend the IIPP is also too general. There have been past situations where IIPP applied to outdoor heat, and yet there were specific issues with agricultural workers exposed to heat illness. There is a heat illness standard that addresses their needs. They also need a hotel housekeeping standard to address housekeepers' needs. The Division is charged with protecting worker safety, so if other industries come forward, then the current law is not addressing their needs, and they need laws to have those needs addressed. They believe the third recommendation is great, but if without an adopted standard the issue of best practices could be problematic. They are confused with the HESIS approach, and feel that a specific standard addressing hotel housekeeping ergonomic issues is the best route.

Lynn Mohrfeld, California Hotel & Lodging Association said that they have taken a training and education approach. Safety is paramount for our workers. A housekeeper's job satisfaction cannot be stressed

enough. They've done presentation and articles, and tried to educate the entire industry. Their guide was professionally developed, looking at no less than a dozen IIPPs and insurance company models in trying to come up with best model guide they could. If there are bad actors, they encourage Cal/OSHA to go after them. He added that the analogy to Pandora's box is correct. They are training how to lift, how to make beds, etc. They are encouraged by HESIS with educational tools, and think this makes most sense. They thank the Division for giving them the opportunity to participate. Mr. Mohrfeld was asked if he was suggesting training and outreach under alternative 5, or under option 3 as trainings are sometimes generalized and don't specifically address the tasks. He replied that he would like to talk more to HESIS to know about that.

Mr. Mohrfeld said that they were going with option 3. With training, one has a model IIPP, and one size does not fit all. In terms of their presentations, that's when they get into specifics, going over lifting and bending, etc. Both approaches are needed, but the educational approach is where they come from.

Marti Fisher, Cal Chamber echoed the comments from Baruch and Lynn, and agreed with education and outreach. It is great that HESIS has stepped in with training materials, and they wonder why that hasn't been started already. They also appreciate the IIPP approach and customizing approaches particular to their property.

Steven Wiker, Ergonomic Design Institute noted that he was commenting from a practicing ergonomist standpoint and asked that it be bases on good science and on good processes. If overlapping standards are developed, employers will comply with the easier standard and attorneys will argue about which standards are more appropriate. Standards that are prescriptive tell one what the goal is. Standards that are performance tell us what one has to do.

Standards would focus on musculoskeletal, but what is it that they are going to add to the federal regulation. The federal regulation uses sciences. He would like to know that it is healthy as an intervention and does not overlook the primary problems in housekeeping, which are slips and falls.

Mr. Wiker inquired as to what is currently prohibiting the Division from going after the bad actors. He said that it helps him when he has to go to intervene in an industry to understand recommended changes. He added that educational process should not be overlooked. Housekeepers clean rooms and bathrooms differently. Even if those exposures are safe, they could be reduced further. The state could help by introducing best practices on the job, based on good science. If there is negative psychosocial issue, he doesn't know if one has to provide for that. Architects and interior designers also affect workload for housekeepers. They increase or decrease the amount of work as part of the design. Some education should be addressed towards architects and interior designers on décor issues. Educate those professions to design rooms that are easier to clean, safer, more usable for housekeepers and guests.

Argelia Rico, Housekeeper (Spanish), said that this was a very important meeting over body injuries faced by housekeepers. She noted that she is very proud of her job, and flew from Los Angeles to speak. She noted that she has a work injury as result of the job, and has been attending meetings for 3 years to share their stories and testimonies on injuries. Cal/OSHA is now aware that their work is heavy and dangerous, and since 2012, they have explained every year what is happening. Enough is enough. They want to end worker injuries. Now is the time to have a law that will protect them. This is what Cal/OSHA can make happen. This is a very important regulation for all housekeepers, most importantly for women, women of color, immigrants and low wage workers with no union. These are the demographics of the housekeepers in California. The health of the housekeepers is important, and they ask for a new law to

be established. She added that day in and day out, their bodies are hurting, that it's stressful and depressing to go get treatment after treatment that cannot resolve their injuries. Now is the time to establish new laws to protect working women. They are getting injured at work, and have to go home and care for their families. She asked about how many more times she has to come back.

Ricardo Hernandez, Housekeeping department (Spanish), stated that he understands that all hotels are different. He worked in a historical hotel with 3 floors and no elevators. They have to carry all the supplies, including heavy linen and soap, on their shoulders. The layout is not flat, and more strength is required to carry materials. Lifting mattresses causes body pain and muscle aches. Some hotels don't follow the law; don't have emergency kits or appropriate tools to do jobs. When hotel management hires supervisors, they're not trained on how to train housekeepers on how to do their jobs. They only push workers to do more work in less time, causing more injuries. He noted that they are asking to pass a new law now and provide services for hotel industry employees and their families.

Fabiola Benavidez, Housekeeper, stated that this is her 3rd time coming here and that it is time to pass a new law. She has not heard from OSHA on when they will pass a new law. She works in 600-room hotel, and they have problems. Some people say they have the tools, but they don't have tools, education, or training. Only when they have problems with money or complaints would management respond. They need tools, uniforms, and more protection for themselves and their jobs. All her coworkers have pain. Six years ago, she had an injury and an ankle brace. The doctor said she had to keep working. Every day the hotel puts more things in the room, which are hard to clean. The bathtubs with glasses are hard to clean, and they don't teach them how to clean it. They just have to do it. They are the face of the hotel, and sometimes they don't have the manager or anyone to protect them. It's time for Cal/OSHA to pass the law.

Ms. Neidhardt clarified that the Division is holding these meetings to gather input and explained that there are requirements that need to be followed, and that a decision has not yet been made.

Carisa Harris-Adamson, Samuel Merritt University, said she would prefer moving forward on a policy to protect women. She has worked with them for 10 years as a physical therapist/ergonomist onsite. She has experience observing these jobs and the training provided by different hotels. Trainings vary widely; guidance is needed as not all trainings are alike. They fear that relying on just a general training will put burden on room cleaners and not the hotel. There are tools that are available that can make the job easier but they're not being used. More research is needed to look at the newer tools but there is evidence in place that documents the exposures that the women are exposed to on a daily basis. This agenda is a step backward. She wants to see a discussion about the edits and feedback provided a year ago to the proposed regulation. There shouldn't be a reliance on general training that doesn't have formalities or implementation policies attached to them.

Ms. Harris-Adamson was asked to clarify if she was showing support for option #4 or option #3. She replied that yes on both. An IIPP with a regulation is a good idea. A best practices IIPP as an appendix to a regulation is what is required to protect these women. She added that they have been looking at exposures and are hoping the findings will be out later this year. The level of exposures that they were quantifying, heart rate and blood pressure responses to making beds, are quite high. It's really a concern. They need to protect these women, and it can't be done without a regulation.

Ms. Materna noted that part of the intent of this meeting is looking at both pros and cons. She would appreciate the last commenter addressing training and would like to encourage more discussion of

educational materials. She asked, what would be needed if they were prepared. She stressed that this was separate from the question of doing a regulation and noted that often times when regulations are put in place, is the perfect time to roll out educational materials on what needs to happen. She told the industry reps, that she hadn't seen the model IIPP that was submitted with the letter, and asked that if it had been developed and rolled out to their members, if they could share more about how helpful it was, how much it has been used, and what more were they looking for.

Mr. Mohrfeld said that the development guide had only recently been released so there was no anecdotal information. They took a dozen other IIPP from major hotel companies, insurance companies, and management companies, and combined them into one model IIPP. It was well received by the industry.

Ms. Materna inquired as to what they would ask HESIS to add.

Mr. Mohrfeld replied that they would like a review with Cal/OSHA to see if they got it correct.

Mr. Fellner said that there are specific training programs that ought to be vetted by HESIS. He would encourage interaction with stakeholders and HESIS on coming up with a program that is incorporated with the guide on IIPP.

Ms. Neidhardt asked Mr. Mohrfeld if the guides had been developed with worker input. He replied yes.

Mr. Wiker noted that NIOSH has put out training programs for various types of hazards and that they have an extensive one for musculoskeletal. New training materials should not just replicate what NIOSH put together. It's important to assist hotel industries to apply training to hotel work. Hotel housekeepers usually have on-the-job training. They shadow experienced housekeepers, and this practice is widespread. In the study that he did for hotel bed making, there were different strategies amongst different housekeepers. Some are better, some are worse. It would be better to provide real solid training on different ways to make beds, and the risks involved. Training support should be tailored and relevant, and not just NIOSH guidelines. Regarding heart rates, he looked at 20 different housekeepers, and highest rate was 140 bpm, 190 bpm. It shows they're working, but not at a hazardous rate, based on NIOSH criteria. He added that it is important to drive down exposures to make it easier to do the job, like providing long-handed tools. The housekeepers carried these things, but didn't use them. The space in showers and bathrooms were too tight, so the tools could not be utilized without getting into awkward positions. They couldn't clean very well, so it took housekeepers longer to do their tasks. When thinking of standards, it would be hard to get housekeepers to adopt protocols that would make it harder for them to do their jobs. Tools should be researched and proven that they help. Providing that information to tool developers on how these tools should work in that environment is important in educational materials. Hotel companies should also make sure that these tools actually help. Housekeepers should be involved in evaluating the tools.

Ms. Vossenas said that they were glad that progress was being made. This discussion is very important in allowing issues to be raised.

In Cal/OSHA's discussion draft released last year, there was a section on training. That's very important to have, and they were glad to see it. On the website, UNITE HERE has already submitted comments on training. In the discussion draft, there is mention of a possible health and safety committee, including

hotel housekeepers, and they think that would get to the issues that Dr. Wiker pointed out as to the right tools to have. It follows the similar framework of safe patient handling.

Regarding NIOSH, she wanted to mention that the most recent abstract they distributed is actually part of a research team from a number of different universities. NIOSH is the government research agency for workers health, and it is the research arm of OSHA. Training issues is one of the topics that are covered in this setting. The 5th paragraph talks of accessibility of job-related trainings. Training is being looked at, and lots of information is gathered on types of trainings they've received.

In Cal/OSHA's discussion draft last year, appendices included training materials, like the Ohio State University's training material, which was funded by an OSHA grant. They encourage training for managers and housekeepers. They support training as part of a new regulation, and support training as stated with their comments on the Cal/OSHA's discussion draft of 2014.

Mr. Wiker echoed Ms. Vossenas comments. It is important to train managers as well so they understand what housekeepers are doing. If they catch something that housekeepers miss, they should train. He asked if the Division has something similar to Federal OSHA's consultation program, as it would take some time to develop a regulation. In the meantime, there is access to free consulting by Cal/OSHA. Hazards slow people down, and it can make a good argument to implement internal processes to improve operations to save money. Some of that money should turn back to the housekeepers to help them do their job.

Ana Gutierrez, Housekeeper (Spanish) said that where she works 1/3 of the housekeepers is injured. There are a total of 33 workers, and 11 injured. The idea of training is great theoretically, but in practice, it's hard to implement and carry on. As a housekeeper, she has seen how companies do trainings for them when there's a remodel or on how to treat guests. However, there is no training on how to protect their bodies. She has been in the industry for 23 years, and has not seen training on that. They need a new regulation that protects their bodies. Year after year, when companies make changes, they never take into account the workload or impact to housekeepers. Housekeepers are not machines. She supports a new regulation.

Ms. Neidhardt reminded workers that Cal OSHA can be contacted to report workplace injuries.

Irma Perez, Housekeeper from the Courtyard Marriott Oakland (Spanish), said that she has worked for 14 years, and that it is important to talk about training. She got training on how to bend and lift mattresses, but doesn't have the time to practice this training. This is very important, and they also need a new regulation to set a number of rooms to clean. Training is beautiful when they teach you how to do things in slow motion. But as a housekeeper, they don't have time to bend down, shift, and get up because they are rushed. She personally cannot work without a waist belt. When she has to bend, she has to have a waist belt to deal with pain she already has. She feels really lucky to be a member of the Local 2850. Through the union, they are able to negotiate a contract that establishes the number of rooms to clean a day. She is here to speak for those who don't have a union or a contract. They have to clean 20-25 rooms. Our room quota is 15. She asks how it is possible to clean 20-15 rooms in pain. She knows of room attendants that are pushed to clock out but then forced to work afterwards. She is here to support a new regulation. She doesn't know what agency can establish room quotas, but those without unions are threatened to be fired. If they speak up, they can be retaliated against. A new regulation would help.

Mr. Fellner inquired if a specific room quota was off the table or being considered.

Ms. Neidhardt noted that input was being accepted from everyone, and that it was not the intent of the Division to limit the input.

Mr. Fellner noted that he would like for the Division to give them a chance to respond when the proposed view is released.

Mr. Wiker noted that with regards to the person that mentioned that housekeepers are cleaning up to 20-25 rooms, he didn't think that, under any hotel room design, this would fall below NIOSH guidelines. He recommends if packages are put together on educating hotels, it should give information on met rates. It would be useful to show hotels that there has to be a limit on metabolic burdens. Some hotels use temporary workers who don't know their protocol, but it would be useful to educate hotels if there is a limit on rooms based on biomechanics and metabolic burdens.

Ms. Neidhardt reminded attendees that they can send comments via email as well.

LUNCH BREAK

Ms. Rico noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Ms. Benavidez noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Annabel Ramirez noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Estela Rivera noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Silvia Medrano noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Yolanda Barron noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Mirna Hidalgo noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Ricardo Aniso Hermide noted that he supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Nathan Dobbs noted that he supports the adoption of a new regulation. He was hurt and the hotel didn't follow OSHA standards. He had chemical burns in both eyes, and the casino didn't have protective wear. He went to speak to management, but they were not sure what to do to ensure proper usage of PPE. A lot of people are getting hurt at Thunder Valley, and no one is helping when they get hurt.

Mr. Smith asked if anyone had filed a complaint. Mr. Dobbs replied that he did under Worker's comp, but he went to the hospital for 4 hours.

Mr. Smith told Mr. Dobbs that he did have the right to complain to OSHA, but that since the hotel was in an Indian Reservation, it would fall under the jurisdiction of Fed OSHA. He was asked to speak with a Cal/OSHA person afterwards.

Carmen Reyes noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Maria Beltran noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Aida Mojica, worker at Thunder Valley in Lincoln noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation. She wanted to speak a little about what happened to her. A door smashed her hand because she was hurrying to finish a job. Not once did management do anything to help or tell her what to do. She was trained through shadowing and was taught that person's way on how to clean. She wasn't taught proper protocol, and had to learn as she went along. A lot of people there that do get hurt are scared to speak up, and management brushes it off. They don't try to alleviate the problem or explain how to do things. They don't carry the right equipment in their carts, and nothing is being done. She had to teach herself how to use carts, but they never taught her when asked. Women need protection. When one is queued for a room, they have to clean as fast as they can because a guest is waiting. She got hurt in a suite where doors are big, and there is no training on how to clean a suite.

Adela Sandoval noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Tiffany Yu noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Runyao Luo noted that he supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Maria Aguilar noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Irma Perez noted that she supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Maria Beltran noted that she worked as a housekeeper for 9 years. In last 2-3 years, there were renovations and lots of new things that required to be cleaned. As she was doing work, she injured her back from rushing with the new additions. There are many of them who can't take a second rest break because they're so rushed. It is very stressful because they can't rest. They clean 11 rooms, and management has said that if they don't complete assignments, they get disciplined. They end up forfeiting their right to rest to avoid disciplinary actions. She supports the adoption of a new regulation.

Sarah Julian said that UNITE HERE represents 25,000 hotel workers, and the Local 19 is part of the Northern California hub. In California, UNITE HERE represents 47,000 hotel workers. They have read OSHA logs on hotel workers injuries. They've been coming for 3 years for these meetings to tell their stories. They keep asking why it keeps taking so long and when will there be a regulation for them just like there are for health care and construction. House keepers have been telling OSHA about injuries since 2007 since the first injury, and they still continue today. More continue to get injured. As a local union leader who has worked with workers for the past ten years, this issue is extremely important to this membership. 90% are women, immigrant women, and these women have lost the means to earn a livelihood for their families, and can no longer feel positive as productive members of society, and live daily with pain and suffering. This is difficult to accept because it is preventable, and does not need to happen. It is time for Cal/OSHA to fulfill its mandate to create an injury prevention standard for hotel housekeepers. They can't wait any longer. They ask for a revised Cal/OSHA draft regulation by July 1st, and a meeting 30 days after the draft regulation by August. They feel it is their turn now. Housekeeper health matters.

Ms. Vossenas said that they know that the Division has been busy and that a lot has gotten done in the past year and there aren't unlimited resources. Their sense of urgency comes from having started in

2012. There have been other petitions that have made progress. Now is time for this to move forward. She wants to thank all the people who have spoken today in support of a new regulation. This is the only thing that will make a difference in occupational health. There is lots of evidence that it is hazardous to worker health. The first presentations by Nicholas Krauss dealt specifically with hotel housekeeper health. There are easily 20 scientific articles that are just about housekeeping work being hazardous. Cal/OSHA as an agency issued information memos in 2011 where they couldn't meet the bar on standards. California had repetitive motion standards. They did recommend an evaluation of work tasks with bed making and cleaning to identify exposures and recognize ergo risk factors. She would like to remind the agency that the things recommended in 2011 are in the discussion draft. It does pertain to what has been recommended to control hazards. Cal/OSHA as an agency has done work towards reducing housekeeping injuries, and the discussion draft captures that. There were two very thorough ergo assessments at two hotels in California that looked at ergo hazards.

Ms. Vossenas noted that she submitted into record these articles. She thinks that the agency has made useful progress that can be incorporate in a regulation. She is a big believer in doing things collectively, which is why she has dedicated her life to occupational safety and health as part of a union. When their petition was voted down in May 2012, and then in June when there was a vote to move petition forward, there were a number of options that the Standards Board had. There were four voting options. The unanimous vote was the one that was voted up. That really made it very clear that Cal/OSHA's mandate was to create regulations as protective as possible. She doesn't want anything held up because labor and the business side of things are too far apart. She has worked as an epidemiologist, and has been in the field for 28 years now. She has spent the last 10 years documenting hotel housekeeper injuries. All these workers need to be trained and protected on the job. This industry is growing as far as jobs because this industry is profitable. They're operating out of regulation while workers are still being injured. She added that they would like to have a revised discussion draft by July 1st, and would like another meeting in august. They cannot afford to lose another year.

Mr. Seaman stated that this had been incredibly informative and helpful. A point worth emphasizing was what might sound like a big disparity between the hotel association and what workers were describing. The issue is that something is still failing. There are too many stories of painful injuries. Workers will typically live their life with these injuries. All the research and science out there can come together in a new regulation. They need something out there that puts some sort of system in place to keep workers safe. These need to be brought together in some way, and a new regulation would be able to do that. The only sensible course is to draft a regulation. They will do whatever they need to do in order to make a regulation that works better. But all comes down to making a new regulation.

Ms. Marquez stated that she supports adopting a new regulation. Everyone has heard the hotel housekeepers. There's a pattern, a trend in the stories. They're getting injured, and there is no recourse or prevention. Their needs are not being addressed, there needs to be action, a regulation that addresses this. Non-unionized workers experience these injuries at a higher rate because they don't have a union. There is urgency in creating a new regulation.

Ms. Vossenas stated that with regards to the other alternatives, specifically with amending existing regulations, that it would be opening up a large effort for these regulations that have been in the books for a long time. It is beyond the scope for a feasible alternative. Repetitive motion injury is only triggered after two injuries. She knows that standard very well. She doesn't want to wait for people to get injured. They want to prevent these injuries. There are musculoskeletal injuries that aren't repetitive motion, like injuries from forceful exertions and ergo risk factors. Those might meet criteria for MRI.

With regards to the IIPP, Ms. Vossenas noted that this doesn't have enough teeth. It is not specific to a particular type of hazard. They already discussed these two in the petition process. A model IIPP standard with HESIS would be fine. She would welcome it as an appendix as part of the new standard. They would prefer mandatory appendices. As for materials and guidance on best practices, she noted that this is very valuable but only as part of the appendices and not instead of a new regulation.

Mr. Fellner agreed with Ms. Vossenas that amending the MRI and IIPP would be a heavy lift. He added that issuing a new regulation with regards to housekeepers' amounts to amending housekeepers from MRI and IIPP. A new regulation would be a heavier lift.

Mr. Smith stated that the Division really appreciates the feedback. Next steps include going over all the advice received today and recommending to the leadership the path forward. He stressed that further input is welcomed and requested that it be submitted by the end of the month. The Department's leadership will be provided with a complete picture of the advice provided on all the alternatives and where to go, and then next steps will be provided to this group.

Ms. Neidhardt reminded everyone to sign-in and stressed that if someone didn't get the announcement it meant that their email is missing. She encouraged all attendees to send written comments.

Mr. Smith thanked all attendees for coming and then the meeting was closed.